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ABSTRACT:

The main subjects of this study, Pieter Vanderlyn, the attributed artist of “A Portrait of Annetje Kool” (c.1740), and Annetje Kool, the sitter, both had subversive identities relative to the sociocultural expectations of New Netherland, a Hudson River Valley based settlement. The oil portrait on canvas depicts a young woman in an elaborate dress with lace and gilt embellishments. To understand this portrait’s historical context, this thesis examines how male and female voices functioned on the margins of the moral boundaries that shaped expectations of gender appropriate thought and action during the colonial, revolutionary, and post-revolutionary eras in New York and Massachusetts. Originally established as a trade outpost for the Dutch West India Company, New Netherland adopted “Dutchness,” an identity that encompassed the religious, cultural, social, political, and economic practices characteristic of the Netherlands and its colonists. With an emphasis on communal worship, the Dutch Reformed Church was indispensable to the cultural unity of New Netherland. However, with a growing multinational community, seizure by the British in 1664, and the rapidly changing sociocultural and religious ideologies of the eighteenth century, Dutchness faded and the church had to modify its dogma over time to compensate for a more multicultural public, and thus, compromised their Dutchness and became Anglicized.

To understand the evolving socio-political ideologies of eighteenth-century Dutch settlement is to evaluate personal accounts of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, which reveal tensions between conservatives, those who embraced the traditional European Dutch way, and the progressives, those who chose to develop a civilization independent of immediate Dutch influence. My examination of male voices, such as Peter
Stuyvesant (1612-1672), Adrien van der Donck (1612-1672), Pieter Vanderlyn (1687-1778), Benjamin Franklin (1706-1790), and William Linn (1752-1808), reveals that the male public presence was fundamental in articulating both the needs of the society and of the individual. Moreover, the Enlightenment thinkers of the eighteenth century were critical in developing a new sense of personal development in relation to the community.

While the men may have achieved perceived control over their families and the settlement through a public voice in books and sermons, women used their voices to privately articulate their struggles with God, with the public, and with themselves. My analysis of several female authors within their respective historical and cultural contexts seeks to highlight female voices relative to each other and to male discourse. Anne Bradstreet (1612-1672), Abigail Adams (1744-1818), and Hannah Webster Foster (1758-1840) developed their female voices into a powerful and articulate dialogue of desire and need through their journals, poetry, and prose, creating niches of feminine discourse. Although two used pseudonyms, the majority of these women were published postmortem, which furthers the assertion that female voices were simultaneously saved and suppressed by men.

My examination of sociocultural expectations, transgressive voices, and voices unheard is significant in offering and understanding the identities of Pieter Vanderlyn and Annetje Kool (1713-1789). Vanderlyn’s portrayal of Annetje Kool highlights the complexity of both artist and muse as transitional figures within a burgeoning nation-to-be, as he offers her a voice through his paintbrush.
INTRODUCTION:
The Treasure Above the Mantle:
Annetje Kool’s Contemporary History—From the Bay State to the Big Apple

I. “Treasures”

“Dr. [Oscar Karl] Hollander’s life could be characterized by his three passions: his wife and family, his profession [as an ophthalmologist], and his avocation of collecting antiques.”¹ My grandfather, at the remarkable age of ninety-eight, died on October 8, 2015. Aside from being one of the most influential people in my life, gramps left behind a significant legacy—his antiques.

Not only am I coping with the loss of an incredible role model, but I am also mourning his impressive American Decorative Arts collection. Gram and Gramps were the primary clients of my father (Mark R. Hollander, DBA The Auction Company, Inc.). My grandfather based his retirement on the acquisition of “treasures.” Ranging from American Indian chief headdresses, to Simon Willard’s finest banjo clocks, to Mochaware and Shaker Baskets, my grandparents’ collection was truly their passion and pastime. Antiques were prominently displayed within their Cape Cod home. Their estate was in many ways a museum; however, as grandchildren we would often play with nineteenth-century cast iron banks and tin toys. I have ridden a nineteenth-century wooden sled down the driveway (with my grandfather in tow!). Living across the street from my grandparents, I would also be sent on delivery missions by my father. Carrying Russian Enamel spoons and other rare items in my jacket pocket was customary for a ten-year-old me.

Thus, I have seen and touched such wonderful things over the years, and these items have very much become a part of me. Watching them go has always been a pleasant ache of

the antique business. Items have consistently come in and out of my house. Participating directly in the de-accession process of my grandparents’ treasures has been an extremely worthwhile, yet emotional process. Notes from my grandfather, crumpled, duct taped, and torn, rested in each item. Whether it was merely the illegible mark of “OKH” in thick Sharpie, or encyclopedic definitions and poetic musings, each item had significant meaning in the construction of my grandparents’ house and family.

Historians, literary critics, and antiquarians alike often debate what constitutes the meaning or value of a particular item. While I have participated in a process that some would deem reduces the object to a mere number, I consider many of these items invaluable for their contributions to my family. They made my grandparents’ house their home. They kept my grandparents’ minds active, constantly researching, reading, and asking questions about the things with which they chose to enshrine their house. They kept my dad busy, constantly on the hunt for the next great treasure. To my young self, my grandparents’ collection appeared as an extension of our own collection. As a child, I was able to have a hands-on experience with some of the finest historical and literary archives and objects, learning that the antique’s provenance is as important as the object itself, and frequently contributes to its value.

Having acquired my father’s keen eye, I will always have an appreciation for the Arts. My interest in fine objects, the portrait of Annetje Kool (formerly thought to be Anna Brodhead Oliver) in particular, stems from my adolescence. When Annetje entered my family’s life, I instinctively wanted to continue researching the portrait and its subject. Studying Annetje, her time, and her place increased the sentimental value of the portrait. What constitutes value when applied to an object? It provokes a deeper emotional meaning
than mere monetary value. It is an inherent feeling that commands you to be in an item’s presence—it demands possession, or at least reverence. What follows builds from a description and analysis of some of my experiences as an antiquarian’s daughter, culminating in the discovery of this portrait of Annetje Kool.

II. Hog Island

“It’s only you and two other people that know,” cheekily confessed the previous owners. It was November of 2009 when my father, Mark Hollander drove to review the contents of an impressive estate on an elite island in West Falmouth, Massachusetts. Little did he know that he would find one of the most iconic portraits of eighteenth-century colonial settlement on their mantle, painted by the revered Gansevoort Limner. Little did he know that the portrait would bring $980,000.00 at auction nearly nine months later.\(^2\)

The client and her husband had inherited a contemporary home on one of Cape Cod’s most impressive coastal settings, bordering West Falmouth Harbor and Buzzards Bay. A Boston-based appraisal service had provided the clients with an appraisal for probate purposes following their inheritance; however, the owners were still interested in the de-accession of some items from the family estate. Referred by a local real estate agent, Hollander visited the client’s home on a crisp fall morning to review some items set aside in the garage. Hollander, whose specialty is in American Decorative Arts, did not purchase

---

\(^2\) NB: The following chapter represents the lives of many. I had the privilege and honor of discussing great literature, rich history, and striking portraiture with some of the world’s most premier antiquarians. To the anonymous sellers, Mark Hollander [my dad] of The Auction Company, Inc., Leigh Keno of Keno Auctions, and David Schorsch of Antiquarian Equities, I am extremely grateful for your time and resources. The following is a compilation of interviews and correspondence—it is a story that narrates the contemporary history of this treasure, as well as illuminates the ironies of the portrait itself and its remarkable journey through time.
anything that day; nonetheless, the clients were eager to have him back to review other contents of their home at a later date.

The following week, Hollander returned to the island, and was invited inside the home. He reviewed some sterling silver, paintings, and samplers that the client and her husband had set aside on the living room floor. Then he saw it. To his right, above the fireplace, hung a striking portrait of a young woman. “That’s a great picture,” he said. “Yeah, well it’s not for sale,” the owner chuckled dismissively. There was the painting, located in a modest home on a small island, untouched. “If this is an American portrait... it is worth a lot of money,” Hollander continued. The client then mentioned that the portrait had remained in her family for several generations, and that the sitter was Anna Brodhead of New York. “I only remembered it belonging to my grandparents, and then I guess there was something about how my grandmother was friends with somebody named Black...” Little did she know that she was referring to Mary Childs Black, a renowned antiquarian and historian who specialized in American Folk Art. Black’s input proves important in the portrait’s journey from a Hog Island mantelpiece, to being recognized as a world-renowned piece of American eighteenth-century portraiture. Moreover, Mary Childs Black’s research is significant in identifying the portrait. Although inaccurate, her research aimed to give the portrait a reasoned identity.

“I hear you like that picture. What is it?” asked the client’s husband. So Hollander went home to consult his reference library. His initial thoughts were that the painting was of European origin, considering the pastoral background. There was something about the drapery that seemed familiar, though. My dad determined that the clients had inherited a mid-eighteenth century American primitive painting attributed to Pieter Vanderlyn (1687-
1778). With no records of purchase, this portrait had the potential to be the first public offering of one of eighteen paintings by Vanderlyn. All he could say was, “I think we have something here.” What Hollander began to discover was simply astonishing. The painterly quality was so stylized, the brushstrokes so familiar, that Hollander felt confident in his research and subsequent assessment. He found similar backgrounds, similar stylized hands, similar flowers, etc. all by the hand of Pieter Vanderlyn, otherwise known as The Gansevoort Limner.\(^3\) Realizing the caliber and significance of the portrait within a body of early American Art, which has monetary value, Hollander forwarded the photos to Leigh Keno, President of Keno Auctions, as he was the foremost expert on American Decorative Arts. Hollander then waited for a phone call.

III. The Portrait

The eighteenth-century oil portrait on canvas depicts a vulnerable, pure, and unblemished image of a young woman. Vanderlyn’s intricate hand clad the sitter in an elaborate dress with lace and gilt embellishments. But the portrait’s condition was compromised, covered in a thick layer of soot. While the portrait had outlived a fire in the Hog Island home, the dealers had serious concerns about its condition and ultimate future, as there were areas of cracked, flaking paint.

In comparison to the eighteen other portraits attributed to the Limner, this painting is by far the best due to the detail and color palette. The iconography of the portrait,

---

\(^3\) NB: The term “Limner” is referring to a painter, especially of portraits. The term “Gansevoort” is identified with a particular geographical region—the Upper Hudson River Valley. While Mary Childs Black has always referred to Pieter Vanderlyn as the Gansevoort Limner, there always lies the possibility that there were several limners who fell under the Gansevoort identity that simply have been overlooked by previous scholarship.
considering the sitter’s body language, hair, embellished bodice, and objects, makes the portrait unusually relevant for its time period. The eighteenth century was a time of rapid development and shifts in portraiture. During this time, several itinerant painters emerged. These untrained artists produced paintings that reflected their European origins, as well as the development of a national, American identity.\(^4\) By regarding the sitter independent from the items that surround her, David Schorsch, President of Antiquarian Equities, Inc., explained, “There is definitely a magical quality to this portrait and part of it is her own inherent beauty, and her youth, and those are a winning combination in portraiture.”\(^5\)

The ornate materiality that Vanderlyn depicts in this painting extends the limits of propriety in a mid-eighteenth century Hudson River Valley settlement. The sitter is depicted as a virginal beauty, clad likely in her wedding dress. As Dorothy A. Mays claims, the majority of these more formal wedding portraits demanded “merely the best fabric the family could afford. Silk and brocade were the most desirable.”\(^6\) Kool is heavily embellished, with an elongated neck, plunging neckline, and a heavily laced bodice belted at a thin waist. The sitter is undoubtedly depicted in her most formal attire. Her green dress is ornately decorated with a floral and vine motif, while her puffed sleeves share a similar highly-stylized and delicate pattern (likely embroidered). May suggests, “A low-necked dress, dripping with expensive lace, was a sign of vanity, pride, and undue attention to material goods.”\(^7\) To further her claims, I assert that Vanderlyn deliberately had Kool

\(^4\) Mark R. Hollander, phone conversation with author, January 10, 2016.
\(^5\) NB: A widely accepted conclusion among the antiquarian community is that signs of youthful beauty are most appealing.
\(^6\) Dorothy A. May, Women in Early America: Struggle, Survival and Freedom in a New World (Santa Barbara, California: ABC-Clio, Inc., 2004), 248.
\(^7\) May, Women in Early America, 384.
defy the notion of “plain style” associated with Puritan culture through materiality.\(^8\) While the Puritan style truly belonged to the seventeenth century, and less to the mid-eighteenth century, the portrait is suggestive of something transgressive or unvirtuous about the sitter.

The attention to material goods in the portrait is perhaps best represented by the objects that the sitter holds, which are ornately defined. The silver snuff box is significant to Annetje’s supposed Dutch identity because, as Deborah Childs claims in “The Vanderlyn Report,” the boxes were “a treasured family heirloom” to many members of the Dutch community.\(^9\) Perhaps this was yet another indication of the family’s wealth. The bouquet of flowers she holds appears to be comprised of roses, peonies, or carnations. Vanderlyn’s frequent use of flowers in his attributed portraits to represent love and marriage is perhaps most pronounced in this portrait, where the sitter holds not one, but three flowers.\(^10\) The sitter clasps the bouquet, likely roses, in front of her breast to display two rings, which are another important signifier of materiality, wealth, and married status.

Although certain religious denominations (like the Puritans) historically denounced a material culture in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, this mid-eighteenth century portrait is a bit radical in its portrayal of material goods. This portrait predates the material decadence that the late eighteenth century valued, when, as May writes,

---


\(^9\) NB: The silver snuff box, which Hollander and Keno initially perceived to be engraved “A” for Anna Brodhead has since been identified as “A.K.” for Annetje Kool.

\(^10\) NB: This comparison is made based on Vanderlyn’s “Young Lady with a Fan [c. 1737]. One could also reference “Portrait of Elizabeth Van Dyke” [c. 1725].
“...women’s jewelry consisted of necklaces, pendant earrings, hair ornamentation, and layers of pearls. It was also common for women to wear several gold chain necklaces at once.”\textsuperscript{11} The sitter is wearing elaborate earrings, and she has a double strand of pearls tightly draped around her neck, which shows a mid-point between the styles of representation and ornamentation.

The portrait is perhaps the most progressive in its depiction of the sitter’s hair. Following the Massachusetts General Court’s 1679 decree that restricted women to wearing modest (i.e. capped) hairstyles, the eighteenth century was a rapidly changing time in hairstyles after the Great Awakening (1730s-50s).\textsuperscript{12} As scholar Katy Werlin explains, “all emphasis switched to a tall vertical mode, as opposed to the horizontal [capped] styles of the previous decades... Curled locks of hair could sometimes be left down to drape over the back of the neck and the shoulder, a descendant of the lovelock.”\textsuperscript{13} Nonetheless, this transition took decades. In the 1710s, women still wore modest hairstyles that were close to the head, with few elongated curls. In the 1750s, however, women’s hairstyles involved an “elegant long ringlet draping over their shoulders.”\textsuperscript{14} The portrait of Annetje Kool anticipates the development of the long lovelock, yet it predates the sociocultural embrace of softer styles. The sitter’s hair is in a soft crown braid, with very elongated curls draping over and behind her shoulders. The ringlets and soft style altogether present a much more romantic perception of beauty and youthfulness as

\textsuperscript{11} Mary D. Doering, “Makeup and Beauty, 1600-1714,” in Clothing and Fashion: American Fashion from Head to Toe, ed. Jose Blanco et. al (Santa Barbara, California: ABC-CLIO, Inc), 164.
\textsuperscript{12} May, Women in Early America, 384.
\textsuperscript{13} Katy Werlin, “Hairstyles, 1600-1714” in Clothing and Fashion: American Fashion from Head to Toe, ed. Jose Blanco et. al (Santa Barbara, California: ABC-CLIO, Inc), 134.
\textsuperscript{14} Colleen R. Callahan, “Hairstyles, 1715-1785” in Clothing and Fashion: American Fashion from Head to Toe, ed. Jose Blanco et. al (Santa Barbara, California: ABC-CLIO, Inc), 136.
opposed to the harsher, more rigid styles of the Puritan and Quaker cultures, which presented tight, covered hairstyles that were neither frizzy, nor curled.\textsuperscript{15}

To best place Annetje Kool and Vanderlyn’s portrayal of her within a certain historical period, it is necessary to regard this portrait, c.1740, in relation to his other works. Vanderlyn’s portrait of Annetje Kool is ornate compared to his “Portrait of a Young Girl with a Fan,” c. 1737, whose identity is unknown. Both portraits are similar in their portrayal of these women; both are seated in front of a window, erect, and elaborately detailed. However, Kool’s portrait is much more extravagant, perhaps even more artistically advanced, than the “Portrait of a Young Girl with a Fan,” which preceded it by three years.

The gilded draperies and tassels amidst the pastoral backgrounds of each portrait suggest a European influence.\textsuperscript{16} Although the backgrounds of both portraits are dissimilar in their portrayals of landscape, (Kool has rolling hills while the other sitter has a line of foliage), the similarly designed backgrounds suggest a uniformity among Vanderlyn’s paintings.\textsuperscript{17} Although I cannot claim that Kool’s background directly reflects the land that her family owned, I can suggest that the pastoral settings were meant to represent land ownership. Landscape backgrounds were a prominent feature of Vanderlyn’s portraiture; twelve of his eighteen portraits have landscape backgrounds, so it is not surprising that Annetje’s and “Young Lady with a Fan” are depicted with similar rows of trees.\textsuperscript{18} Finally, the columns in the background of Kool’s portrait are much more defined than in the

\textsuperscript{15} May, \textit{Women in Early America}, 384.
\textsuperscript{17} Mary Black, “The Gansevoort Limner,” 744; Paul S. D’Ambrosio, “Portrait of Annetje Kool by Pieter Vanderlyn,” 101.
\textsuperscript{18} Mary Black, “The Gansevoort Limner,” 744.
portrait of the other young woman. Although both archways appear Doric, Kool’s is much more prominent than the other.

The countenances of both women are flawless. While the structures of both faces are similar in jawline, Kool’s is perhaps a bit more refined due to her intentionally rouged cheeks and lips. As Mary Childs Black notes in “The Gansevoort Limner,” Vanderlyn’s attention to “feature... fabric... and the face” distinguished him from his contemporaries.\textsuperscript{19} Kool is depicted with much more lace and embellishments than the other sitter, whose green dress overpowers the red lacework on her stomacher. Kool’s portrait is delicately articulated; the white stomacher is perhaps one of the most prominent focal points of the portrait. Both sitters share the same hairstyle, which interestingly suggests a uniformity in Vanderlyn’s representation of these two women. Nonetheless, the objects that they hold are very different. While Kool is surrounded with flowers, jewels, and engraved snuff boxes, the anonymous sitter is depicted holding a fan, with a journal or Bible on the table next to her. Unlike Kool, the other woman is surrounded with a more traditional set of objects for mid-eighteenth century portraits; these items would likely indicate a woman’s delicacy and virtue.

These two representations of women are likely suggestive of Vanderlyn’s interpersonal view of Kool’s virtue. The irony, perhaps, is that Kool’s apparent chastity, although elaborate, is false. Both Vanderlyn and the sitter appear to wander from the strict religious tenets of early American settlements. For instance, Vanderlyn represented a form of artistic liberty that strayed from the strict religious overtones of early eighteenth-

\textsuperscript{19} Mary Black, “The Gansevoort Limner,” 740.
century America. He was remarried. He purportedly wrote scandalous letters. The church reprimanded him for his progressive hymns that had closer ties to Pietism, a more liberal and personal faith than the traditional Dutch Reformed Church. While Vanderlyn was outspoken in his distaste for the Reformed religion, the sitter had an illegitimate child, also violating church mandates. How could Vanderlyn paint the sitter in such an extravagant, yet delicate fashion? The materiality of the portrait, coupled with the gaudy dress, drapery, and excessively flushed cheeks complicate Vanderlyn’s ideas of Kool’s virtue. Vanderlyn’s attention to striking browns, reds, pinks, greens, and blues offers his portraits an indescribable “richness” that is just as delicate as it is profound. The portrait has several signifiers of wealth and beauty; however, it does not reveal that Annetje is indeed a mother. What is most interesting about Vanderlyn’s role as artist is that the majority of his sitters were from middle-class backgrounds; thus, his role as a freelance and untrained artist within New Netherland was utilized regardless of his religious beliefs or church membership. Vanderlyn’s artistry was accepted by the townsfolk and settlers in the Hudson Valley because families arranged for more than ten portraits within fifteen years.

The portrait suggests an “otherness” about Annetje Kool that is unlike any other Vanderlyn portrait—she is a masterpiece. His depiction of her is perhaps suggestive of a unique relationship between Pieter Vanderlyn and Annetje Kool, considering her supposed

---

immoral persona and his portrayal of her apparent chastity. While I cannot characterize their relationship as amorous with any certainty, some connection may have existed between the painter and sitter to produce such a striking portrait. Perhaps, as Schorsch suggested in our discussion, there "might be some thread of connectedness between two free-spirited free-thinking people." Although Schorsch considered it "part of the human dimension" that Vanderlyn and the sitter had a unique relationship, I maintain that there is still something so enchanting about the portrait that indicates more than a mere friendship, or at least more than that of an itinerant painter and the female subject. How did they meet? Why is her painting much more elaborate than his other works? What was so special about these two people? Primary sources by and about these two people leave these questions widely unanswered; nonetheless, there is something peculiar about the purity of the portrait that cannot be overlooked. Vanderlyn's portrayal of Kool is inherently radical in principle; the ornate materiality that is demonstrated in this painting, and her hairstyle, predate the sociocultural appreciation for all things luxurious.

IV. In the Presence of Greatness

"It is truly an American masterpiece," Hollander stated. This portrait, as well as several others, rested in the family home for years, undisturbed. Although once threatened by a fire, the painting survived because it was in the living room. Perhaps the most significant discovery regarding this portrait and her journey is that the convictions of many (the family and Vanderlyn) are as much reflected in the painting itself as they are in the

[26 NB: I recognize that fornication was not unusual in an eighteenth century colonial settlement like it would have been in a Puritan settlement in the seventeenth century; however, considering the fact that Annetje's illegitimate child's name was torn out of the church records, something about her sexuality is suggestive, or maybe even subversive.]
portrait’s impressive three-hundred-year provenance. The portrait is meaningful for its promising monetary value, its historical and aesthetic contributions, and its personal connections within the family across generations.

It was midnight when the phone rang. “Do you know who that is who painted the picture?” the voice exclaimed emphatically. It was Mr. Keno. Coaxing Hollander to go downstairs and reference an article in *Antiques Magazine* by Mary Childs Black, Keno confirmed that the portrait was indeed by Pieter Vanderlyn. The article not only specifically listed the characteristics of Vanderlyn’s style as a painter, but it also contained a picture of the exact portrait located on Hog Island.²⁷ This was the article that the client referred to when Hollander first commented on the portrait. Black, the author of the article, was a friend of the family that owned the portrait. Thus, Hollander’s suspicions of the Vanderlyn attribution were confirmed. Among the eighteen Vanderlyn portraits known to date, this appeared to be the masterpiece. Its value is multi-layered.

Keno and Hollander talked for an hour discussing the possibly of securing the painting for sale. Obviously appraised value would influence the clients’ potential interest in selling the portrait. The following day, Hollander called the clients to ask whether he could take a few more photos of their family portrait. They had no objection. It was obvious that their curiosity had been stimulated and the possibility of a sale was becoming a reality. As the client recalls, “... then we started talking dollars... and you know I was like well... maybe we will look into this [after all].” The client asked how much Hollander thought the painting would bring if offered at public sale, to which he replied, “six figures.” The client and her husband chuckled and replied, “That’s rather vague in that it could mean

---
$100,000.00 or $999,000.00.” “Somewhere in that range,” Hollander confirmed. Again, the clients laughed anxiously. In an email dated Tuesday, November 17, 2009, Keno wrote, “As compared to the roughly eighteen other known examples attributed to the same artist, this painting, in my opinion, ranks in the top three... I feel confident that its value would be in the range of $150,000.00 to $300,000.00.”

Learning the portrait’s estimated value created a dilemma for the clients, as they were leaving Cape Cod, and the portrait, for a four-month vacation to Florida. The client then showed Hollander photos of the portrait in their family home generations earlier. It was always prominently displayed. The tiles around the fireplace were even hand-painted to match the flowers that the sitter holds in the Limner painting. The clients were nervous about leaving the picture unsupervised for the winter, considering its newly established liability. Keno’s estimate piqued the client’s interest and fears that an item of value could be in peril in their house for the winter. Hollander finally asked the clients if they were interested in meeting with Keno, to which the husband replied, “Is that the guy on Antiques Roadshow?” Yes, indeed it was.

Mr. Keno arrived by limousine at Hollander’s house in West Falmouth early on Thursday, November 19, 2009, by limousine, and together they headed to the island to meet with the clients. The sellers were amazed to see Leigh Keno, an internationally acclaimed antiquarian, at their doorstep. With Keno and Hollander in the doorway, the client’s husband walked by, glanced over and exclaimed, “Yep. That’s the Roadshow guy, alright!” They all walked into the living room, where Keno was bowled over by the presence of the important portrait of presumably Anna Brodhead. Looking back, the client said, “… actually, the name I had doesn’t match what they came up with [referring to
Deborah Child’s most recent genealogical piece that was commissioned by David Schorsch]...”

Keno received permission from the clients to remove the portrait from the wall to study it. The group then discussed the condition, provenance, and potential de-accession of the portrait. The client recalled that Keno was eager to take the portrait back to New York City to conduct further research. The clients signed an insurance proxy, and issued a few requests. First, the clients wished to remain completely anonymous to ensure the security of their home and their family. The other request, still assuming the impressive appraised value of the piece, was that the painting be used in an institution, college, or museum as a learning tool. The client also asked if Keno and Hollander could reproduce the image and unusual period frame with current reproduction means available (i.e. Gicle print and expensive period-type framing).

Fortunately, each of these requests have been met. The sellers remain anonymous sellers. The replica, produced in 2008, hangs above their mantle to this day. “There’s a special reason that it’s [the painting] is there... I can’t not have the painting there,” stated the client. Thus, to the sellers, the value of the painting was not due to its aesthetic contributions as a promising piece of eighteenth century folk art, or even the need for the original work to remain in the family home. The replica offered value in meeting the client’s desire for a sentimental attachment to a piece of work that had remained above her family’s fireplace for generations.

28 NB: The portrait was restored and re-identified after the sale in 2008. The client and her family had two potential names for the portrait’s sitter according to their personal genealogical records. They were Anna Brodhead Oliver and Margaret Kool. Historian Deborah Child, who had no relationship to Mary Childs Black, identified the portrait as Annetje Kool, mother of Margaret Kool, in 2010.
After Keno, Hollander, and the consigners reached an agreement, the portrait began its long journey to New York City by train. Keno and Hollander wrapped the portrait in cardboard and blankets, secured it, attached a rope handle, and Hollander dropped Keno off at the train station.

**V. “Inaugural Auction: May 1-2, 2010”**

From that day, Leigh Keno had begun a new adventure as the director of a premier auction house in New York City. In his arms, he carried the leading piece for his first major sale. He had secured some interesting items prior to this particular portrait; however, this painting would obviously be the focal point of a major Americana sale. During the months leading up to the sale, there were several discussions regarding the portrait, as information shared across generations and speculation became fact, or so they thought. One thing was for sure—there was interest in this American portrait’s rarity at the highest level of collectors and museums.

Hollander represented the clients at the sale in Stamford, Connecticut in May of 2010. As he recalled, “All of the main players and their representatives were in attendance.” Potential buyers discussed deals privately with Keno: the room buzzed with activity and questions as to where the picture might settle and how to negotiate the payment structure of such a deal. Keno and Hollander had many conversations with eager potential buyers. Then came the moment when Keno told Hollander that not one, but three clients were willing to secure the portrait at the million-dollar level. What kinds of terms would Keno and Hollander need to ensure from the sellers to allow these buyers to purchase the painting? If the portrait were to bring near a million dollars, would there be four equal payments? As a representative agent for the sellers, Hollander agreed to the proposed
payment structure, but he refused to allow anyone to take the portrait without complete payment in full.

Hollander was in the back of the room on May 2, 2010 when Lot 422, “Portrait of Anna Brodhead Oliver,” sold. The sale began at $300,000.00 in $50,000.00 increments. Before Hollander knew it, the sale surpassed $750,000.00. The portrait finally sold at an astonishing price of $980,000.00 ($940,000.00 hammer price). The good news, according to Hollander, is that the painting now belongs to one of the top dealers in the country, David Schorsch, who represents one of the foremost collections of Americana in the world, that of the Katcher family. As Hollander notes, “These are not your normal dealers. This very small group of elite art historians micro-analyzes design, quality, and authenticity. They are the epitome of defining perfection.” Perfection translates into dollars. The painting has since held an educational purpose, as the subject of scholarly lectures, articles, and textbooks alike since its sale in 2010.

The picture was paid for properly in the allotted time, and ownership was transferred to Mr. Schorsch for his client. Following the sale, the portrait was cleaned, the beauty exposed, and its importance made public, as the painting has often been the foremost piece in international Folk Art magazines and reference books in the past several years. The portrait has been considered a masterpiece, having been listed in Antiques Magazine and in Expressions of Innocence and Eloquence: Selections from the Jane Katcher Collection of Americana, Volume II. The scholarship of lineage and provenance was reconfigured only to support the family lore regarding the picture. Its aesthetic contributions to eighteenth-century portraiture cannot go unnoticed. Moreover, its rare provenance, remaining in the family from its consignment in 1740 to May of 2008, is
nothing short of remarkable. Finally, its monetary value as an important piece of American Decorative Arts reflects the strength of Vanderlyn’s hand as artist. The client’s original story was close to accurate—the story today has been further developed by Deborah Child’s research. The clients remain friends of the Hollander family.

VI. Restore and Re-Identify: The Post-Sale Portrait

“There’s a vindication in it when something sets a record price like that... It’s making a statement for all time,” he began. I met with Mr. David Schorsch on a brisk December morning in 2015 surrounded by some of the world’s best folk art. What many, myself included, would classify as “treasures,” were strewn around his office like everyday housewares—from the finest of Windsor chairs to the striking, yet delicate portraiture of Ammi Phillips. It was remarkable. The final sale of the portrait at Keno Auctions not only spoke to the quality and reputability of folk art dealers and clients, but it spoke to the power and value of eighteenth-century portraiture in and of itself.

Schorsch was eager to conserve the portrait following the sale. Working with Peter Fodera, an elite New York conservator, the two restored the painting. While some antiquarians were critical of Schorsch’s intentions, as “cleanings” often entail gaudy and thick varnish, many perhaps did not see the potential that stood before them beneath layers of soot and loose paint. Schorsch understood the position. "As much as I love untouched furniture and decorative objects, I think different rules apply for paintings... The painting has a texture and a surface that has been retained through the cleaning process which is rare." Not only did the conservation reveal more acute detail in the sitter’s countenance and bodice, but loose paint from centuries of Cape Cod living (and from the fire) was also re-adhered.
Perhaps the most interesting twist in this story is that no one accurately identified the painting until months after the sale, despite decades of research and genealogical confusion. Note that the client’s original story was close to accurate. In an email dated Friday, December 25, 2009, the client writes, “I’m still perplexed by the fact that the proof I had of the painting said it was of Margaret Newkirk and yet it’s being presented as Anna Brodhead Oliver. Obviously, I don’t know who wrote that and how that was determined but I just wanted to be sure that further research wasn’t warranted. Or maybe it doesn’t matter that much?” Thus, the client had information relating to both Margaret Newkirk as well as Anna Brodhead Oliver, both residents of Kingston, NY, during the mid-eighteenth century. Mary Childs Black, in a 1969 Antiques Magazine article, cited the portrait as “Margaret Newkirk (Mrs. James Oliver) … it is likely that she is the mother of James Oliver (bapt. June 9, 1745) rather than his wife.” While the snuff box that the sitter holds was originally identified as “A.,” or Anna Brodhead, the restoration process revealed the box to read “A.K.,” or Annetje Kool. Thus, the restoration of the portrait played a significant role in properly identifying the sitter as Annetje Kool.

After its sale at Keno Auctions, the portrait was re-identified following an extensive research project by Deborah Child, an eighteenth-century historian. Hired by Schorsch, Child, and her subsequent archival research, revealed the identity of the sitter to be Annetje Kool of Kingston, New York. While some genealogies are a series of dead ends with questions left unanswered, Schorsch explained, “sometimes they just hit… this one hit.” In my most recent trip to Kingston, I visited the Senate House Museum and conducted

30 Deborah M. Child, “Vanderlyn Report” (paper presented to David Schorsch on June 15, 2010), 1-78.
archival research to investigate both Annetje Kool and Pieter Vanderlyn’s involvements in the Kingston community. My research reflects Deborah Child’s findings. Annetje Kool (1713-1789) married Matthew Newkirk (1717-1789) on November 8, 1740.\textsuperscript{31} She was four years older than he, and had previously had an illegitimate child in 1734, who was specifically unnamed in the Dutch Reformed Church records—the name was torn out of the public record.\textsuperscript{32} It simply reads “illegitimate,” with an unnamed father and no witnesses.\textsuperscript{33} Annetje and Matthew Newkirk’s daughter, Margaret (1745-1808), was listed under Matthew’s will.\textsuperscript{34} Margaret then went on to marry James Oliver (1745-1826), Anna Brodhead’s son. While the family had identified the sitter as Anna Brodhead Oliver (born 1707), wife of Andrew Oliver (1719-1777), she actually is Annetje Kool (1713-1789), wife of Matthew Newkirk (1717-1789), and would have been related to Anna Brodhead Oliver through the marriage of their children.\textsuperscript{35}

\textbf{VII. Conclusion: The Hunt Continues}

While I do agree that “The Vanderlyn Report,” submitted by Deborah Child, provides compelling evidence that the sitter is indeed Annetje Kool and not Anna Brodhead Oliver, the discoveries require further research. How would this family have established a connection with Pieter Vanderlyn, the attributed artist? Furthermore, why did Vanderlyn

\textsuperscript{32} Deborah M. Child, “Vanderlyn Report” (paper presented to David Schorsch on June 15, 2010), 40.
\textsuperscript{33} Baptismal and Marriage Registers of the Old Dutch Church of Kingston, Ulster County, NY 1660-1809, 205.
\textsuperscript{35} Deborah M. Child, “Vanderlyn Report,” 64.
depict Kool in such a stunning fashion? Scholarly works have left these questions widely unanswered. This is most likely due to the lack of primary information available.

Nonetheless, there are flaws in this analysis that Child herself admits require further research in the genealogical records of Hurley, NY.\textsuperscript{36} It is significant that these names and identities circulated for generations among the consigners, historians, and the antiquarian community; they are all integrated into a complicated and intertwined genealogical progression. If the sitter is not Kool, the genealogical complications seem to suggest that the portrait is nonetheless a product of this particular family lineage.

Trying to accurately identify and describe the settlement of Kingston, New York, and the individuals who lived there is nearly impossible considering the lack of primary evidence available; however, this portrait is crucial in portraying the style, formality, and expectations of the time. The irony is that both of these individuals, Annetje Kool and Pieter Vanderlyn, failed to uphold the demands of a society rooted in Dutch tradition. Both Kool and Vanderlyn were members of complicated social webs, and struggled to identify themselves both personally and communally. This is evident when one considers Vanderlyn’s hymns, and Kool’s illegitimate child and subsequent marriage to a younger man. Perhaps one of the most interesting ways this identity struggle became relevant was the discovery of this million-dollar portrait in a modest home on Hog Island. The portrait itself lacked a scholarly-backed identity until its sale in 2010, some 270 years later.

The portrait is invaluable due to its impressive provenance, remaining in the same complicated family genealogy until its sale in 2010. The fact that it has survived is simply remarkable. The construction of the painting is nothing short of perfect. Vanderlyn’s

\textsuperscript{36} Deborah M. Child, “Vanderlyn Report,” 78.
delicate brush strokes illuminate the sitter’s supposed pure countenance and virginal beauty, when in reality this perceived virginity was indeed false. Although Vanderlyn perhaps aimed to portray Kool as the icon of Dutch colonial wealth and perfection, the reality is that the portrait does not reflect Kool’s identity as a mother. The Dutch Reformed Church, as one of the most conservative governing bodies of Hudson Valley settlement, would not have approved of this behavior. Maintaining a cohesive Dutch identity was extremely important to the burgeoning settlement of Kingston during the eighteenth century, and it was rooted in communal engagement and virtuous conduct. It appears that Vanderlyn and Kool refused to adhere to these precedents, which was significant to the construction of this portrait, and, to me, makes this painting so appealing to analyze.

Vanderlyn and Kool both have subversive identities relative to the sociocultural demands of New Netherland; nonetheless, these transgressive voices were significant relative to the rapid social changes of the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. They behaved beyond the moral boundaries of a conservative Dutch community. The following chapter, Chapter 1, describes the settlement of Kingston, New York, and defines the sociocultural norms that were essential to communal identity. Chapter 2 discusses the role of the male voices of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, both public and personal, ranging from Adrien van der Donck to Benjamin Franklin as New Netherland transitioned into a British colony and then New York state. Chapter 3 seeks to recognize the presence of the female voice within the development of the British colonies through the New Republic; in some ways, it aims to give Annetje Kool, the sitter, a voice that she and the portrait otherwise lack. Finally, the conclusion articulates the relationship between the male and female voices, how the female voice entered the public sphere over time, and how the
convictions of Vanderlyn and Kool ultimately unite in a transgressive portrait that functions beyond the moral boundaries of eighteenth century propriety.
CHAPTER 1:
“Dutchness” in New Netherland:
Hudson River Valley Settlement in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries and the
Relative Importance of Being Dutch

I. Introduction

Both Pieter Vanderlyn (1687-1778), the attributed artist of the “Portrait of Annetje Kool,” and Annetje Kool (1713-1719), the sitter, challenge traditional church doctrines and expectations, straying from the strict religious tenets of Colonial America. New Netherland was a seventeenth century Dutch Reformed Settlement along the Hudson River Valley that used religion as a medium to develop and retain its folkloric practices in new areas of settlement.\(^{37}\) Pieter Vanderlyn and Annetje Kool were transgressive for their time; they were able to, deviate from the religious constructs of New Netherland, but they did so differently. The ways in which Vanderlyn and Kool regarded the applicability and significance of religion were subject to individual circumstance. For instance, Vanderlyn believed in a form of artistic liberty that strayed away from the strict religious overtones of this early eighteenth century settlement.\(^{38}\) The church reprimanded him for his transgressive hymns, which more closely reflected Pietism, a more emotive and intimate faith, rather than more conservative branches of Protestantism.\(^{39}\)

While Vanderlyn was outspoken in his distaste for the Dutch Reformed Church, the subject of the portrait, Annetje Kool, had an illegitimate child, also violating church

\(^{39}\) D’Ambrosio, “Portrait of Annetje Kool by Pieter Vanderlyn,” 98.
mandates. Thus, these two subjects, one as artist, and the other as muse, disregarded the imposed boundaries of social acceptability. Both Vanderlyn and Kool were able to live in a Dutch settlement where they perhaps expressed few associations with “Dutchness.” They lived in Kingston, which had been an important settlement in New Netherland was now part of the Hudson River trade under British rule. Vanderlyn, an itinerant artist, used portraiture as a medium to negotiate how he used religion in the pastoral setting of New Netherland. This chapter will describe the sociocultural constructs that Kool and Vanderlyn negotiated to fit their personal circumstances, one as a religious radical, and the other as a young single mother who remarried.

Both Vanderlyn and Kool lived in an evolving time in New Netherland. Having been under British rule since 1664, the Dutch settlers of New Netherland were struggling to hold onto what I characterize as “Dutchness,” the religious, cultural, social, political, and economic practices characteristic of the Netherlands and its colonists. These characteristically Dutch interests were heavily invested in the community—they sought to cultivate their unique nationalism abroad through practices such as communal worship. This was also a changing time in religion, where people began to question religion. The First Great Awakening of the 1730s effectively split the Protestant denominations into “old lights” and “new lights.” Old lights believed in a conservative religion based on logic and rationality, and new lights believed in a liberal religion that was passionate and affective.

One effective way to understand the evolving religious ideologies is to evaluate the literature of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, which displays the tension between

---

conservatives and progressives. Moreover, I seek to establish how religion may have shaped the identity of New Netherland and its colonists from the early seventeenth century through the late eighteenth century. I argue that the strict religious constructs of New Netherland created settlement that depended heavily on religion as a means of developing a sense of “Dutchness” abroad. Nonetheless, these constructs required negotiation to accommodate individual circumstance; for Pieter Vanderlyn and Annetje Kool, this negotiation displays an appreciation of religion, but not a strict adherence to its terms.

II. Calvinism and the Dutch Reformed Church

Calvinism purported to cultivate an intimate relationship between God and his people, creature and creator. I argue that a similar relationship can also be cultivated in a community, as was displayed in the New Netherland settlement by an attempt to preserve the old, European customs of worship. According to John Calvin, “True and substantial wisdom principally consists of two parts, the knowledge of God, and the knowledge of ourselves.” His modification of Christian theology in the sixteenth century, as historian Arthur Dakin suggests, provided Christians with a complete theology by which to live.

The communal worship practiced in New Netherland throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries appears to have preserved Dutchness; the colonists were extremely nationalistic in their practices, and sought to adhere to their native practices in New Netherland through religion. In New Netherland, these “creatures” of God were challenged to cultivate a settlement in a new land with foreigners, which included

---

43 Dakin, *Calvinism*, 11.
bordering American Indian tribes and other French and British settlements, who not only threatened their religious affiliation, but also their Dutch identity. Calvin believed that one needed to confide in God to learn humility in a world full of vice, arrogance, and self-absorption. In the case of New Netherland, this required an adherence to standards that were uniquely Dutch.

Branches of Calvinism were then cultivated in New Netherland, and there seemed to be little universality among the religious practices of various colonial settlements. The applicability of religion depended on the different settlements. The Protestant Reformation (c. early-mid sixteenth century) transformed the European belief system, when radicals like Martin Luther and John Calvin willingly challenged the power of the established church. Following the Reformation in Europe, several Protestant denominations were developed, depending on a country’s religious history. In New Netherland, Dutch settlers practiced Calvinism. Principles derived from scholars such as John Calvin and Huldrych Zwingli were guiding voices within the Dutch colonial settlements. As Elton J. Bruins suggests, the Dutch colonists “wished to pattern their church life [in New Netherland] on the mother church in the Netherlands.” The Dutch wanted to cultivate and extend their own religious and national identity abroad, and the Dutch Reformed Church’s emphasis on communal worship contributes to an evolving sense of nationalism among the Dutch colonial settlements.

---

Calvinism had a deliberately flexible and pertinent theology that could relate to the struggles of new settlement. While other historians argue that Calvin had a single approach to dealing with social, political, and economic areas of disagreement, Mark Valeri claims that Calvin's teachings were applied circumstantially, or as a "case-by-case application of the biblical text to local conditions."\textsuperscript{46} The use of Calvinism in Dutch settlements varied; however, the presence of Calvinism was significant in guiding these settlements to develop a solidified Reformed identity that was, indeed, Dutch. In New Netherland, religion guided social, economic, and political discussions and decisions, and was thus fluid in its applicability. Religion cultivated "Dutchness" abroad and preserved the mission of the mother church—The Dutch Reformed Church of the (European) Netherlands.

III. The Evolution of Dutchness in New Netherland

The Dutch settlers in New Netherland established a culture that extended well into the eighteenth century despite British and American Indian contestation. The Dutch Reformed Church and its set of beliefs undoubtedly evolved over time as the settlement came under British Rule in the late seventeenth century and as New York became more multicultural. Questions of belief and religious tolerance emerged as settlements developed and became more established. Would the Dutch Reformed Church welcome or denounce these settlers from different cultural and religious traditions? First and foremost, it is necessary to critically assess the status of the Dutch Reformed Church and its practices in the 1660s, and how the Dutch Reformed religion developed in New Netherland. This field of scholarship has not been active, as primary source literature, particularly in English, is

scarce. Nonetheless, relying on the literature available from similar religious
denominations and colonial locations aids in the historical reconstruction of Dutch settlers’
religious and cultural views into a colonial society that was dominated by the British.

The “ziekentrooster” presence in New Netherland from (1624–1664)
demonstrates a willingness to address the challenges of new settlement creatively, without
adhering rigidly to the church structure that one would have experienced in Europe. The
Dutch West India Company supervised the colony of New Netherland, and sent church
affiliates abroad, which further emphasized the applicability and flexibility of Calvinism.47
This helped facilitate the Dutch colonies’ spiritual and economic relationship with the
homeland. While Henry Hudson was considered responsible for the beginnings of Dutch
colonization in North America via his exploration sponsored by the Dutch East India
Company in 1609, Ward and Firth Haring Fabend claim that the “ziekentrooster” presence
was significant in cultivating a sense of community guided by religion. “Ziekentroosters”
were church affiliates sent to New Netherland as sources of comfort and solace to Dutch
settlers. They acted as a unifying force to cultivate a Dutch community, strongly
maintained by religion and trade. Their presence further solidified the identity and early
development of the Dutch New York colonies. As Fabend notes, the Dutch West India
Company sent a “ziekentrooster” to New Netherland to comfort the sick and terminally ill.
Not only were these “comforters” responsible for the sickly, but they also offered Sunday
services for the community.48 Despite the fact that they were not formally ordained by the
Dutch Reformed Church in Holland, Fabend notes that “this official was also given

47 Ward, Colonial America, 8; Fabend, “The Reformed Dutch Church and the Persistence of Dutchness in New
York and New Jersey,” 139.
permission to baptize and to perform marriages, and it was he who catechized the children of the community.”

49 The political and economic framework and religious heritage of New Netherland proved decisive in developing a sense of “Dutchness” that was tied to God, to trade, and to communal practices that were grounded in the old, European way. The ziekenbroosters had the ability to enforce a moral code which emphasized traditional European notions of belief and practice upon the Dutch colonists.

Thus, the officials sent abroad by the Dutch West India Company were central members of the community due to the breadth and depth of their influence. Their affiliation with the Dutch Reformed Church was essential in developing a community that was identified by both their homeland and their church affiliation. These qualities helped to distinguish their community from other settlements, and further cultivated their Dutchness in Dutch settlements—maintaining a strong connection with the mother church, while developing a settlement of their own. Perhaps these religious affiliates were fearful of failing in their missions abroad because they were under the strict jurisdiction of the Dutch West India Company, which controlled their livelihood. Nonetheless, as Mark Valeri notes, these church affiliates “chiefly served to validate the virtues of hardscrabble merchants whose practices, including privateering, served political purposes but hardly accorded with standard Calvinist moral teachings.”

50 Thus, the ziekenbroosters actively modified Calvinism to fit the needs of the particular settlement; in this case, it involved economic leverage, but compromised traditional Calvinist ideology.

49 Ward, Colonial America, 58.
50 Mark Valeri, “Calvin and the Social Order in Early America,” 29.
New Netherland was never truly a homogenous society due to American Indian influence and the diversity of dissenters who settled abroad; rather, this multicultural settlement used religion as a vehicle to unite their community. The ziekentroosters, as well as the Dutch colonists, were sent on an economic mission by the Dutch West India Company—to develop and maintain a booming fur-trading society. According to Fabend, one of the limitations, or strengths, of this community was that the Dutch Reformed religion was the only one that could be practiced publically; thus, contributing to the settlement’s continual growth over time.\(^\text{51}\) The settlers were expected to uphold traditional Dutch practices and worship—the Dutch Reformed Church was the only established denomination. This uniform system of beliefs, as Fabend suggests, contributed to the sustained growth of the Dutch colonial settlements in the Hudson River valley.\(^\text{52}\) The Dutch colonists sustained the economic pressures of the Dutch West India Company, the governing force of the settlement, until 1644, when the British seized control of New Netherland. Nonetheless, there were challenges to establishing the pattern of growth. Few ministers were willing to endure the trials and tribulations of new settlement abroad—the threat of Native violence, the economic instability, and the necessary labor that came along with new land.\(^\text{53}\)

Thus, it seems as though religion became politicized by the Dutch West India Company in order to maintain control in a foreign land. The Company, realizing that few wanted to assume the risk of new settlement, extended to Europeans a “patroonship.” Patroonships gave willing Dutch colonials extensive plots of land to manage; this thus gave

---

\(^\text{51}\) Fabend, “The Reformed Dutch Church and the Persistence of Dutchness in New York and New Jersey,” 140.

\(^\text{52}\) Fabend, “The Reformed Dutch Church and the Persistence of Dutchness in New York and New Jersey,” 140.

\(^\text{53}\) Fabend, “The Reformed Dutch Church and the Persistence of Dutchness in New York and New Jersey,” 140.
the owners manorial advantages, including class status, first refusal on the land, and political involvement. When the Dutch colonized the Hudson Valley in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, they found themselves at odds with the landscape, with local Native American tribes, and with other Christian religious denominations. Rather than developing a set of new guiding principles, because of their vulnerability economically, geographically, and politically, the settlers, as Valeri notes, “depended on a cohesive cultural and religious order through the conservative Dutch Reformed Church to sustain national identity.” The cohesive cultural order was initially based on the patroon system, in hopes that Holland natives would be willing to maintain property in New Netherland and colonize. The religious order, led by the Dutch Reformed Church, unified the Dutch colonials under a specific, and characteristically Dutch, moral code. Furthermore, it was as though religion and economics were inextricably linked through the Dutch West India Company—the company hired and distributed the ministers. Along with the patroons, others migrated to New Netherland, which made the colony, although Dutch in origin, more diverse in population. Not only was the colony surrounded by Native influence, but the British and French were also colonizing along the Hudson. Thus, the threat of internal dispute proved more troubling to the Dutch colonials than being sent abroad to cultivate a new livelihood to further the fur trade.

During the mid-seventeenth century, New Netherland was a settlement in transition, in rapid experimental reform without order. Nonetheless, the deep-seated need to preserve the settlers’ Dutchness, specifically through religion, is an example of a

---

54 Ward, Colonial America, 58.
55 Valeri, “Calvin and the Social Order in Early America,” 28.
community that believed that by creating a cohesive understanding and awareness of “civilization” and a willingness to become “civilized,” the settlement would succeed morally and, moreover, fiscally. As Edward Tanjore Corwin notes in *A Manual of the Reformed Church in America*, the New Netherland settlement “was an armed commercial corporation, possessing almost unlimited powers to colonize, defend and govern its possessions.”

Thus, the Dutch were able to practice and solidify their Dutchness under The Dutch West India Company; nonetheless, much of this order was derived from the British, who seized control of New Netherland in 1664.

**IV. “The British Are Coming:” The Decline of Dutchness in New Netherland**

Under British rule (1664-1776), Dutch settlers in New York may have felt as though they were losing their Dutch identity. The cultivation of their “Dutchness” became subservient to the British order. As Elton J. Bruins claimed, “The first major threat to the Dutch church and its adherents in America was the loss of sovereignty over New Netherland to the English in 1664.”

Before English control, the Dutch were able to preserve their native tongue by cultivating and extending their native religion. The Dutch Reformed Church was the only established religion in the Dutch settlements until 1664, when the British seized control of New Netherland. The colonists struggled to cope with this newfound competition for language and belief, one they had not had to directly encounter with the supposed streamlined cultural and religious order. The Dutch colonists struggled to cope with this newfound competition for language, for belief, and for

---

ideological control. Following The Treaty of Westminster on February 9, 1664, the British controlled New Netherland until the Revolution in the late eighteenth century.

Under British rule, the strong and characteristically “Dutch” ideological and cultural control began to decline. With these changes of authority, the conventional “Dutchness” was no longer as prevalent. The Dutch could not preserve their religious and cultural practices and maintain order and Dutchness under British rule. The Dutch traditions became modified over time, though their symbolic extinction would be around the American Revolutionary period. In some ways, the Dutch Reformed Church failed under English rule.

While England had taken control of the governance and economy of New Netherland, the Dutch still practiced religion under the Classis of Amsterdam, their native church. One member of the Dutch Reformed Church in New Jersey wrote to the Classis in the early eighteenth century, complaining about the Irish minister who began preaching in his local church. The complaint read:

We must... be careful to keep things in the Dutch way... [I write to you] ... because of his [the English Dissenter's] departure from the Holland manner of administering these Holy Covenant Seals; and concerning the administration of them, according to his self-opinionated ways; for he is a stranger among us.  

People genuinely felt threatened by the “foreign” presence, for they feared the loss of their own “Dutchness” within an English-dominated society. They sought to preserve their

settlement “in the Dutch way,” keeping New Netherland closely tied to the religious practices they perceived of their homeland. Furthermore, the complaint notes that the preaching of Reverend Gilbert Tennent mixed the English and Dutch languages, which continued to devalue Dutchness. The Dutch clung onto a church that had been experiencing radical change under British rule. There was a moment of tension in the Dutch Reformed Church over who belongs; the Dutch felt compromised by the English dissenters who exerted their authority over New Netherland, regarding the English as “a stranger among us.” The exposure to other religions and cultures threatened the preservation of Dutchness, as Dutch language and religion consequently became anglicized under British control. By the 1720s, all of these concerns with Dutch identity had become futile, as Dutchness remained the primary concern of older generations. In essence, the settlement had failed to maintain their identity under British authority despite the settlers’ efforts to remain characteristically “Dutch” in their practices.

With this Anglicization, the Dutch Reformed Church began to lose its appeal. After a decade of growth without the cultivation of a polyglot society, the threat of foreign influence became a serious problem for the church. As Randall H. Balmer claimed, “… New York suffered mightily, losing both its political standing and the allegiance of many of its communicants.” It appears as though the Dutch could no longer embrace their culture publically, as the Dutch language and the Dutch Reformed Church were losing their pure-bred fervor. While Calvinist theology was malleable, the Dutch wanted to preserve their

religious practices in the old, Dutch way. This was not possible under English authority; the Church had to modify its dogma to compensate for a more multicultural public, and thus, compromised their Dutchness.

The irony of this discussion about the relative importance of “Dutchness,” and the sociocultural religious practices that were instilled in the greater New Netherland community is that the main subjects of this study, Vanderlyn and Kool, perhaps did not value, embrace, or perform Dutchness. Vanderlyn and Kool, as transitional figures, were living during a British colonial period. Vanderlyn’s portraiture reflects his European origins as well as the development of a nascent American identity. His depiction of Kool in particular is suggestive, as her transgressive notion of propriety is glorified through Vanderlyn’s extravagant and non-judgmental image of her.
CHAPTER 2
The Male Voice in the Public Sphere:
A Study of Peter Stuyvesant (1612-1672), Adriaen van der Donck (1612-1672), Pieter Vanderlyn (1687-1778), Benjamin Franklin (1706-1790), and William Linn (1752-1808)

I. Introduction

As a developing settlement, New Netherland was radically evolving socially throughout the seventeenth century. This can be attributed to the ways in which several men— as artists, politicians, believers, and thinkers— articulated their visions for the burgeoning Dutch colonies of New Netherland and New York under the British. Adriaen van der Donck (1618-1655), Peter Stuyvesant (1612-1672), Pieter Vanderlyn (1687-1778), and William Linn (1752-1808) provide four different examples of male commentary throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in New York. Early male visions for both personal and communal improvement culminated in the production of Enlightenment thinkers like Benjamin Franklin (1706-1790). Although he was neither of Dutch origin nor a resident of the Hudson River Valley, Benjamin Franklin contributed to the later discussion of self-advancement which became so fundamental to the Early Republic (1780-1830).63

The male public presence was essential in attempting to preserve cultural identity during a time of radical transition. New England settlements were oftentimes multinational; thus, the communities sought to maintain their cultural identities through religion, politics, and social order. Men had the greatest ability to influence the

63 NB: Benjamin Franklin’s contributions are discussed relative to the shift from concerns about communal identity to the focus on individual identity and self-advancement. Thus, my discussion of Franklin is not in conjunction with Dutchness, as he had no exposure to these ideals. He lived with a different set of cultural expectations in the burgeoning nation-to-be.
development of these new settlements, as they had more freedoms to navigate the public sphere. Thomas A. Foster notes, “in early America successful manhood rested on the establishment of a household, the securing of a calling or career, and self-control over one’s masculine comportment.” Thus the male public image was predicated on a strong-willed and very public lifestyle. While it was considered Peter Stuyvesant’s political duty as governor from 1647-1664 to intertwine religion into his political decisions, a conservative mind like Adriaen van der Donck, an artist like Pieter Vanderlyn, or an orator like William Linn, presented different views of religion, religious worship, and the applicability of religion to maintain social order and both personal and communal identity. These men shaped the cultural landscape of New Netherland, and then New York, by participating in a public form of discourse in which they would convey their personal aspirations to a broader audience (unlike the female voice, which was confined to a relatively private sphere).

To understand the evolving socio-political ideologies of eighteenth century Dutch settlement is to evaluate personal accounts of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, which reveal tensions between conservatives, those who embraced the traditional European Dutch way, and the progressives, those who developed a civilization independent of immediate Dutch influence. Each of these men functioned within different eras, each with a different code of social acceptability. Adrien van der Donck and Peter Stuyvesant lived in a Dutch colonial settlement, in which the society had a keen understanding of its Dutch origins, its religious affiliations, and its direction for growth. In 1664, Dutch
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colonialism was compromised, as the British seized control of the Hudson River Valley. Thus, Pieter Vanderlyn lived in a British colonial settlement where Dutchness was primarily the concern of older generations. Finally, Benjamin Franklin and William Linn witnessed the American Revolution and Early Republic, during which new notions of American identity were introduced. Franklin’s desire for self-advancement and Linn’s hopes for cultural unity through scripture reveal the tensions between liberal and conservative male voices following the Great Awakening (1730s-1750s).

Each of these men proved essential in defining the relationship between governmental duty and religious need during a time of both ideological and political revolution; nonetheless, their contributions were inherently different. Adriaen van der Donck used his male public presence to further his own faith; Peter Stuyvesant’s political duty perhaps compromised his personal belief; and Pieter Vanderlyn’s obsession to be one with God threatened his role within the church. William Linn attempted to maintain order through his conservative sermons, which harkened to a pure form of Dutchness that was fleeting. Finally, Franklin changed the nature of masculine development. Rather than focusing on the image of the ideal male in a communal setting, he focused on the advancement of self. The voices of Adrien van der Donck, Peter Stuyvesant, Pieter Vanderlyn, and William Linn each pave the way for Franklin’s ultimate discourse of self-advancement, which became essential to the development of a new nation.
II. What It Means to Be a Man: Masculinity in the Public Forum

To better understand the roles of these five men in the public forum, one must identify what it meant to be a man in a colonial settlement. According to Jessica Choppin Roney, who studied “Effective Men” in Philadelphia from 1725-1775, “Eighteenth-century English political thought linked ‘virtue’ with good government.” Scholars like E. Anthony Rotundo note that many men were on the quest for “clues to the fundamental nature of manhood.” Thus, men personally wanted to understand the “nature” of being a man and a man’s societal obligations. As scholars, writers, activists, and free thinkers alike, each man played a unique role in shaping the settlement’s identity (religious, governmental, societal, etc.).

The colonial male’s sense of duty to others was crucial in characterizing the male voice, both publicly and privately. Men who asserted themselves into the public discourse of governance and order sought to further mold society rather than benefit themselves. This refinement happened in several ways, including social ordinances, economic reform, and ideological control. As Rotundo writes, there was an immense amount of pressure put on the male—as a provider for the family, as the head of household, and as a representative in society. He claims, “… duty was a crucial word for manhood... Every social relationship was organized as a conjunction of roles.” Moreover, the colonial male voice could not be

---

65 NB: Modern scholarship regarding male voice and identity in New Netherland during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries is scarce; thus, in some cases I must extrapolate evidence from scholars writing about the eighteenth century and apply it to New Netherland. Roney is but one example.
69 Rotundo, American Manhood, 12.
70 Rotundo, American Manhood, 12-13.
focused solely on the betterment of self; it was primarily focused on the community. Herb Goldberg claims in *The New Male: From Self Destruction to Self-Care*, that males, and masculine voices are both “unnatural” and “unstable.” Unlike Goldberg, I claim that these public figures were under social pressure to have a natural and stable presence within the society. On a more private level, however, their personal values could have been both “unnatural” and “unstable” for the time—especially those of Vanderlyn and the later Franklin. I suggest that the perceived “unnatural” and “unstable” voice is derived from the concept of communal values as more significant than personal convictions. In the case of New Netherland, this government was twofold, and included the self-government of the population under the ideology of the Dutch Reformed Church; it also included the political duties of elected officials, and their visions for the Dutch colony. While the male public discourse greatly contributed to the development of an orderly settlement, their internal struggle for acceptance, and as Goldberg notes, “[to live] up to the image,” cannot go unnoticed.72

Some men like van der Donck and Linn were steadfast in their purpose; they had a self-imposed obligation to maintain the Dutch cultural practices in New Netherland—in Linn’s case long after New Netherland existed politically. Other men like Stuyvesant, Vanderlyn, and Franklin struggled to negotiate the perceived needs of the society with their own grievances. While Stuyvesant may have had a political obligation within New England, he still maintained personal beliefs privately. While van der Donck was torn between the

---

71 Herb Goldberg, *The New Male: From Self-Destruction to Self-Care* (New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc., 1979), 17. NB: While Goldberg’s book is a psychological study of males, females, and male-female relationships, and he lacks a specific attention to historical periods, his claims are still relevant for the purposes of this study, as he provides a psychological context for the colonial male voice.
old Dutch way and the new community, Stuyvesant was torn between his political obligation and personal conviction, and Vanderlyn was torn between religion and self. While Linn sought to unite the community under an outdated Dutchness, Franklin focused on self-improvement, and how the betterment of the individual impacts the public good.

III. Adriaen van der Donck (1618-1655): The Ideal Dutchman

Adriaen van der Donck's manuscript, *A Description of New Netherland* (1655), can be perceived as merely observational for its accounts of Dutch settlement and landscape; however, I maintain that his writings and later advocacy were purposeful in that he insisted on the strict preservation of Dutch practices in the newly established New Netherland. A native of the Netherlands who had studied law, van der Donck arrived in New Netherland in 1641. Van der Donck, a man heavily involved in colonial government and legislature, became invested in the settlers, as well as the efficiency and fairness of the colony through his participation on the Board of Nine, a group of men who were chosen to represent the populace. Van der Donck was extremely concerned with the governance of New Netherland, and sought to strictly uphold characteristically Dutch practices abroad. This included religious, cultural, social, and economic traditions. Van der Donck sought to protect New Netherland from foreign, specifically English, influence. He was steadfast in his demands for an orderly Dutch society through both a streamlined government and religious order; however, as the society was multicultural and multifaceted by nature

---

(undefined borders, Native presence, threat of British, etc.), his wishes remained unfulfilled at his death in 1655.

Van der Donck’s voice characterizes New Netherland during the mid-seventeenth century; he began to draw connections between political government and religious need. Politically, he feared the impending English takeover, writing in the 1640s, “There will not be another opportunity or season to remedy New Netherland, for the English will annex it.”75 Spiritually, he sought to uphold the Dutch Reformed religion abroad. His observations of New Netherland during the mid-seventeenth century reveal a settlement in transition, in disorderly political and religious experimentation. Historian Edward Tanjore Corwin characterizes the settlement as “an armed commercial corporation, possessing almost unlimited powers to colonize, defend and govern its possessions.”76 While Corwin implies that the settlement had some independence, my study of men like van der Donck and Stuyvesant indicates that the Dutch West India Company was obtrusive and demanding. Van der Donck had an inherent need to preserve the settlers’ Dutchness, specifically through religion. Thus, he sought to create a cohesive definition and understanding of “civilization,” one that perhaps the West India Company overlooked. The Company depended on the patroon system and the ziekentroosters to maintain Dutchness in New Netherland, not the Dutch Reformed Church.

Van der Donck, as a member of the Board of Nine, was extremely dissatisfied with the government of New Netherland under the jurisdiction of the West India Company; he,

75 Adriaen van der Donck, quoted in Ada Louise Van Gatsel, “Adriaen van der Donck, New Netherland, and America” (PhD diss., The Pennsylvania State University, 1985), 12.
rather, advocated for the self-sufficiency of the settlement. In 1649, van der Donck and the Board began to compile ordinances against the Dutch West India Company and its representatives, who included Peter Stuyvesant. As scholar Ada Louise Van Gatsel claims, van der Donck’s concerns stemmed from the fact that the Dutch West India Company’s “managers adopted a wrong course, looking more to their own interests than to the welfare of the colony.”\textsuperscript{77} This included the “unnecessary” expenditure of certain reforms, which likely included Stuyvesant’s social ordinances and costly public works projects.\textsuperscript{78} Moreover, van der Donck was advocating for an economic freedom that Stuyvesant could not have established. To van der Donck, Stuyvesant was acting as an agent for the Dutch West India Company, whose economic concerns regarding the fur trade not only depended on multinational relations and the development of a multinational society, but also on an external and centralized governing authority. Van der Donck’s primary concerns about Dutch identity included his fear of foreign influence. Van der Donck wrote, “... it is very odd, improper, and unreasonable for any other nation to presume to have any title to or jurisdiction in this place or others included with it, since it has been from the first a Dutch possession.”\textsuperscript{79} By characterizing this civilization as solely Dutch, van der Donck perhaps believed the settlement could preserve the wishes of the homeland while simultaneously solidifying its own fiscal and moral future independently of “odd, improper, and unreasonable” foreign interference (a.k.a. the British).

As a male public voice, van der Donck perhaps aligned himself the most with the principles about masculinity explained by Goldberg. In his book, van der Donck was very

\textsuperscript{77} Van Gatsel, “Adriaen van der Donck, New Netherland, and America,” 147.
\textsuperscript{78} Van Gatsel, “Adriaen van der Donck, New Netherland, and America,” 148.
\textsuperscript{79} van der Donck, \textit{A Description of New Netherland}, 5.
focused on defending the settlement from the “other,” rather than describing the settlement outright. Thus, he adheres to Goldberg’s characterization of men using “psychological energy... to defend against, rather than to express, what he really is.”80 While it is significant that van der Donck focuses on the potential threats of other groups, such as the Natives and the British, his discussion of religion instills a powerful presence of spirituality and religiosity in the New Netherland settlement. Van der Donck offers the settlement a type of religious identity that could function independently from the Dutch West India Company, and aims to cultivate and modify the European Dutch way to fit the sociocultural need of New Netherland. Despite the ways in which Adrien van der Donck was advocating for the preservation of the Dutch settlement, in essence, his mission was to promote the colony of New Netherland in hopes that the settlement would continue to grow in both size and autonomy from the Dutch West India Company.81

Van der Donck’s exposure to the American Indians’ set of beliefs further solidified his own beliefs in the Reformed religion. Unlike Stuyvesant and the Dutch West India Company, who regarded the local Indian tribes as essential assets to the fur trade, van der Donck saw possibilities in the Natives as converts. He observed, “Although the original natives of New Netherland are heathens and unbelievers, they all know and confess that there is a God in heaven, eternal and almighty.”82 Although the native peoples did not practice religion in the Dutch way, they still recognized the omnipresence of some spiritual being. As van der Donck notes, the Dutch emphasized:

80 Goldberg, The New Male, 18.
82 Van der Donck, A Description of New Netherland, 110.
... That God is omniscient and omnipresent; knows the nature of devils exactly; quietly observes their doings; and will not permit a puffed-up and faithless servant to tyrannize man, who is the most glorious creature of all and made in God’s image, provided he duly puts his trust in God and does not forsake his commandments in favor of evil.\textsuperscript{83}

Van der Donck promotes the “omniscient” and “omnipresent” nature of God, and is quick to denounce the “puffed-up and faithless servant,” who has supposedly been sent to “tyrannize man.” In his criticisms of those who fail to uphold God’s word and “image,” his statements could pertain to the Dutch West India Company. Van der Donck saw Stuyvesant as a political agent for the Dutch West India Company, who consistently undermined the community’s needs in favor of their own economic goals. By claiming that God is responsible for overseeing the workings of the Devil, and by instilling the value of the Ten Commandments in the local Indian tribes, the Dutch perhaps sought to draw them closer to the Reformed God. Van der Donck, as an observer, also notes that the Dutch were able to subdue the indigenous peoples’ fear of the devil through the Reformed religion.\textsuperscript{84} Van der Donck’s exposure to the local American Indian’s spiritual beliefs further solidified his own faith in the Reformed religion; his examination was not a sign of his own changing religious views.

Van der Donck, as a public male presence through his role on the Board of Nine, and through \textit{A Description of New Netherland}, was able to identify and connect religious need with political obligation. His opposition to the Dutch West India Company coupled with his observations of Native practice perhaps further solidified his own definition of “citizenship.” As a member of the Board of Nine, van der Donck’s male voice and public

\textsuperscript{83} van der Donck, \textit{A Description of New Netherland}, 111.
\textsuperscript{84} van der Donck, \textit{A Description of New Netherland}, 113.
presence was highly regarded, despite his opposition to the Dutch West India Company. Van der Donck’s book suggests that masculinity did entail full involvement in the community’s practices, both religious and political. Van der Donck’s portrait of masculinity as a way to defend the settlement and its origins as a heavily spiritual community is significant because he is an early writer who is strictly adhering to the European “Dutchness” in his experiences abroad.

IV. Peter Stuyvesant (1612-1672) and Political Duty

As a government-appointed representative of New Netherland, Peter Stuyvesant had a political obligation to create religious and moral order to maintain control of the Dutch settlement and its people. Stuyvesant was perhaps caught in what Rotundo defines as the “compromise between communal ideal and individual desire.”85 As governor of New York from 1647-1664, he was integral in developing a sense of order—much like the British Colonial order of the mid-seventeenth century—for this trade-based community. He also articulated a vision of a settlement in which religion was integrated into the daily practices of a society to benefit the future of Dutch New York. However, as Rotundo notes, “Much economic ambition could be rationalized as a man’s way of adding to the common wealth, and political self-advancement could always be explained as a desire to serve the community in some greater cause.”86 Stuyvesant embodied this description. Although a leader in the public sphere, he did not always act out of communal interest, and for that reason was regarded as a pompous and strict authoritative figure within New Amsterdam. I maintain that he failed to fulfill his political duty. Although New Netherland did transform

85 Rotundo, American Manhood, 15.
86 Rotundo, American Manhood, 15.
from what George Smith defines as a “trading outpost” to a “bonafide colonial experiment,” much like the British under Stuyvesant, he still failed to uphold the principles set forth by the Dutch West India Company, and moreover, he failed the needs of his own community.87

When Peter Stuyvesant was appointed Director-General of New Netherland in 1647, the Dutch West India Company expected him to maintain the feudal relationship between the Company and their respective territories.88 When he entered office, the Dutch settlers were at war with local Indian tribes. While the fur-trading economy was failing due to a standoff with the Native Americans, the community lacked a cohesive social order.

Stuyvesant’s allegiance to the Dutch West India Company meant that he needed to re-invigorate the settlement, and to ensure that the colonists could maintain the economic demands of the Company.89 While he was crucial in shaping colonial policy in the eighteenth century through his social reforms, Stuyvesant’s system of governance was wildly unpopular in New Netherland. Under his authority, as Hinkley notes, the people were denied political agency.

When the people appealed to Governor Stuyvesant for permission to ‘assemble for the protection of their liberty and other property,’ he refused; when they questioned his authority, Stuyvesant replied: ‘we derive our authority from God and the West India Company’; and that was that.90

The son of a Calvinist minister, Stuyvesant sought to establish order through various social reforms, which included a strict observation of the Sabbath, restrictions on liquor

89 Byard Tuckerman, *Peter Stuyvesant: Director-General for the West India Company in New Netherland* (New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1893), 59.
consumption, and the tolerance of only one religious denomination. According to Bayard Tuckerman, Stuyvesant “was accustomed to a rigid discipline, and he knew how to govern only as a master.” His style of leadership revealed the tension between self-promotion, communal gain, and the advancement of the community. Even though Stuyvesant claimed to “derive [his] authority from God and the West India Company,” his unpopular governance and subsequent failure were critical in creating a negative image of him and the Dutch West India Company. He was too rigid for the Dutch, who believed in religious and political liberty. In essence, the settlers wanted to live a decentralized, freer lifestyle with fewer restrictions, while Stuyvesant wanted to introduce a centralized order that was based on only one set of ideals. While Arnold Whitridge notes that Stuyvesant was “one of the very few among those who controlled the destinies of New Netherland to regard the colony as a political society, and not just a trading station,” Stuyvesant was very unpopular in the local community and ultimately failed to protect his community from external influences, such as the British.

Although New Netherland began to develop a new sense of political order that it had otherwise lacked, Stuyvesant’s aim to unifying the colonials under one denomination, The Dutch Reformed Church, was perceived as inconceivable. In 1656, Stuyvesant issued an ordinance “against conventicles,” claiming that anyone who housed a dissenter would be “subject to official espionage.” Stuyvesant believed that New Netherland should remain a
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91 Balmer, A Perfect Babel of Confusion, 150-151; Shorto, The Island at the Center of the World, 275; Tuckerman, Peter Stuyvesant, 59.
92 Tuckerman, Peter Stuyvesant, 64.
95 Smith, George L., Religion and Trade in New Netherland, 35; 224-227.
Dutch settlement in its cultural practices and religion; however, the settlement, which was multicultural by origin, resisted his authority. Richard Cavendish claims, “He [Stuyvesant] was a convinced Calvinist, hostile to Quakers, Lutherans and all other species of Protestants, and tried to have Jews and those who did not belong to the Dutch Reformed Church banned from the colony, but the company persistently overruled him.”\footnote{Richard Cavendish, “September 8th, 1664 – New Amsterdam Surrendered to the English,” in \textit{Months Past} (September 2014): 8.} While Cavendish claims that Stuyvesant was steadfast in his authority, using his personal beliefs to denounce other branches of the faith, I suggest that Stuyvesant had a political obligation to ensure that the most capable fur traders were living in New Amsterdam. The Dutch understood the sociocultural expectations of the fur-trading society as an extension of their European origins. New Netherland was not solely a Dutch settlement; rather, it was multicultural. The Dutch were frequently dealing with the local Indian tribes, as well as the British and French. Thus, Stuyvesant’s social reforms simply could not work effectively.

Thus in reality, Stuyvesant had little control over New Amsterdam. He failed to perform as expected by his community. Stuyvesant perhaps struggled to execute his political obligation as governor because he was promoting the economic advancement of the Dutch West India Company in the face of a struggling Dutch community. Moreover, Stuyvesant had to fulfill certain economic obligations to the Dutch West India Company. The Dutch West India Company, as Arnold Whitridge notes, “was authorized to appoint and remove all governors, to administer justice, to erect forts, make treaties with barbaric chiefs, and to resist invaders.”\footnote{Whitridge, “Peter Stuyvesant,” 325.} Nonetheless, the ordinances that Stuyvesant instituted “administer[ed] justice” perhaps too severely for the settlement. He tried to homogenize a
settlement that was multicultural by origin; he attempted to develop a centralized
government in a society that was defiant. With undefined borders, and its small population,
New Amsterdam’s economy was predicated on the interactions with other groups, like the
British or the Native Americans.98

While New Netherland’s economy may have been based on multinational exchanges,
the Dutch Reformed Church religion was a critical part of Dutch culture and identity.
Nonetheless, this identity was not only predicated upon cultural practices, but also heavily
reliant on economic success. To the Dutch West India Company (and thus to Stuyvesant’s
career), commercial success was paramount. As the Company wrote to him in 1663:

...Although we heartily desire, that... sectarians remained away from there
[New Netherland], yet as they do not, we doubt very much, whether we can
proceed against them rigorously without diminishing the population and
stopping immigration, which must be favored at a so tender stage of the
country’s existence.99

Thus, Stuyvesant’s efforts to create a homogenous society that supported the Dutch
Reformed Church were compromised by the economic goals of the Dutch West India
Company, which feared “diminishing the population and stopping immigration,” a potential
outcome of Stuyvesant’s policies, as New Netherland was new and scarcely populated and
economic gains were not realized. By 1664, the entire settlement had surrendered to the
British, and the Dutch West India Company was investigating Stuyvesant’s failures.
Stuyvesant had failed, first, to secure the borders, secondly, to have amicable relations with
the local commissioners, and finally, to uphold the Dutch West India Company’s wishes for
a strong trade outpost. He had succeeded, however, in bolstering a sense of Dutchness in
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98 Hudson River Valley Review, “‘No Country for Peter Stuyvesant,’” 123.
New Netherland through his efforts to strengthen the Dutch Reformed Church, education, and the behavior of his citizens. After Stuyvesant’s surrender, Dutchness presumably remained significant to those of the older generations; subsequent generations likely did not regard Dutchness as essential to their identity in the British Colonial Era or the Early Republic.

Despite his failures, Stuyvesant had established the first municipal government in New Amsterdam, which attempted to homogenize and promote the importance of a centralized government. Thus, he vehemently resisted British rule. British influence would threaten the future of his governance, and his relationship with the Dutch West India Company. Furthermore, the English presence stripped the Dutch of their agency as Dutch colonials, because they lawfully now owed allegiance to the British crown. Corwin writes:

> The State Church of Holland could not enforce its decisions on the subjects of another nation; but since [the Dutch colonists] had now become subjects of England, under special articles of surrender, what was their relation to English ecclesiastical law? Although naturalized Englishmen, they were not members of the Church of England, yet neither were they in any legal sense dissenters.

New Amsterdam’s fall to the British in 1664 would also confirm Stuyvesant’s fears about New Netherland’s undefined borders. Falling to Britain would be the end of any hopes for a homogenous settlement that met the economic demands of the Dutch West India Company. The Dutch, in essence, lacked a coherent identity, as they “were not members of the Church of England, yet neither were in any legal sense dissenters.” The Dutch, under British rule
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100 Drake deKay, “The Administration of Peter Stuyvesant – II,” in De Halve maen (April 1978), 12.
from 1664 through the Revolution, were plagued by the uncertainty of their loyalties, and one could argue that Stuyvesant was the most responsible for failing his citizenry because the way he governed New Netherland contributed to New Netherland’s surrender to the British in 1664.\textsuperscript{104}

After the British seizure of New Netherland, Stuyvesant had allegedly become “a man who had failed to observe his oath” to the Dutch West India Company.\textsuperscript{105} The Dutch West India Company opened an investigation into Stuyvesant and his failure to secure New Amsterdam in the face of a British military threat despite Stuyvesant’s resistance to British rule, albeit unsuccessful. After Stuyvesant’s nearly 70,000-word letter of defense, the West India Company insisted that the fort and settlement should have been defended until the bitter end.\textsuperscript{106} What the Company perhaps failed to recognize was the lack of control that Stuyvesant had over his own people. Stuyvesant, in essence, became one of the men whom Goldberg describes as, “...burn[ing] himself out in this never-ending need to prove [himself or his worth], because he can never sufficiently prove it.”\textsuperscript{107} As an agent for the Dutch West India Company, Stuyvesant was pressured by the Company and masses alike to serve their interests. Unfortunately, as a man who implemented such strict social ordinances to manage the Dutch colonists, he lacked their trust as an autonomous representative of their settlement, which likely contributed to his failures as Governor. Stuyvesant’s conflicting loyalties and ultimate failure are significant because of his concern for Dutch identity abroad. Like van der Donck, Stuyvesant attempted to create a community that valued the

\begin{footnotes}
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“old” Dutch way; however, his political and economic obligations perhaps overshadowed otherwise noble intentions. Stuyvesant’s role in the public forum is significant because his torn obligations begin to reveal how personal religious convictions and prejudices were denounced by a society that was focused on the well-being of the community. Stuyvesant’s personal beliefs likely clouded his governance; by attempting to streamline the society as Dutch-only, he compromised not only the support of his people but also the economic future of New Netherland. It is as though Stuyvesant’s unwillingness to compromise his personal aspirations for New Netherland was the cause of the settlement’s surrender in 1664.108

V. Pieter Vanderlyn (1687-1778) the Pietist

Pieter Vanderlyn (1687-1778) was a well-known Hudson Valley painter and preacher. Vanderlyn was born in Holland in 1687 and immigrated to New Netherland via Curacao, a prominent slave-trading Dutch colony in the Caribbean.109 A physician and surgeon in the Dutch Navy, Vanderlyn arrived in New Netherland and was admitted to the Kingston Dutch Reformed Church in 1718, where he began preaching and serving as a choirmaster.110 His second wife, Geertry Vass, was the daughter of a traditional Dutch Reformed minister.111 His activism in the Kingston Dutch Reformed Church, however, was challenged by his own convictions about God. As Paul S. D’Ambrosio notes, “he [Vanderlyn]

---

108 NB: For a less strident claim about Peter Stuyvesant’s unpopular role in New Netherland, please see: Tuckerman, Peter Stuyvesant, 174-176 and Rink, Holland on the Hudson, 237-242.
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111 Roth, “Vanderlyn’s Song,” 73.
exhibited Pietist leanings which clashed with theological conservatives such as his powerful father-in-law."\textsuperscript{112} In essence, Vanderlyn married into the church despite his divergent religious beliefs.

Vanderlyn’s voice was integral in validating a new way of thinking about the relationship between self, community, and God. His hymns not only reveal the convictions of his personal relationship with the Kingston Dutch Reformed Church, but also the struggles of his relationship with God. Vanderlyn, in some ways, was an outsider. He became the “stranger among us,” that was alluded to some decades earlier conservative colonials. His preaching was much more concerned with the individual, which made him a “stranger” to the church, and in turn, the community.\textsuperscript{113} Vanderlyn was Dutch by birth, and became “a naturalized citizen of the English province” in 1719 at the age of 32.\textsuperscript{114} He arrived in New Netherland under English rule, and by the 1720s most of the settlers’ concerns with Dutch identity had receded—Dutchness likely only remained relevant to those of older generations. Domine Vas, Vanderlyn’s father-in-law, was cultivating a church that harkened to a pure Dutchness that Vanderlyn likely overlooked. I argue that Vanderlyn identified himself by his personal relationship with God rather than the New Netherland community; thus, he and his perceived beliefs went against those of the conservative formerly Dutch society.

Vanderlyn’s alleged alignment with Pietism, a more emotional and intimate faith than the Dutch Reformed, shaped the future of his relationship with the church.

Demonstrating his conscious choice of ideology, Vanderlyn spoke freely against the church

\textsuperscript{112} D’Ambrosio, “Portrait of Annetje Kool by Pieter Vanderlyn,” 98.
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out of his own frustration with God. Eric J. Roth notes in his article, "Vanderlyn’s Song," that Pieter Vanderlyn allegedly wrote “a scandalous letter... to Domine Mancius,” another local Reformed minister, regarding his status as choirmaster, and was admonished twice for the “unconstitutional readings” he offered to churchgoers.\(^\text{115}\) While his father-in-law admonished him in 1735 for his progressive hymns, the Church record does not reflect an official excommunication, as Vanderlyn “refused to listen” to the church consistory, and continued preaching freely.\(^\text{116}\) Vanderlyn was the product of a changing time in religious practices, such as the Coetus-Conferentie Affair (~1735), which “pitted theological conservatives bearing allegiance to the Mother church in Europe (the Conferentie) against those arguing for more self-governance.”\(^\text{117}\) Thus, the colonial Dutch Reformed Church was different from the European Dutch Reformed Church, and Vanderlyn was not allegiant to either of these; rather, he was a Pietist who yearned for his personal oneness with God. Vanderlyn sought to further develop his own relationship with God independently from the community, which was uncharacteristic of the formerly Dutch settlement.

Vanderlyn’s voice is significant as a male free thinker because he was willing to modify religion to fit his circumstance as an artist in a multinational society struggling to identify itself under British rule.\(^\text{118}\) Vanderlyn chose to practice Pietism; nonetheless, the ideological pressure to conform to the “old” Dutch Reformed religion, which was the colonial church associated most closely with his national identity, was likely difficult for a gentleman with different personal beliefs about the nature and practice of religion. He was

\(^{115}\) Roth, "Vanderlyn’s Song," 74.
\(^{116}\) Church Records of Bans and Baptism, Senate House Archives, Kingston, NY; Roth, "Vanderlyn’s Song," 74.
\(^{118}\) NB: I am deliberately making a broad claim here, as there were several multinational societies other than that of Kingston that were subject to British, French, etc. rule.
savvy, though, and used art as a medium through which to introduce change in the church. Vanderlyn’s hymns (1730-1740) complemented his growing interest in artistic liberty and the use of art as a medium to facilitate social change. According to Roth, Vanderlyn was most active in the church during the 1730s, in his late 40s, which is also when he began to paint. This is significant because Vanderlyn, in essence, was liberated from the Church in 1735, at the height of his career. When Vanderlyn used his voice, although liberating, it compromised his relationship with the church (particularly with Domine Vas), and, one wonders, his wife’s family? Nonetheless, Vanderlyn still functioned within the public sphere despite his personal convictions; Vanderlyn was a free-thinking artist, and did not conform to the “masculine ideal” that was portrayed by others such as Domine Vas, or Stuyvesant, or the later William Linn.

Vanderlyn’s troubled personal relationship with religion is most evident in his hymn, “O Heylige drie-enig Godt” (“Oh Holy Triune God”), in which he passionately articulates his desire to be guided by God. This hymn is essential in characterizing Vanderlyn’s relationship with God as one of insurmountable passion. This public profession reveals very personal feelings towards God that many Dutch colonials would have considered to inappropriate to make public. It reads:

    O Heavenly ardor! In my spirit is kindled,
    A perfervid flame that until now was tempered,
    Hidden from your warmth
    As vain chaff conceals the millet
    From it tear my ungodliness apart
    Sear my bowels!

119 Roth, “Vanderlyn’s Song,” 76.
120 NB: I am extremely indebted to Ms. Robyn Reed, Head of Access Services Librarian for her time and efforts on my behalf. I found the complete hymn at the Senate House in Kingston, NY. She was willing to translate the hymn to the best of her abilities, and presented me with a finished product that likely adheres to the same meter that Vanderlyn had intended. I am in awe, and am forever grateful.
Pierced and cultivated
In thy Holy design, I take flight and my heavy load sloughed,
In the comfort God’s grace.¹²¹

Here, Vanderlyn articulates his passions for god, and likens his desire to a kindled flame. This fiery imagery is suggestive of Vanderlyn's admiration of God; it is as though the passion, or the “perfervid flame” within Vanderlyn, cannot be quenched. Vanderlyn seeks the “warmth” of God, and begs God to “sear his bowls,” to “pierce” him, and to “cultivate” him in “His holy design.” Thus, Vanderlyn seeks the eternal comfort of God, and can only “take flight” under God’s direction. He is willing to endure pain to be united with God—to be “seared,” “pierced,” and “cultivated.” Nonetheless, in this eternal profession, it is as though Vanderlyn confides in God for he has no one else to entrust. He continues, asking God for direction. “Guide me, shepherd me/ on the path of your Goodness, here on Earth/ lead me into the palace of your peace,” he writes.¹²² Vanderlyn, by asking God for the “path” of “Goodness,” characterizes himself as “ungodly” or anti-good.

The hymn continues, as Vanderlyn presents himself as inferior to the power of the almighty, and begs for salvation. While it was common to remain humble in the presence of God, Vanderlyn's attention to his individual circumstance is overwhelmingly personal. It reads:

Oh Holy triune god, I have been beautifully marked in Your Name in my baptism. Then let me be considered a child and heir. The fabric of my heart is wicked. I was born all in sin. Inclined to evil, without care, in nature a child of wrath... May that my soul go in peace through death into eternal life.¹²³

¹²² Pieter Vanderlyn in Roth, "Vanderlyn’s Song,” 76.
¹²³ Roth, "Vanderlyn’s Song,” 76; The hymn has been dually named, as Roth titles it “O Heylige drie-enig Godt,” Mary Black titles it “Wie Schon Leucht’ Uns Der Morgenstern.” This is the hymn that I reviewed at the Senate House in Kingston, NY.
Here, Vanderlyn recognizes the allegiance he has to God. Vanderlyn, “marked” in God’s name, feels as though he is not being true to his vow. He regards himself as “wicked,” as “born in sin,” and “inclined to evil.” This “child of wrath” does not list his sins, but rather begs for salvation. Vanderlyn minimalizes himself as a “child of wrath,” and asks God for “eternal life.” His relationship with God is highly intimate compared to the communal worship practiced by the Dutch Reformed Church. Moreover, perhaps his “radical” preaching represents his personal torment and supposed failure of living up to the ideal image of being a man, as his constant minimization of self does not reflect the perceived strength, purpose, and drive of the “typical” colonial male.\textsuperscript{124} Vanderlyn modifies religion to fit his needs as a believer in some higher Being, albeit different from what the Dutch Reformed Church advocated.

The Dutch Reformed Church’s need for ideological control was sometimes at odds with personal belief; thus, I claim that Vanderlyn’s struggle with God was not uncommon for the time. His voice was likely representative of the convictions of many; however, he was one of few willing to express these convictions publicly. Nonetheless, the “guilt” and “personal shame” exposed by the hymn reveals Vanderlyn’s struggle with the church and with himself. As Eric J. Roth suggests, the dichotomy of a religion that had an “uplifting message of liberation and reform,” and yet was unable to understand the “personal convictions and contradictions” of its members, further complicated Vanderlyn’s situation.\textsuperscript{125} Perhaps the ideological control of the Dutch Reformed Church and its members forced the colonists to conform, or, like Vanderlyn, to be admonished. Being

\textsuperscript{124} Goldberg, \textit{The New Male}, 17-19.
\textsuperscript{125} Roth, “Vanderlyn’s Song,” 78.
chastised by the church in a Dutch settlement meant more than compromising one’s religious affiliation; it signified a break in an identity that was once characteristically Dutch. Vanderlyn was most deeply interested in values that did not necessarily reflect the Dutch community, but rather revealed his personal belief.

While there remains nearly a 60 year void in primary material to inform the time between Vanderlyn’s admonishment in 1735 and his cited civic engagement in 1792, Vanderlyn’s eighteen portraits dating from 1730 to 1745 suggest that he was traveling along the Hudson River Valley as an itinerant artist. By 1792, Vanderlyn’s role in the public forum perhaps overshadowed his former role as a religious dissenter within the community. Vanderlyn was often cited in *The Rising Sun*, Kingston’s local newspaper, for his self-appointed roles on various committees. On March 31, 1792, he was a representative of the “meritorious fellow citizens” who sought to “render it highly expedient to change the fourth magistrate” in an effort to uphold “the dignity and... the fate of New-York, and the happiness of its citizens.”¹²⁶ Vanderlyn was on “a committee of correspondence to pursue such measures as they may deem most proper to carry the resolutions into effect.”¹²⁷ Thus, Vanderlyn was a member of a sub-committee that unanimously overturned the supposed fourth magistrate. His advocacy in this small committee of men signifies his participation in the political forum, which included other impressive male voices such as Jonathan Hasbrouck and Peter Van Gasbeek.¹²⁸

Vanderlyn’s financial position, as father of five children, is less obvious than his religious beliefs and civic involvement. It is known that in early January 1794, Vanderlyn participated in the import and distribution of “genuine drugs and medicines,” which he distributed to the community “on the most reasonable terms.”¹²⁹ Did his work as an itinerant artist provide an income that would support his family? As the Gansevoort Limner, he is attributed with eighteen paintings but how much he earned for his painting is unknown. As the Idaho Statesman read on November 3, 1921, the irony of Vanderlyn’s personal tragedy as a struggling believer is that he “is now hailed as the originator of the “‘Hudson River School’” and “collectors are scurrying around to dig up samples of his old pictures.”¹³⁰ Vanderlyn was a conflicted resident of the Hudson River Valley; nonetheless, his involvement in both public and private forums shows his complexity as a radical believer, artist, and outcast from traditional Kingston.

Despite decades of British American influence and evolving religious tenets with more liberal interpretations, the 1730s marked another important shift in the church with The First Great Awakening. While Stuyvesant and van der Donck both adhered to European Dutch practices, Vanderlyn was willing to renounce these practices as insufficient for his personal needs; his actions serve an example of a changing time in religious code and thought. It is significant that this free-thinking artist, as a European-born Dutchman and world traveler, was willing to recognize his personal convictions about God so publicly during an age of communal worship that minimized the importance of personal belief.

VI. William Linn (1752-1808) on the Importance of Religion

William Linn (1752-1808) was a minister of the Dutch Reformed Church of New York. His belief system was much like that of Peter Stuyvesant, despite the more than one hundred years that separated them; they both were trying to preserve a Dutchness that was, indeed, fleeting. Linn’s input is particularly significant because he was preaching during a time of great social turmoil—the nation was at war. As Philip J. Anderson notes, “...Linn was part of that generation of clergymen who not only felt themselves to be God’s spokesmen in time of civil upheaval, but who also sought to interpret the halting and groping experience of the new nation.” ¹³¹ A graduate of Princeton, where he studied theology, Linn was deeply concerned with liberty and development.¹³² He often chastised the British as the “evil” within the new nation’s quest for progress.¹³³ Thus, Linn’s attempt to preserve and brand the Dutch Reformed Church during this time is significant in characterizing his beliefs as outdated in a time of rapid social development.

William Linn focused on the lineage of the Dutch Reformed Church within the context of a new government. In the Early Republic, William Linn focused on religion as a means of preserving Dutchness in a multinational, multi-religious, and increasingly secular society. He claimed that sinners have no peace; they lack peace within themselves, peace with others, and peace with God.¹³⁴ This informs Linn’s discussion of how to punish sinners by his study of “the character and misery of the wicked.”¹³⁵ As Linn, a minister of the Dutch

Reformed Church, professed in 1783, “Whatever kinds, and whatever degrees of wickedness there are, they all proceed from an innate depravity of mind.” While both Vanderlyn and Linn seem to recognize sin as a chronic issue, Vanderlyn, as a sinner, seeks a repentance that Linn, who expels sinners, seems to denounce. Linn notes in 1796:

There are some who adopt loose and dangerous principles, who allege, either that scripture is not true, or that the great doctrines, as generally taught, are not contained in it. These are wicked, and they are corrupters of others... the secret motive, however, which leads many of this character to a rejection of scripture, is the desire of being free from its restraints. They are wedded to their thoughts, and these and the scripture are irreconcilable. Unhappy men! Engaged in an undertaking desperate and impossible...

Linn’s characterization of the “desperate” and “impossible” mission that sinners undertake to find salvation is similar to Vanderlyn’s convictions about self and God. Vanderlyn, like the sinners that Linn references, is indeed “wedded to [his] thoughts” about God, and definitely desires to be “free from [the] restraints” of what Vanderlyn called his “heavy load.” Here, Linn appears “wedded” to his thoughts of Pietism and change. Moreover, the desperation is reflected in the recognition of wickedness; he [the sinner Linn writes of] begs for God’s forgiveness, much like Vanderlyn begs for God’s guidance. The traditional Dutch Reformed Church of the 1780s responded to “sin” and “wickedness” by invoking God’s judgment. Perhaps Vanderlyn, as a sinner, sought “the desire of being free from its [religious] restraints.” The post-Revolutionary Republic was experiencing a rapid sociocultural shift from former notions of European-centric ideals, to that of newfound American ideals, and Linn’s voice was critical in preserving and rebranding the notions of “old” European Dutchness throughout the Hudson River Valley.

Linn’s ability to tie a political and historical discussion into the communal practice of worship represents a patriotic outreach that absorbed the community into a discourse that was very tied to Dutch identity. He publicly sponsored the integration of homogenized religion into an otherwise multicultural society. Both the Bible and his political understanding of New Netherland informed his wishes for social and political unity within the community. As Jack Douglas Klunder notes, Linn had a keen sense of his audience, with “the wonderful blending of biblical exegesis with historical reflection, moral challenge and pleas for personal examination.”\(^ {139}\) Linn’s apparent thematic preaching covered a range of issues, from personal conviction to the need for cultural unity. According to Anderson, Linn was extremely concerned with society’s “inattention to family instruction and government, a lack of observance of the Sabbath, abuse of temporal prosperity, prevalence of infidelity (deism), and the want of union.”\(^ {140}\)

Like Stuyvesant and van der Donck, who wanted to preserve and maintain ideological control and order in a homogenous Dutch society, Linn wanted cultural unity during a time of rapid sociopolitical transition. British rule from 1664 through the Revolution compromised the Dutch descendants’ agency over religion, government, and cultural practice. In the New Republic, Linn offered the citizens of the Hudson River Valley a specific religious identity that harkened to a traditional European sense of Dutchness that had not been universally employed since the seventeenth century. Linn, who was raised in a colonial settlement, was focused on the imagined past of Dutchness through religion; however, this imagined past could not be brought to fruition in a community that was


lawfully allegiant to the British crown and then New York state. Linn’s voice is crucial as a man whose ideas and values shaped a civil society; however, his voice was perhaps too focused on the imagined past to realize the rapid socio-religious and socio-political developments in the new nation that required a new, and characteristically American identity.

VII. The Enlightened Benjamin Franklin (1706-1790)

Following the First Great Awakening of the mid-eighteenth century, the American Revolution proved the most decisive shift in the concept of what it meant to be a virtuous citizen. Major ideological shifts and religious revivals began to place the emphasis on the individual relationship with God, rather than with the community. Benjamin Franklin (1706-1790) was a product of these changing views of different religious practices and theological ideas. Franklin’s published works invoked a new sense of theological order which was closely tied to rational thought. Benjamin Franklin, as a widely recognized public voice in colonial settlement, was integral in articulating the changing times. Franklin’s alias as Silence Dogood, his publications in the *Pennsylvania Gazette*, *Poor Richard*, and his scientific manual, *Experiments and Observations on Electricity*, each contributed to the development of the male voice of the eighteenth century.\(^{141}\) I maintain that Franklins’ works on self-advancement and self-improvement contribute to a growing sense of freedom of expression that emerged in the post-Revolutionary Republic.

Part of Franklin’s presence is that he was a member of an elite group of men dealing with moral challenges, which included both political and religious issues and differences.

Franklin, much like Vanderlyn, was a free thinker. As Joyce Chaplin argues, “... He actively sought to influence public policy from a position on the margins of the major public forums for exercising political power and social privilege.”\(^{142}\) Despite his work on the “margins” of society in the mid and late eighteenth century, Franklin was most interested in personal values, which were possibly influenced by both a desire for acceptance, as well as personal need. In his writings, Franklin’s style focused on the redemption of self, and how self-improvement transcends into the public good. Franklin’s belief in Deism presented a much more personal approach to religion, logic, and self-advancement which is reflected through his literary works. Specifically, Franklin used Deism as a vehicle to define his own moral purpose, or calling. Joyce E. Chaplin suggests that Franklin’s style focused on the act of “life writing,” in which the goal is “spiritual redemption.”\(^{143}\) Franklin’s constant awareness of God’s presence in daily activities, I argue, contributed to Franklin’s growing concern for self-advancement through the freedom of expression.

The redemption that Franklin sought was a deep, complicated, and competitive personal contentment. In a letter to his mother, Abiah, on April 12, 1750, Franklin reveals how he would prefer to be remembered. He writes, “...so the Years roll round, and the last will come; when I would rather have it said, He lived usefully, than, He died rich.”\(^{144}\) Thus, he would prefer those to remember him by his contributions, rather than his personal gains. Franklin’s works frequently tie self-advancement to the public good, suggesting that personal improvement results in communal improvement. This extremely personal

\(^{142}\) Lester C. Olson, *Benjamin Franklin’s Vision of American Community: A Study in Rhetorical Iconology* (South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press, 2004), 11.
narrative reveals Franklin’s convictions. As a man widely recognized for his scientific experiments, his alias as Silence Do-Good, and his political role as one of the nation’s Founding Fathers, Franklin’s various contributions have molded his voice, which, in this case, articulates his aims privately.

Furthermore, Franklin’s contemplations cited in his Autobiography reflect a changing time in the relationships between self (the soul and the brain), community, science (which was considered progressive), and religion (which was considered conservative). He writes, “...But on the whole, tho’ I never arrived at the Perfection I had been so ambitious of obtaining, but fell far short of it, yet I was by the Endeavour made a better and happier Man than I otherwise should have been, if I had not attempted it...” Thus, like van der Donck, Stuyvesant, and Vanderlyn, Franklin faced challenges in the public forum. Was he able to uphold the male image that Goldberg suggests was so essential to the male persona of the time? Franklin perhaps fits Goldberg’s model because he longed for acceptance; he longed to obtain perfection. However, I suggest that this “perfection” he “had been so ambitious of obtaining” was unfeasible from the onset due to his competitive nature that consistently pitted the self against the self. Nonetheless, Franklin is able to recognize that he “fell far short of [perfection],” but he was “made a better and happier man” because of this self-perceived failure. While Franklin may claim that he failed to live up to the expectations of the male public image, he was still transformed by these experiences.

145 NB: His Autobiography was first published in France in 1791, and was then published in English in 1793. The text itself is a compilation of Franklin’s memoir--like musings.
147 Goldberg, The New Male, 18.
Franklin's self-expression is so unique in that he was able to navigate outside of the moral boundaries, while also being a very public figure. His public presence, his physicality, and his religious convictions each reflect the changing moral codes of self-expression and self-identification. Religion was important to Benjamin Franklin because it presented a moral code by which to live by. Following his youth as a Presbyterian, he became a devout Deist, in which he believed that God controlled man's actions.\textsuperscript{148} While traditional Deism suggests a more hand-off “clockmaker” God, Franklin's deistic leanings tied God more closely to the daily actions of man. This contributes to his understanding that individuals have an obligation to self-improve. He defined his religion in the form of a creed, writing, “I never doubted, for instance, the Existence of the Deity, that he made the World, and govern'd it by his Providence; that the most acceptable Service of God was the doing Good to Man; that our Souls are immortal; and that all Crime will be punished and Virtue rewarded either here or hereafter; these I esteem'd the Essentials of every Religion.”\textsuperscript{149} Thus, religion was a system of order through which people actively serviced the distant (but omnipresent) God by “doing Good to Man.” Self-improvement, or “virtue” led to the common good.

Franklin regarded religion as a mode of thought through which God observed the workings of man; religion, to Franklin, offered an ethical framework for individuals. Franklin's observations of and friendship with Methodist Minister George Whitefield (1714-1770) reveal not only Franklin’s attention to the presence of powerful and articulate male public voice, but also to the rhetoric and immediate influence of scripture on the

\textsuperscript{148} Franklin, \textit{A Norton Critical Edition: Benjamin Franklin's Autobiography}, 77.
\textsuperscript{149} Franklin, \textit{A Norton Critical Edition: Benjamin Franklin's Autobiography}, 77.
people of Philadelphia. He writes, "It was wonderful to see the Change soon made in the Manners of our Inhabitants; from being thoughtless or indifferent about Religion, it seem’d as if all the World were growing Religious; so that one could not walk thro- the Town in an Evening without Hearing Psalms sung in different Families of every Street."\textsuperscript{150} Thus, it appears as though religion unified the masses. It created a civilized society, in which “it seem’d as if all the World were growing Religious,” with the sounds of “psalms sung in different Families of every Street.” It immediately changed the “manners,” or behavior of the city’s “inhabitants.” Once “thoughtless or indifferent,” now they likely were spirited and appropriate. Unlike William Linn or Peter Stuyvesant, Franklin used religion to benefit the community as a whole first through the self-improvement of the individual. This, I feel, was predicated on his trust of Whitefield. Franklin writes that he “never had the least Suspicion of his Integrity, but am to this day decidedly of Opinion that he was in all his Conduct, a perfectly honest Man.”\textsuperscript{151} Franklin, who did not share the same religion as Whitefield, could not deny the man’s “integrity” and “honesty,” despite their different values. Altogether, Franklin’s concerns about conduct, which included morality, virtue, and integrity, were crucial to the betterment of self, which he believed was not solely based on one particular religious prophesy.

While Benjamin Franklin emphasized the importance of a virtuous citizenry through his published works, his sexual behavior neither upheld his deistic creed nor the strictures of monogamy. In fact, Franklin willingly admits in his \textit{Autobiography} that his “hard-to-be-govern’d Passion of Youth, had hurried [him] frequently into intrigues with low Women

\textsuperscript{150} Franklin, \textit{A Norton Critical Edition: Benjamin Franklin’s Autobiography}, 100.
\textsuperscript{151} Franklin, \textit{A Norton Critical Edition: Benjamin Franklin’s Autobiography}, 101.
that fell in [his] Way."\textsuperscript{152} Franklin, in some ways, admits to licentious behavior in his youth. While he does not explicitly state the details of his “intrigues with low Women,” he is quick to note that his passion was “hard-to-be-govern’d” in youth. Thus, the allusion of his other sexual partners both reveals his failed monogamy. Moreover, Franklin got away with the behavior due to his status. He continues, “… by great good Luck I escaped [uncontrollable passion/desire].”\textsuperscript{153} Franklin’s image was not tainted as a result of his supposed sexual affairs with women other than his wife; rather, he gets away with this behavior because of his status. While he claims that he “escaped” his uncontrollable passions for women other than his wife, the “faithful Helpmate,” I rather suggest that he “escaped” a tainted image due to his nomadic travels across the Atlantic.\textsuperscript{154} This is extremely significant considering Franklin’s gender and his social class.\textsuperscript{155} As a product of the Enlightenment, Franklin was able to address his faults through his writing, and sought to improve himself through his “Names of Virtues,” which did include chastity, and forgave himself without seeking God’s forgiveness.\textsuperscript{156}

\textbf{VIII. Conclusion: The Evolution of Male Voices}

In retrospect, the Enlightenment thinkers of the eighteenth century were essential in developing a new sense of personal development in relation to the community. Most specifically, the male public presence was fundamental in articulating the needs of the society, and the needs of the individual. Each of these men characterized “civilization” and

\textsuperscript{152} Franklin, \textit{A Norton Critical Edition: Benjamin Franklin’s Autobiography}, 66.
\textsuperscript{153} Franklin, \textit{A Norton Critical Edition: Benjamin Franklin’s Autobiography}, 66.
\textsuperscript{154} Franklin, \textit{A Norton Critical Edition: Benjamin Franklin’s Autobiography}, 66.
\textsuperscript{155} NB: Chapter 3 will further refine this discussion of sexuality and gender within public and private spheres.
\textsuperscript{156} Franklin, \textit{A Norton Critical Edition: Benjamin Franklin’s Autobiography}, 80.
“identity” differently. Van der Donck identified with the European Dutch Reformed Church and wanted to use European scripture to develop a society that reflected Holland. Stuyvesant, as Governor under the Dutch West India Company, needed the civilization to produce fur; thus, he wanted the Hudson River Valley to be a cohesive Dutch settlement that could meet the Dutch West India Company’s economic demands. Vanderlyn, as a free thinker in a conservative society, was tormented by his personal convictions about God. Vanderlyn’s civilization perhaps would have been based on the needs of the individual relative to the community, but nonetheless would have also been tied to a passionate scripture that offered spiritual redemption. Linn, rejecting the secularization of a new American nation, identified with an imagined past that was based on the preservation of Dutchness through religion; however, the cultural unity that Linn wanted to preserve was unfeasible under British and then American rule. Finally, Franklin included Deism as a part of his over-arching life plan for self-advancement through an adherence to specific virtues. This included but was not predicated on scripture, like van der Donck and Linn likely would have insisted.

Nonetheless there were flaws with the male public voices and their modes of thought regarding identity, civilization, and belief. Following the Enlightenment, the growing concern with individual interest perhaps undermined the power of scripture and trumped communal interest, rather than acting as a contribution to others. Rotundo writes,

> Since the settlement of New England, the aggressive passions that threatened social order had been associated with manhood and with selfish interest. Throughout the eighteenth century, the connection between male passion and individual interest had persisted. Thus, when influential thinkers of the late eighteenth century pondered the growing claims of the self, they thought only of the male self. From the start, individualism was a gendered issue.\textsuperscript{157}

\textsuperscript{157} Rotundo, \textit{American Manhood}, 17.
Thus, by thinking “only of the male self,” these public advocates were failing to recognize their other essential halves—their female counterparts. One could argue that the male voice established masculinity, which was heavily tied to “individualism;” however, these men were also extremely influential in the lives of others. In order to best understand and articulate the needs and aims of colonial settlement, one must investigate the other side of this “gendered issue”—that of the female voice.
CHAPTER 3
Supplementing the Female Voice:
A Study of the Works of Laurel Thatcher Ulrich (1938-), Anne Bradstreet (1612-1672), Abigail Adams (1744-1818), Hannah Webster Foster (1758-1840), and Annetje Kool (1713-1789)

I. Introduction

Although colonial settlements remained male dominated societies throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, they were also evolving with respect to gender. While the men may have achieved perceived control over their families and the settlement through a public voice in books and sermons, women used their voices to privately articulate their struggles with God, with the public, and with themselves. In the forms of journals, poetry, and prose, women were developing the female voice into a powerful discourse of desire and need. Some women desired a stronger sociocultural attention to female autonomy and sexuality, while others yearned for involvement in the public sphere. Most, however, needed the reaffirmation of God and of self—they wanted a publically recognized identity.

The personal narratives of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries describe the changing gender spheres of the burgeoning nation. These female voices articulate the tension between conservatives, those who chose to adhere strictly to the terms of their mother country, and progressives, those who adapted conventional British or Dutch practices to fit the circumstances of their early American eighteenth-century settlements. Although there are no direct sources for Annetje Kool of Kingston, NY, investigating the religious thoughts and personal convictions of other women during the colonial era, the revolution, and the post-Revolutionary Republic helps to contextualize the female’s changing relationships with God and with self around Kool’s lifetime.
What is most significant about these evolving female voices is that each subject is neither completely different from, nor completely representative of their respective eras. During the colonial era, which was immersed in Puritan culture, Anne Bradstreet (1612-1772) was privately subversive towards God and the patriarchal society. This pre-revolutionary period confined women to a submissive domesticity, which ensured that they did not function in a public, or male, sphere. Annetje Kool (1713-1789) was a transitional figure between two eras—the colonial period and the American Revolution. Within this time, Kool likely would have been exposed to the religions tension caused by the Great Awakening, and possibly to Enlightenment philosophy. She anticipated the later stories of female autonomy and the freedom to explore (intellectually, sexually, etc.), as she lived through these subsequent religious revivals. As the mother of an illegitimate child, Kool serves as a product of the social hypocrisies about religion, self-awareness, and sexuality—topics left unrecognized and unaddressed until the nineteenth century (when the rise of the “Republican Mother” as a feminist movement for greater female autonomy and inclusion emerged).

Abigail Adams (1744-1818) and Hannah Webster Foster (1758-1840) both function within a public sphere. While Adams is able to frequently discuss politics, education, and self-advancement, Foster’s seduction novel, *The Coquette* (1797), exposes a time when a disproportionate amount of young people, especially women, were given the freedom to explore and function within a more public realm. The growth of the female voice perhaps

---

158 NB: Seventeenth century settlement organized by Puritan religious, legal, and civic control was specific to the Massachusetts Bay colony. For the purposes of this thesis, Puritan refers to the sociocultural expectations of life within this conservative community. Thus, it represents the moral boundaries presented by Puritan society throughout the seventeenth century.
culminates in many ways in the development and publication of seduction novels like *The Coquette*, in which the post-Revolutionary Republic briefly allows for a stronger female independence and self-expression in a public and formerly male-dominated sphere.

While not all of these women were recognized or praised for their contributions to the articulation of female circumstances, needs, and feelings during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the legacy of their input is worthy of investigation and recognition. As William J. Scheick notes in *Authority and Female Authorship in Colonial America*, "A delicate balance in speech and action was required for a colonial woman to conform to the prevailing standard of female respectability." Thus, in the colonial era, it seems as though each female relationship was based on a cultural expectation of subservience which consistently devalued the female voice in the public sphere. Thus, Anne Bradstreet would have remained submissive and virtuous in all thought and action in order to remain respected and accepted by society; however, Bradstreet was subversive in her private musings about God (and she got away with it!). Women like Adams and Foster, however, had the ability to function in an expanded sphere following the revolution. The development of the New Republic briefly embraced female involvement in the public sphere as a means of adding to the efficacy of the nation. Kool falls somewhere in between this rapid social development, in that she anticipates some form of female autonomy, yet falls victim to the arbitrary social hierarchy of mid-eighteenth century New Netherland/New York.

---


160 Professor Jillmarie Murphy, in discussion with the author, February 2016.
I contend that the women who speak with the subversive voices, such as Bradstreet and (likely) Kool, anticipate the later more public voices of Adams and Foster. Each of these women developed niches of feminine discourse that sought to articulate their personal needs and desires. Each author’s seemingly radical musings anticipates the works of the next. Each text becomes progressively more focused on the female’s unrealized and unrecognized passions. My analysis culminates in the 1797 publication of The Coquette—the first widely accessible seduction novel.


Colonial womanhood consisted of two main expectations. A woman must be loyal to her husband and to God, and her role as a domestic wife tied her to an inherent servitude to others. These basic domestic duties and responsibilities meant that women had no voice in a public forum; rather, their main roles as mother and wife were to maintain the household affairs. Wives and mothers, unlike men who were supposed to be consistently asserting themselves in a public sphere, were confined to domesticity. As Merril D. Smith notes in Women’s Roles in Seventeenth-Century America, in this century, “Households were the foundations of society.” Women were thus responsible for upholding a virtuous household.

---

161 NB: Modern scholarship regarding female voice and identity during the eighteenth century in areas such as the Hudson River Valley is scarce; thus, in some cases I must extrapolate evidence from scholars writing about seventeenth and eighteenth century colonial settlements and apply it to New Netherland. I am using the contexts of the Dutch colonial, British colonial, Revolutionary, and Early Republic to contextualize my suggestions about Kingston, NY.
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Within the household, however, the male father figures were still given authority. The male figure was typically the provider, while the female was the maternal and virtuous presence within the house. In 1712, Benjamin Wadsworth, as minister of the First Church in Boston, MA, wrote an essay titled “The Well-Ordered Family: Or Relative Duties,” to outline the ostensibly God-given duties within the household. He emphasizes not only that “The husband is call’d he Head of the Woman...,” but he also notes the importance of scripture in furthering the men’s role as the superior authority over women in all aspects of life.163 Wadsworth’s characterization of society was based on strictly Puritan notions that minimized the female voice most severely. Moreover, these values were perhaps important to preserve a nativism that was fading due to external multinational and religious influences. He characterizes the relative duties as follows:

Though the Husband is to rule his Family and his Wife, yet the Government of his Wife should not be with rigor, haughtiness, harshness or severity; but with the greatest love, gentleness, kindness, tenderness that may be... Wives ought readily and cheerfully to obey their husbands... Though the Husband and Wife are one flesh, yet the husband is the Head, and the Wife is required to obey him, and that by God's pair Command: She may not usurp authority over the man.164

Thus, he claims that women were indeed inferior to men, and that the female sex should “obey” their husbands. These individuals were living in a world where women were expected to be subservient; thus, there should be no competition for authority. Women were placed in an obedient role, where it should have been rare for women to attempt to “usurp authority” by asserting themselves into an area of discourse which they were

inherently excluded from. Despite his persistent characterization of women as inferior, he does note that women should be given a kind of praise for the work that they do participate in. He writes, “Though the Wife is the meeker vessel, yet honour is to be put upon her in her inferior station.”165 It is ironic that Wadsworth immediately identifies women as the “meeker vessel,” yet he insists that she should still be honored for the duties she fulfills through her “inferior station.” These duties likely included raising the children, completing tasks laid forth by the husband, and upholding a virtuous household.

Historian Laurel Thatcher Ulrich’s Good Wives: Image and Reality in the Lives of Women in Northern New England, 1650-1750 and A Midwife’s Tale: The Life of Martha Ballard, Based on Her Diary, 1785-1812, both help to define and characterize the women’s sphere within colonial New England settlement as independent from and submissive to masculine authority in both public and private life. Women participated only in the private sphere, and Good Wives further emphasizes the roles and complications of compliant wives throughout the mid seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In order to “earn the devotion of her children, the praise of her husband, and the commendation of God,” a wife must master the “ways of her household.”166 Men and women, by believing that the patriarchy was based on the word of God, found themselves in separate spheres with inherently different sociocultural expectations. As Ulrich notes, “Submission to God and submission to one’s husband were part of the same religious duty.”167 This is particularly significant in my

165 Benjamin Wadsworth, “The Well-Ordered Family: Or Relative Duties,” 34.
study of Anne Bradstreet, who is eternally devoted to both God and her husband, and it is unclear with whom she wants to share an eternal unity.

As Ulrich suggests, women were given a difficult role in society which compelled them to constantly subdue their personal beliefs and behaviors to uphold an idealized image of female etiquette and gentility. She writes,

[Women lived in] A hierarchical social structure which made female chastity the property of men, a religious tradition which demanded morality from both sexes, and patterns of feminine behavior rooted in traditional fatalism and in the rhythms of village life—against this backdrop men and women in northern New England played out an old drama of conquest and seduction.168

Colonial men and women were bound to a lifestyle of give and take, a lifestyle which united the word of God with daily obligations. The “morality” was derived from God, whose scripture further solidified this gendered lifestyle. As Wadsworth suggested in 1712, “Social Duties and Comforts, are not hindered but furthered by Christianity.”169 Thus, the awareness and sense of duty that was associated with gender performativity in colonial settlement meant that women were expected to maintain submissive, obedient, and passive lives. These behaviors and duties were all expected of colonial women, who were considered to be a male’s “conquest,” and who lived in a society that was perhaps “seduced” by God’s promise of salvation.

Ulrich’s *A Midwife’s Tale* displays the changing roles of women in eighteenth-century New England; Martha Ballard (1735-1812), her subject, is a midwife who participates in a social realm beyond her traditional duties as housewife, yet she continues to fall short of being considered a member of a public society. Following the Revolution, it appeared that

---

women were able to become progressively more involved in the public sphere; however, women’s involvements continued to be deliberately excluded from the political and social workings of the Early Republic despite advances in education, and female autonomy. In Hallowell, Maine, as Ulrich notes, “The base of that community life was a gender division of labor that gave them responsibility for particular tasks, products, and forms of trade.”

Thus, the woman’s potential to immerse herself in a public setting is undermined by a gendered division of labor, which gave men the ability to assert themselves in a political and social sphere more directly than women, who were left to barter for things such as “cabbages and textiles” with other women.

While women were subject to a continued exclusion from public life, Martha Ballard played an integral role in Hallowell, as her work was oftentimes very personal. Therefore, she needed to maintain a level of confidentiality and trustworthiness throughout her practice. Ballard was responsible for the delivery of children, and she was compensated for her time. This could have been monetary compensation, or it could have involved trading. In her position, she needed to understand the financial situations of each family that she worked for; for the birth of Eliab Shaw’s Daughter, Ballard was paid on October 22, 1792, some four years after the date of delivery. Ballard also participated in the deliveries of some illegitimate children, delivering 20 babies to single women between 1785 and 1812. Out of the 106 first births Ballard delivered between 1785 and 1797, 38% of the children were conceived out of wedlock, 29% were the result of premarital sex, and 8% were

---

recorded as illegitimate.¹７３ Scholarship widely recognizes Ulrich’s findings, which indicate that premarital pregnancy was on the rise throughout the eighteenth century.¹７４ She writes,

Perhaps the Devil had become more attractive—or young people less fearful. More probably, external controls of sexual behavior imposed by church, courts, and parents were breaking down, while the new internalized morality which would become characteristic of the nineteenth century had not yet developed.¹７５

The development of the post-Revolutionary Republic was significant in constructing a cohesive American identity. Throughout the mid to late eighteenth century, as Ulrich notes, “external controls” were breaking down. Following the Great Awakening, the “new internalized morality” placed the onus of worship and personal development on the individual, rather than the community. While the statistics on illegitimate and premarital births indicate that more than a few women were participating in these acts, the Puritan and later Victorian notions of propriety did not exist throughout this area. Ulrich writes, “there is no evidence that in rural communities women who bore children out of wedlock were either ruined or abandoned as early novels would suggest.”¹７６ Although during this time women were considered culpable for their decisions, rather than the men who were tried in Puritan New England during the early eighteenth century, Ballard, among others like Annetje Kool and Abigail Adams, was living during an era of rapid social, political, and ethical development, when no one could determine the limits or expectations of morality.

¹⁷³ Laurel Thatcher Ulrich, A Midwife’s Tale, 152.
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Each of these four women, Anne Bradstreet, Annetje Kool, Abigail Adams, and Hannah Webster Foster, fit into Ulrich’s construct of femininity and female expectations differently; nonetheless, it is notable that each female voice anticipates the next. Anne Bradstreet appeared to be a devout Puritan; however, her willingness to write during an era where “[in her] hand a needle better fits,” is representative of a subversive female voice. Her use of sensual imagery in the seventeenth century to characterize her relationship with God and her husband is uncharacteristic of a “good” Puritan, and, I suggest, anticipates the later voices of Annetje Kool, Abigail Adams, and Hannah Foster. Although Annetje Kool appears to lack a voice within this discussion, I maintain that her role as a young mother with an illegitimate, unnamed child, who only appeared in Church and town records once, is an example of Ulrich’s changing expectations of women in eighteenth-century settlement. Her role as a young woman who was able to subsequently marry and live fully in the wake of her supposed “ruined” adolescence, is significant in the construction of her portrait, which is almost virginal in its depiction. Abigail Adams, as a product of the Enlightenment, may appear to have a more rational, and to an extent more mature relationship with God and with her husband, John; however, she still participates in this passionate language, which candidly and blatantly articulates her desires. Finally, Hannah Foster produces the first seduction novel in 1797, which highlights the radical lifestyle of a “coquette.”

I argue that each of these women, and their subsequent voices, contribute to a larger argument over female roles and sexuality within colonial settlement. Each struggles to establish a cohesive identity, for they lack the resources necessary to do so independently from external forces of church and state. Nonetheless the female needs and desires become more clearly articulated over time, which perhaps speaks to the fact that the era leading up to the Revolution was a period of fragmented identities, both personal and communal. Thus, these women were asserting themselves into an unfamiliar discourse with their own use of language, which was unfamiliar to many.

III. Anne Bradstreet (1612-1672) the Puritan: The Complications of “Being Devout”

Anne Bradstreet (1612-1672) was a devotional author who imbued strong Puritan beliefs into her poetry. While she frequently demonstrated a certain selflessness in her poetry that fostered a strong relationship with God, she also regularly questions and challenges Puritan ideologies through her writing. Bradstreet was a British colonial woman who focused heavily on her relationship with God. Her voice is critical to our understanding of religion and identity due to her affective relationship with God. As scholar Jeannine Hensley claims, Bradstreet’s “purpose in writing exemplifies the Puritan ideals for literature”: to glorify God. While Bradstreet's works describe her affiliation with God, her identity may appear to be wholeheartedly dependent on God. I argue that Bradstreet’s relationship with God is most clearly articulated in her poems regarding death. In death,

---
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her loyalty to God likely becomes blurred by trauma. Thus, Bradstreet perhaps aims to exemplify an “ideal” Puritan, yet falls just short of that exemplary belief due to her personal struggle with God in times of sorrow and grief. Bradstreet’s internal grappling, articulated through her poetry, reveal a complex initiative of simultaneously articulating her resentment toward and endless love of God.

In her poem, “In Memory of my dear grand-child Anne Bradstreet. Who deceased June 20 1669. Being three years and seven Months old,” Bradstreet acts subversive and angry due to the tragic loss of her granddaughter. While she does describe the promise of being united with God in the afterlife, she only offers God a mere couplet at the end of her poem, which perhaps suggests that her loyalty in this moment is disingenuous. Bradstreet, rather, focuses on the emotional trauma associated with death and her foolishness in thinking that she could preserve such a fleeting life. The poem begins, “with troubled heart and trembling hand I write.”181 Unlike her other poems, such as “Here Follow Several Occasional Meditations,” which are so closely linked to the virtues of God and divinity, Bradstreet rather notes “the heavens have changed to sorrow my delight.”182 The heavens and God have caused her pain in the loss of her granddaughter; nonetheless, she is not surprised by this as “experience might ‘fore this have made me wise,/ To value things according to their price.”183 Thus, she chastises herself for believing that she would not be disappointed, as she was too hopeful. She then invokes images of delicate and transitory
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objects, such as a “withering flower,” a “bubble,” “brittle glass,” and “shadow[s]” to emphasize her late granddaughter’s fragility and brief life.\textsuperscript{184}

Like Larzer Ziff, who argued that Bradstreet, as well as many other Puritan writers of the time, invoked certain imagery in her poems that responded to the “natural order,” I contend that Bradstreet, due to her sorrows, is fighting with both the natural order and its relationship to the divine order set forth by God.\textsuperscript{185} She does acknowledge her foolishness in believing that God would protect this sickly child, noting the “impermanen[ce]” of her granddaughter.\textsuperscript{186} She was a fool to think that she could coddle something transient and ephemeral. Here, Bradstreet is struggling with the Puritan imperative of “weaned affections,” in which Puritans should not mistake fantasy for reality.\textsuperscript{187} She sees herself as too emotionally invested in an illusion of her granddaughter, thus making her anything but an exemplary Puritan. As Charlotte Gordon notes in \textit{Mistress Bradstreet: The Untold Life of America’s First Poet}, there was a distinct shift in the tone of Bradstreet’s poetry around 1669, which is when her life became most tragic.\textsuperscript{188} Gordon writes that Bradstreet, “rather than being resigned to losing the child... dreamed of soon rejoining her.”\textsuperscript{189} The heavens have turned on her and have stolen her granddaughter, taking her away to a lone “endless bliss,” where “[the child] ne’er shall come to [Bradstreet].” To Bradstreet, it seems as though God betrayed her, taking away the unfinished life of her young “withering flower” of a granddaughter. As scholar Ellen Brandt argues, “… this colonial woman [Bradstreet]
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barely hides incipient hatred for a sometimes cruel, and explicitly masculine, God.”190 This is evidenced most clearly by the couplet at the end of her poem. Bradstreet only directly references God at the end of her poem, perhaps suggesting her expected loyalty to Him in the face of her frustrations and sorrow. Bradstreet’s pain was truly heart-wrenching, so much so that she began to contemplate her own death as a means of rejoining her deceased grandchildren. She then begins to draft “A Weary Pilgrim” in preparation for her own death.

While Bradstreet does eternally profess loyalty to God throughout the majority of her poetic works, her poems are full of sensual imagery. As a female author, Bradstreet appears to willingly submit to the power of God (and her husband), in order to uphold her role as a Puritan woman in a male-dominated society. I rather claim that she uses poetry to project her female voice to God and to her husband; she takes quaint, domestic, and private scenes, and distributes them to an audience of friends and family. Bradstreet’s “To my dear and Loving Husband” and “... On the Burning Of Our House” both demonstrate a decidedly un-Puritan perspective due to the sensual imagery the poems invoke.

In “To My Dear and Loving Husband,” Bradstreet writes a passionate poem which outlines the limitlessness of her desire, which does not respect the traditionally perceived Puritan values of holiness, humility, and privacy. She claims that husband and wife are united as one, “If ever two were one, then surely we,” which is an unlikely description of the relationship between husband as wife. Husbands were supposed to be the heads of households, while women were supposed to be submissive housewives and mothers. This

rather relates first to a faithful vow, and, secondly, to a sexual unity. As Nasser Al-Beshri argues, Bradstreet “failed to stay self-effacing” in this poem, which was considered the “first deadly sin, pride.”\textsuperscript{191} At the beginning of the poem she perhaps urges her husband to compare her to other women “if [he] can.” Or is it that she urges other women to compare their relationships to that of hers? Bradstreet is both united with God and with her husband, her “love” that “is such that rivers cannot quench,” is undoubtedly powerful, and suggests that her passion for her husband’s affections supersedes the natural order’s “gold,” “riches,” and “rivers.” Thus, this playful and passionate Bradstreet is engaging in a form of sensual discourse that was undoubtedly intended to remain private.

Bradstreet invokes pleasant and passionate imagery to support this affectionate appreciation she has for her husband (and God).\textsuperscript{192} She continues, “Thy love is such I can no way repay,/ the heavens reward thee manifold, I pray.”\textsuperscript{193} Thus, Bradstreet is suggesting that her husband’s love is so passionate and fulfilling that the heavens will reward him. Or, perhaps, is it God’s love that Bradstreet affectionately seeks? She concludes, “Then while we live, in love let’s so persevere/ That when we live no more, we may live ever.”\textsuperscript{194} Here, Bradstreet acknowledges the afterlife, suggesting that she and her husband may as well continue to live passionately during this life, so that when they are dead, they “may life ever” in eternal unity with each other, and with God.

“… On the Burning of Our House,” although about the literal fire that destroyed Bradstreet’s house in 1666, shares the same passionate, vivid imagery that she invokes in
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“To My Dear and Loving Husband.” “...On the Burning of Our House” is more closely related to the passion Bradstreet feels towards God exclusively. In the midst of a very destructive fire, in which the majority of Bradstreet’s belongings were destroyed, she turns to God for an intimate moment. She writes, “That fearful sound of ‘fire’ and ‘fire,’/ Let no man know is my Desire.”\(^{195}\) Rather than being fearful, Bradstreet desires these “piteous shrieks of dreadful voice” in the “silent night,” welcoming this spiritual awakening; however, she sacrifices her house. As Ellen Brandt suggests, “The fire is described as a sort of personal, albeit spiritual, rapine, in which devastation and a perverse pleasure are unmistakably intertwined.”\(^{196}\) I agree that she endures these “piteous shrieks” in hopes of seeing and engaging with the glory of God in the afterlife; however, she must sacrifice material goods for God.

God allows everything to be taken from Bradstreet in the fire; however, she still longs to have these material possessions. She faces material devastation, in that her “pleasant things in ashes lie/ And them behold no more shall I.” Bradstreet is angry, and addresses God in a decidedly un-Puritan way. While she may write that Heaven is “purchased and paid for too/ By Him who hath enough to do,” her bitter tone denounces God for the destruction of her house. She admits that she “could no longer look” at her house while it burned; she merely “blest His name that gave and took,/That laid my goods now in the dust.” She blesses God in this poem for she has nothing left in the material world. She concludes, “The world no longer let me love,/ My hope and treasure lies above.”

Thus, the natural world is deprived of material goods, so Bradstreet resorts to a devout

---
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language in which she claims her “hope,” i.e. her eternal unity with God, and her “treasure,” i.e. her passionate devotion, indeed lie “above” in heaven, when in reality, both her metaphorical and literal treasures have been burned.

Although frequently perceived as a conservative and devout Puritan, some of Bradstreet’s personal convictions were extremely subversive. Her works, I feel, anticipate later American women such as Annetje Kool. Although Bradstreet frequently emphasizes the Puritans’ beliefs in piety, modesty, and devout worship, she perhaps participated in these practices despite her personal convictions, sorrows, or questions. Although she notes that there is no physical action that one can take to be regarded more highly by God, she emphasizes the “spiritual advantage” gained by devotion. The irony is that the “spiritual advantage” had to compensate for several bad things God sent Bradstreet’s way. For example, Bradstreet endured the painful deaths of several of her grandchildren, and a rampant fire destroyed her family’s house. Also, her husband was often gone for long periods of time, so she was frequently left alone to take care of things.

Anne Bradstreet’s devotion is representative of a time in colonial history that used God as a means of justifying actions. Bradstreet’s keen sense of divine retribution and salvation, both in reflection and in lifestyle, could make her an exemplary Puritan. Her poetry, however, suggests a Puritan who was conflicted between societal obligation and personal desire. She wants to be one with God and with her husband simultaneously, yet she cannot publically pursue these things due to society’s imposed boundaries. Her works violate a moral code that sought to confine both public and private thought, yet they were published during her lifetime by her brother-in-law, Rev. John Woodbridge. Her poems
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were less subversive in the 1650 publication of *The Tenth Muse* than in her later works. As a colonial female author, Bradstreet is likely the most subversive of the female voices, for she was producing radical private musings that were, indeed, transgressive. It was not until the Enlightenment of the 1730s that women were exposed to a new mode of thought and the American Revolution when they briefly voiced their thoughts in the public sphere.

IV. The Rational Abigail Adams (1744-1818):
A Product of the Great Awakening

While Bradstreet emerges as an author who challenges the colonial period’s deep confidence in the strength and nature of God, Abigail Adams lives during an enlightened period that developed during the American Revolution. Although private, her correspondence provides key insight into the mind of a woman who was deeply involved, by marriage, in the political workings and ethical struggles of the Revolutionary era.

As a voice of reason, Abigail Adams rationalized religion on a personal level. By focusing on how individuals think (rather than how individuals feel), Adams was one of the few people, before Enlightenment writers like Thomas Paine, who questioned the prominence of religion in daily practices.\(^{198}\) I claim that Abigail Adams’ struggle with religion is representative of a woman who recognizes the importance of God in her own life, but who values an “old light” rationality that rejects the dramatization of religion.

While traveling in the state of New York, Adams wrote on July 4, 1790, “… the oratory of a Clergyman here consists in foaming loud speaking Working themselves up in such an enthusiasm as to cry, but which has no other effect upon me than to raise my pity.”\(^{199}\) Her

---


distaste for Calvinism overall speaks not only to her rationality, but also to her English identity. She longs for the “Candour and liberal good sense,” the “devotion without grimace,” and for a “Religion upon a Rational system.” The Dutch Reformed Church of New Netherland emphasized communal worship as a means of becoming closer to God. Adams, rather, consulted God as a voice of reason. She sought a scripture stripped of its evangelistic origins, in some ways, which is perhaps why she disapproved of the new congregations, including the reformed, that emerged from the “new light” religious beliefs about God and Man, as well as their style of worship of “foaming loud speaking.”

Moreover, as an “old light,” Adams was concerned with the evolving, heavily evangelical adaptations of scripture as a means of changing the facts set forth by scripture. She wrote to John Quincy Adams on October 15, 1780, “However the Belief of a particular Providence may be exploded by the Modern Wits, and the Infidelity of too many of the rising generation deride the Idea, yet the virtuous Mind will look up and acknowledge the great first cause, without whose notice not even a sparrow falls to the ground.” Adams keenly drew upon the Enlightenment ideologies and secularism that began to infiltrate American thought. Questions of religion, politics, and gender began to emerge as prominent shifts in ideology and the perception of self. The “modern wits,” or the New Lights, according to Adams, ruined the original “Belief of a particular Providence.” They influenced the “infidelity” of the rising generation, who were so emotionally invested in religion that they overlooked the initial, factual “belief.” Adams quickly noted, “without whose notice not

even a sparrow falls to the ground,” thus emphasizing the applicability of religion to daily practices, even to that of a sparrow. She suggests that the more the “modern wits” continue to interpret and modify scripture, the more removed they become from the intended meaning of the verse.

Raised in the aftermath of the Great Awakening, Adams struggled with religion due to her unwavering rationality which stemmed from her exposure to “old light” ideology. Adams’ father, Rev. William Smith (1706-1783) was a minister in Massachusetts; Smith’s family was negatively affected by the subsequent religious revivals of the mid-eighteenth century. Thus, Adams, likely influenced by her father, adhered to a traditional form of religious worship that focused on rationality rather than passion. Nonetheless, in a letter written to her daughter on March 10, 1794, Abigail expressed a maternal empathy, which humanizes her otherwise overt rationality. She wrote, “True, genuine religion is calm in its inquiries, deliberate in its resolves, and steady in its conduct; is open to light and conviction and labors for improvement... and, as the Scripture expresses it, ‘is peaceable, gentle, easy to be entreated.’”

She used scripture directly to define “true, genuine religion,” rather than enhancing scripture with her own emotions. Adams attempted to express the malleability of religion and its natural need for growth and improvement through this passage. Without such improvement, religion would become stagnant. Moreover, she interpreted religion as a dogma that is “easy to be entreated.” While religion was becoming personal, emotive, and intangible, Adams applied her logic to a system of belief, which made the voice and reason of God seem less distant.

---

While Adams did not share an emotional attachment to and close relation with God, her relationship with John Adams reveals that her passion could neither be contained nor adequately communicated through her letters. This further humanizes Adams as a lonely wife who longs for the companionship of her traveling husband, similar to Bradstreet. Adams who took care of the family farm in Braintree, MA, while her husband pursued his political aspirations. Nonetheless, her language was extremely progressive in this portrayal of their relationship. In this letter, Adams operated in a new mode of discourse; rather than the rational political discussions that she and John frequently engaged in, Abigail Adams framed her letter intimately. Adams depicts her relationship with John in a similar way to that of Bradstreet, who was writing about a century earlier. Abigail wrote to John on December 23, 1782:

My dearest Friend... should I draw you the picture of my Heart, it would be what I hope you still would Love; tho it containd nothing New; the early possession you obtained there; and the absolute power you have ever maintained over it; leaves not the smallest space unoccupied. I look back to the early days of our acquaintance and Friendship, as to the day of Love and Innocence; and with an indescribable pleasure I have seen near a score of years roll over our Heads, with an affection heightned and improved by time. Nor have the dreary years of absence in the smallest degree Effaced from my mind the image of the dear untitled man to whom I gave my Heart.205

She initially addresses him as her “dearest friend,” which was a customary way for husband and wife to greet each other; however, she then describes her heart as being both “possessed” and “obtained” by John some years ago. Nonetheless, her heart “containd nothing New,” due to the “absolute power” that her husband has over her heart. His possession is so strong that it “leaves not the smallest space unoccupied” by him. Thus, his

---

hold over his wife's heart is all-encompassing, and apparently leaves her no space for her own feeling. Reflecting on their earliest relations, she digresses that her “indescribable pleasure” and “affection” has only been “heightened and improved by time.” Thus, her passion for John’s company has grown and matured significantly over the years to the point that her desire, to an extent, possesses her. She is caught in the “dreary years of absence,” in that she is constantly yearning for John to return home to her. Nonetheless, she does acknowledge her memory of “the image of he dear untitled man to whom [she] gave [her] Heart” in fond anticipation of his return. However, it appears that the “untitled man” has changed over time. When she first met John, he lacked a formal occupation or rank; his current, and supposed “titled” situation, suggests a restless distance between the two lovers. Adams nostalgically longs for the “untitled man” who was more present in her daily life.

Their continuous letter writing was a vehicle through which Adams was able to assert herself into an inherently male discourse—discussing politics, religion, governance and the like in a private setting. Similar to Anne Bradstreet, who expressed her passions through poetry, Abigail Adams functions within a private mode of discourse with her husband, John, where she passionately articulates her desires both as a wife and as an intellectual. As scholar Rosemary Keller notes in *Patriotism and the Female Sex: Abigail Adams and the American Revolution*, Adams “…seldom failed to speak her mind on matters of compelling importance. In the process, Abigail often exhibited a penetration and vision in her thinking that set her apart even from the enlightened of her day.”

---

Keller’s argument, I contend that Adams’ role as a visionary was crucial in creating female space in a male-dominated world. Like Bradstreet, Adams was able to “penetrate” the male discourse through her use of the pen; however, her letters were not published until 1876, some 58 years after her death. Still, her letters helped to influence her husband in the political sphere during her lifetime, and she also published a few letters in the newspaper anonymously.

Both Anne Bradstreet and Abigail Adams write regarding similar concerns about the delicate balance between personal belief and unrealized passion. Abigail Adams was able to justify the seemingly distant words of God; however, she was unable to rationalize her own passions for her husband. Although private, her letters frequently engage in a more public discourse; her discussion of politics in particular speaks to the post-revolutionary period, during which women were becoming more educated and autonomous. Adams’ mode of discourse would have been more socially acceptable for the time period, unlike that of Bradstreet, who likely would have been outcast from society. Throughout the post-revolutionary era, female autonomy and freedom to explore within the public (formerly male) sphere was considered more acceptable. Adams thus demands rational intellectual companionship as well as physical companionship. While Adams begins to touch upon her personal desires for John’s company, Hannah Webster Foster more strongly articulates the moral hypocrisies of the burgeoning nation through The Coquette (1797), which simultaneously encourages this female self-expression and discovery, and denounces it by imposing old-fashioned boundaries of social acceptability and propriety.

---

V: The Progressive Hannah Webster Foster (1750-1840)
and the Emergence of the Romance Novel

The development of the American sentimental novel throughout the eighteenth century, I argue, provides the most crucial stepping stone for the development of the female voice. Specifically, the work of Hannah Webster Foster, who wrote The Coquette: The History of Eliza Wharton, addresses women’s needs and represents the female sphere within an otherwise male-centered society. The rebellious character of Eliza, who is imbued with all sorts of sexualized images and situations, is forced to address the relationship between herself and the greater community. The Coquette depicts the life of Eliza Wharton, a social butterfly who befriends Major Sanford, a flirtatious young bachelor who seduces Wharton following his marriage to another woman. Thus, Wharton has an affair with a married man. The character of Wharton is based on Elizabeth Whitman (1752-1788), who had an illegitimate pregnancy and died. Although Wharton’s ultimate downfall does reflect the unrestrained and ever-so-passionate sexualized female, the ability for Foster to write such a popular novel during a post-war period when national identity and gendered roles were still in transition provides a meaningful lens into the female circumstances of the early nineteenth century.\(^{208}\) Ian Finseth claims, “Foster implicitly indicts the gender ideology of a nation whose women could play no sanctioned public role beyond that of the available maiden and faced dispiriting, unfulfilling lives in marriages which effectively obliterated their legal identities.”\(^{209}\)

\(^{208}\) NB: While Hannah Webster Foster’s novel may have deliberately been written for the public eye, it was published anonymously in 1797.

Not only is Foster’s text fairly defiant, but it also suggests an inherently unoptimistic future for the Republic, which was supposed to have a more established set of moral boundaries than before the Revolution. I claim that although Foster’s depiction of females in the public sphere may truthfully be bleak, the mere fact that these passionate impulses are being produced and read is revolutionary in principle, following the voices of Bradstreet and Adams alike. While Bradstreet was functioning within a very private sphere of female discourse, in which she shared her poetry with only friends and family, Adams was also able to function in a private sphere, but her ideas frequently transcended into the public sphere due to her husband’s involvement in the political realm. Foster writes of the dangers of female involvement in the public sphere; *The Coquette* is as much a cautionary tale as it is a novel on female ideas and feelings. Foster challenges societal norms by defying the gendered society through the display of female independence, rebellion, and sexual desire in a published narrative; nonetheless, *The Coquette* is a cautionary tale which continues to impose an arbitrary moral code upon women late in the eighteenth century.

Rather than conforming to a sociocultural normality of mourning, which one would presume involves chastity and solace, the fictional Wharton rather chooses to “soar above” societal expectations, and is eager to return to her sociable and active lifestyle. While Eliza is grieving the loss of her fiancé; she appears unleashed from the shackles of betrothal, rather than saddened by the loss of Mr. Haly, her husband-to-be. The initial depiction of Eliza Wharton is crucial in identifying her non-conformist attitude from the onset of the epistolary novel, as she is the one to characterize her sentiment as “pleasur[able]” rather
than that of “melancholy.”210 Although surrounded by wealthy, married friends, Wharton is happily enveloped in a form of self-love that is non-conformist from the outset. She writes, “I have been, for a month or two [as a widow], excluded from the gay world; and, indeed, fancied myself soaring above it. It is now that I begin to descend, and find my natural propensity for mixing in the busy scenes and active pleasures of life returning.”211 In response to Lucy Freeman’s supposed “moral lecture,” in which Lucy criticizes Wharton for acting “coquettish,” Wharton experiences some sort of pleasurable re-birth. Following her failed betrothal, she seeks to re-immerses herself in a socially active lifestyle that is full of “busy scenes,” and suggests that her urge to mingle is merely a “natural propensity.” This “natural propensity” was overshadowed by an obligation to mourn for “a month or two,” in which Wharton was supposedly “excluded from the gay world.” She even later dismisses mourning, characterizing it as an “absurdity of a custom.”212

Wharton’s dismissal of marriage is uncharacteristic of the times; women depended on their husbands for an identity, a legal presence, and for financial status. Thus, Wharton’s offhand dismissal of marriage’s significance is, perhaps, a critique of the sociopolitical norms of the Republic, which confine women to lives of subjection. Moreover, the novel criticizes Eliza, who navigates beyond the moral expectations of the burgeoning nation-to-be. Wharton quickly dismisses all notions of propriety in favor of regaining her social independence, and she fails. Nonetheless, she continuously disregards the cautions of both her mother and Freeman. She writes that her friendly nature, “which [Freeman] term[ed]

---

coquettish,” should be regarded with a “softer appellation,” as they are coming from an “innocent heart, and are the effusions of a youthful, and cheerful mind.”\textsuperscript{213} Wharton dismisses others, which further stimulates her independent, active, and self-proclaimed “cheerful mind,” but there is danger in portraying herself this way.

Wharton’s use of language, tone, and wit is extremely rebellious in its challenge of sexuality, morality, and ethics. She is willingly subversive, eagerly questioning authority due to the quickness of her wit and her pen. The pace of her text is quick, light, and without conviction. In a letter to Lucy, she writes of the competition between suitors. She digresses:

The watchful eye of Major Sanford traced every word and action, respecting Mr. Boyer, with an attention, which seemed to border on anxiety. That, however, did not restrain, but rather accelerate my vivacity and inquisitiveness on the subject; for I wished to know whether it would produce any real effect upon him, or not.\textsuperscript{214}

Wharton feeds off of a competitive energy that puts her at the center of attention; she is stimulated by the thought of being wanted, as this encounter did “accelerate [her] vivacity and inquisitiveness,” which is how coquettes are traditionally defined. Nonetheless, her inherent need for independence, or self-decreed independence, fosters this coquettish behavior, in which she lures men in with her language and tone. She continues, “At present, I shall not confine myself in any way.”\textsuperscript{215} She fears the confinement of marriage; thus she continues to tease both men in an effort to remain the object of their desires. She wants to be wanted, and, through these letters, she exemplifies an adolescent understanding of nuptials, which Freeman ruthlessly criticizes. Foster subversively suggests that women

\textsuperscript{213} Hannah Webster Foster, \textit{The Coquette}, 7.
\textsuperscript{214} Hannah Webster Foster, \textit{The Coquette}, 48-49.
\textsuperscript{215} Hannah Webster Foster, \textit{The Coquette}, 51.
should have the right to choose autonomy; she does this by highlighting the mishandled social relations between men and women in the eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{216}

Eliza Wharton demands sexuality, and sociality throughout \textit{The Coquette}. The novel, while simultaneously recognizing the newfound female autonomy, is also a cautionary tale, which imposes a moral code of social acceptability onto the post-revolutionary female. Wharton falls victim to this system. With the disproportionate amount of young people under twenty-five living in the post-Revolutionary Republic, authors were trying to direct young ladies. While women were able to play a more active role in partner selection, these moral tales sought to guide young people to marry others who were considered appropriate.\textsuperscript{217} Thus, \textit{The Coquette} recognizes the emergence of a new generation of women, like Eliza, who wanted to date, and explore their options before marriage.

While the novel does recognize that pre-marital intercourse was a reality, the book still seeks to impose socially acceptable boundaries, most specifically upon the female sex. We, as readers, witness Major Sanford’s willingness to use and abuse Wharton. Furthermore, as bystanders, readers are forced to engage with Wharton’s downfall as the product of her coquettish behavior. Her desire for sociality is perceived as a sexual innuendo; this ultimately contributes to her death in childbirth. In a final letter to her mother, Eliza writes:

Yes, madam, your Eliza has fallen; fallen, indeed! She has become the victim of her own indiscretion, and of the intrigue and artifice of a designing libertine, who is the husband of another! She is polluted... Farewell, my dear mamma! Pity and pray for your ruined child; and be assured, that affection and


\textsuperscript{217} Carla Mulford, Introduction to \textit{The Power of Sympathy and The Coquette}, x.
gratitude will be the last sentiments, which expire in the breast of your repenting daughter.\textsuperscript{218}

While education, public involvement, and greater sexual freedoms may have satisfied women's desires, or intrigues, in this period, the latter comes at a higher cost for Eliza Wharton. Eliza's willingness to engage socially with several suitors, rather, was reflected in "her own indiscretion," where she became pregnant with "the husband of another['s]" child. This, in turn, makes Eliza "polluted," "ruined," and, indeed "fallen" from society. Eliza dies in childbirth, and is buried by strangers. Eliza's involvement in the public sphere, i.e. exploring her options with several suitors, being sociable, etc., ultimately causes her death. Scholar Cathy N. Davis notes, "...a learned and accomplished woman [was] translated into a poor, pathetic victim of victim whose dishonor and death could be partly redeemed only be serving to save others from a similar end."\textsuperscript{219} Eliza Wharton (and Elizabeth Whitman, on whom Eliza is based) was thirty seven years old when she died of puerperal fever. She is not like the young, often teenaged, women seduced in other novels. Foster deliberately highlights the complexities of male and female social relationships during a time of radical social and gender transformation. Readers sympathize with Eliza because she falls victim to an overpowering male, Major Sanford, who takes advantage of her. The Coquette thus seeks to highlight the sociocultural issues surrounding female autonomy. Eliza falls victim to this re-invented patriarchy that includes females. She becomes an outcast from society, dying only in the company of strangers.

\textsuperscript{218} Hannah Webster Foster, The Coquette, 153-155.
As *The Coquette* was the one of the first seduction novels made widely accessible to the public, the story focuses on the victimization of Eliza Wharton as a cautionary example of female fragility. While women were allowed to have a more independent and involved role in the public sphere, this new form of public engagement could serve as a source of trouble—even death. The beginnings of early American literature all have moral overtones, seeking to present a code of socially acceptable conduct to its readers. In *The Power of Sympathy* (1789), by William Hill Brown (1765-1793), the author is quick to note that “Seduction is a crime... that nothing can be said to palliate or excuse.”

Thus, these women who fell prey to their own intrigues, like Eliza Wharton, could neither conceal their crime, nor repent their sins and be saved. The tones and forms of these novels are extremely suggestive in constructing a New Republic that was seemingly based on inclusion of both sexes; however, it had specific requirements for the conduct of the new nation, which included the same female delicacy and submissive nature that had existed in the colonial era. While Foster’s voice does enter the public sphere in writing a published novel, she also cautions women about doing so if that means letting go of a traditional view of female sexuality. Moreover, she brings attention to the arbitrary nature of social relationships between males and females, in which the female will always be inferior.

VI. Conclusion: Supplementing the Voice of Annetje Kool (1713-1789)

As Abigail Adams and Hannah Webster Foster began writing at the end of the eighteenth century, women were participating in a new form of female autonomy that allowed young women to explore several suitors before committing to a spouse through
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marriage. Pre-marital sex was not uncommon to the social construct of the New Republic. Nonetheless, this new autonomy caused women to face a double standard, in which they were encouraged to explore their options before marrying, but they were also expected to marry someone who was appropriate.

Annetje Kool (1713-1789) acts as a transitional figure between Anne Bradstreet, who is simultaneously devout and subversive, and Adams and Foster. Foster, in particular, most explicitly addresses the hypocrisies of prevailing social views about female sexuality in *The Coquette*. Kool was living in a transitory period, in which the role of government was becoming progressively less prevalent in the household. As Sandra F. VanBurkelo notes in her chapter “The Way of Obedience,” in which she discusses the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries:

> Fewer and fewer Americans characterized “private” sexual offenses like infanticide or bastardy as threats to the stability of the polity; as family government came to be viewed as qualitatively different from the state and sufficient to its appointed tasks, the old assumption of a public stake in the morality or regularity of home life seemed far less obvious.  

While VanBurkelo addresses the Early Republic in her chapter, it is significant to note that the changing perceptions about female sexuality emerged not only in the late eighteenth century (as in post-Revolutionary), but throughout the eighteenth century. As Thomas J. Joudrey notes, “at least some women of the mid- to late eighteenth century defied legal prohibitions, stared down projections of social stigma, and wrested new freedoms from the complex conventions defining marriage.”  

Furthermore, gender roles within New

---


Netherland began to shift rapidly following the British seizure in 1664. Thus, while Annetje was living in a pre-revolutionary settlement, as the mother of an illegitimate child, she likely did not face any severe backlash; rather, she is positively portrayed. The “old assumption of a public stake in morality or regularity of home” was a concept of the past—grounded in the age of Anne Bradstreet. Kool, as the mother of an illegitimate child in 1734, anticipates the post-revolutionary moment when women were given more freedom to explore. She looks beyond the old-fashioned threats of instability that pre-marital sex could affect the sociocultural construct of the community. However, by the end of the eighteenth century, Americans began to shift these ideas once again because they believed that private sexual offenses could in fact threaten the very fragile stability of the New Republic. There was a push to encourage young people to marry “appropriate” partners in order to add to the efficacy of the new nation.

The anticipated separation of government and family is what contributes to Annetje’s story. She has an illegitimate child who was baptized on September 16, 1734. The Kingston Dutch Reformed Church records that I examined state that the name of the child was torn from the public record. While the father was unnamed, and there were no witnesses to this baptism, the Church record does leave clues. It reads: “father not named- name torn out – illegitimate- no witnesses named.” While I can merely speculate on her role as a mother, it is possible that the child died, that the child grew up in another
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household, etc. Fortunately, Annetje was able to marry some six years later. On November 8, 1740, Annetje Kool married Matthew Newkirk (1717-1789). Together, they had three children—Gerret Newkirk (1741-1816), Jacobus Newkirk (1758-D.O.D. unknown), and Margaret Newkirk (1745-1808). While Annetje Kool is not named in Matthew Newkirk’s will—dated June 1, 1789—it appears as though their family was very wealthy. Newkirk wills their children eight slaves, and the document pledges to bequeath nearly £700 to his children and grandchildren.

While Annetje could have served a similar example as an Eliza, with a supposed coquettish behavior, I rather, assert that Annetje Kool was simply a victim of the mid-eighteenth century’s religious and moral hypocrisies. Rather than being deliberately subversive, like Anne Bradstreet in her poetic musings, or Hannah Webster Foster, in her portrayal of the post-revolutionary double standard concerning female sexuality, Annetje likely shared in the same naïve “indiscretion” that Eliza did. While Annetje predates Eliza, she is still positively portrayed. Nonetheless, the moral code that the older generations were continuing to place upon the younger generation in the New Republic, which was amidst a significant social transformation, likely fell on deaf ears.

---

226 NB: This contributes to a later discussion regarding Pieter Vanderlyn’s portrayal of Annetje Kool. Reference my Conclusion for further information. Furthermore, Annetje Kool likely was not listed in Matthew Newkirk’s will because a) she died, or b) she merely made suggestions for the dispensation of land to offspring, as marriages became progressively more child-centered as the eighteenth century progressed, or c) the “old fashioned” and Dutch way of regarding marriage as a “community of goods,” in which her legal identity would have been protected under an usus (or legal document)—thus making her involvement in Matthew’s affairs and property unlikely. Carol Berkin, First Generations: Women in Colonial America (New York: Hill and Wang, 1996), 83-87.

In conclusion, Annetje Kool, although silent, acts as a transitional figure who anticipates the later developments in female sexuality and identity. This is most significant, as Kool was a product of a settlement in transition. Kingston, New York was a multinational community that was struggling to both adhere to the conventional Dutchness that the European mother church instilled in its worshipers, and to modify these principles to create a new settlement that could function as a cohesive social unit. Kool, much like Pieter Vanderlyn, neither fully adheres to nor revolts against the moral boundaries expected of New Netherland. She, rather, is a symbol of impending modernity.
CONCLUSION:
Whispers Within the Portrait:
The Significance of Published Voice within a Burgeoning Nation

I. The Importance of Voice

The main subjects of this study, Pieter Vanderlyn, the attributed artist of “A Portrait of Annetje Kool” (c.1740), and Annetje Kool, the sitter, both had subversive identities relative to the sociocultural expectations of New Netherland, a Hudson River Valley based settlement. My analysis of several female authors within their respective historical and cultural contexts sought to highlight female voices relative to each other and to male discourse. This includes the female voice’s transition from a private mode of discourse to a form of public commentary. What is most ironic about my analysis of gender within public and private spheres is that the female voice was simultaneously saved and suppressed by men.

Both Anne Bradstreet (1612-1672) and Abigail Adams (1744-1818) were private authors. It is unlikely that either of them had the intention of being published. Bradstreet’s intended audience would likely been her close family and friends. At some point before 1650, Anne Bradstreet shared her poetry with her brother-in-law, Rev. John Woodridge, who arranged for The Tenth Muse, a compilation of her earlier and less transgressive works, to be published. Bradstreet imbued strong anti-Puritan beliefs into her later (post-1650) poetry of mourning, such as “In Memory of My Dear Grandchild Anne Bradstreet Who Deceased June, 20, 1669, Being Three Years and Seven Months Old.” Moreover, she included very sexualized imagery in her devotional poetry, like that of “To My Dear and Loving Husband,” and “… On The Burning Of Our House.” Thus, regardless of whether Bradstreet included strong Puritan or anti-Puritan imagery into her poetry and prose, she
wrote from a decidedly un-Puritan perspective, in which she frequently denounced God. While Abigail Adams’ correspondence with John occurs within a private sphere, she engages with a more public form of discourse in her discussions of politics and personal belief. She also published several pieces anonymously or under a pseudonym.\(^{228}\)

Throughout these letters, she, like Bradstreet, articulates her passion for her husband, divulges her political beliefs, and advocates for greater female autonomy.

Despite the growing female autonomy in the post-Revolutionary Republic, male involvement was still required in conveying these female voices to the public sphere. In 1650, Rev. John Woodbridge, Bradstreet’s brother-in-law, published *The Tenth Muse*, a collection of her early poetic works. It was not until 1678, some four years before her death, that other male family members, including Woodbridge, published compilations of her works in both Britain and America. Thus, the majority of her transgressive voice was published closed to her death (she was a very sickly person) and under the influence and censorship of men.

Like Bradstreet, Adams’ letters were published in 1848, some thirty years after her death, by her grandson, Charles Francis Adams. It is suggestive that her grandson published her works, rather than her children. What caused this delay? Hypothetically, Abigail Adams remained unpublished for so many years because she simply lacked a strong enough legacy until John’s presidency from 1797 to 1801. Furthermore, while many of her letters have been compiled and published, it is entirely possible that some remain unfound, or that some were deemed too radical or suggestive for publication. Nonetheless, Adams did publish an essay in 1781 which addressed the female circumstance as reflected in a

publication by the former Earl of Chesterfield, Philip Dormer Stanhope. Chesterfield’s letters to his illegitimate son condoned female marginalization, and Adams publically addressed what she classified as an “abuse upon our [the female] sex” anonymously.

While Adams published some of her beliefs about female and male social spheres, Hannah Webster Foster’s (1750-1840) *The Coquette* was published anonymously in 1797. Foster’s epistolary novel likely began as private musings, as the novel provides a glaring critique of the moral hypocrisies of female sexuality in the new nation. The novel was not attributed to Foster until 1856, some fifty-nine years after its initial publication, and some sixteen years after Foster’s death. Foster likely maintained her anonymity due to the subversive plot, which can both act as a cautionary tale and a moral critique on female sexuality. Jared Gardner also suggests in his book, *The Rise and Fall of Early Magazine Culture*, that authors like Foster maintained anonymity to provide a broader social critique, rather than a personal analysis of a society’s moral boundaries.

Thus, it is essential to understand that many factors contributed to the emergence of the female voice from the private sphere to the public sphere. This included the limits of class or prominence, education, and the ways in which women chose to leave records, if at all. Each woman studied remained unpublished (with the possible exception of Anne Bradstreet and Abigail Adams) until after their death. This is significant because some men likely did not know of their female counterparts’ private musings; they, rather, could have truly believed that females lived in silence.

---

II. Annetje Kool: The Product of a Male Paintbrush

This examination of sociocultural expectations, transgressive voices, and voices unheard is significant in offering and understanding the identities of Pieter Vanderlyn and Annetje Kool. The convictions of both artist and muse ultimately unite in a portrait of a transgressive female that has survived 275 years. Moreover, my thesis offers the portrait an identity that it has otherwise lacked. It highlights the complexity of Annetje Kool and Pieter Vanderlyn as transitional figures within a burgeoning nation-to-be.

While neither Vanderlyn nor Kool fully adhered to or deviated from the expectations of New Netherland during the eighteenth-century, it is significant that Kool is being articulated through Vanderlyn’s paintbrush. The portrait in itself is uncanny—it is the product of both familiar and unfamiliar elements. It has customary features of European portraiture, such as the landscape background, and the heavy maroon drapes. These elements are placed in conjunction with more unfamiliar, or perhaps uncharted, elements of early American Folk Art, such as the ornate materiality of the snuff box and jewels, and the intentionally rouged cheeks. Vanderlyn’s depiction of Kool brings us back to the question of how colonial, revolutionary, and post-revolutionary females articulated themselves through private musings. Anne Bradstreet had her brother-in-law, Abigail Adams had her grandson, and Foster likely had an agent of some sorts. What exactly does this portrait reveal about Kool’s private dimension?

While I can merely be speculative, I maintain that the convictions of both painter and muse are articulated in the portrait. Vanderlyn was a free-thinking artist, who used art as a mode of social commentary. His depiction of Kool as a delicate and ornate subject is undoubtedly transgressive—Kool was the product of the times. She, in essence, was likely
the coquettish figure that Foster warned her readers of in the late eighteenth century. However, she did not appear to suffer the same kinds of consequences that Foster warned about. This did not affect Vanderlyn's portrayal of Kool as a delicate and unblemished beauty, clad in the finest of textiles and jewels.

Moreover, the portrait remained an unrecognized heirloom for over a quarter of a millennium. While the painting indeed is a male portrayal of a female subject, its contributions in capturing the female circumstance of the eighteenth century cannot go unnoticed. While the portrait did not receive the acclaim of public auction until 2010, some 270 years after its production, it did remain the focal point of a household. Not only was Kool portrayed positively through Vanderlyn's intricate hand in 1740, but she also remained prominently displayed for several generations. Thus, Kool, as the product of the eighteenth century's arbitrary modes of propriety and social acceptability, remained above a mantle for 270 years before moving before a greater audience. Today, she is valued as an internationally acclaimed piece of folk art.

In this portrait, the transgressive voices of Kool and Vanderlyn unite. Kool was situated within a complex matrix of masculine and feminine roles, in which females were expected to uphold passé notions of propriety during a time of radical social transition. She lived in a British colonial settlement, which likely had different moral code than the former Dutch colonial settlement. Functioning under a new set of beliefs, women such as Kool and Wharton were faced with a dichotomy, in which autonomy was both promoted and cautioned against. Thus, Kool’s emergence as a married, wealthy woman following the birth of her illegitimate child is significant in portraying the changing modes of social acceptability during the eighteenth century. There is value to both Vanderlyn and Kool’s
transgression. While Vanderlyn used art as a medium through which to propel social change, Kool was a product of this social development. Some may deem her a victim of the hypocrisy, but Vanderlyn’s depiction of Kool suggests that she is a model for impending modernity. She successfully navigated the moral boundaries of acceptability.

While Kool’s voice has been “silenced” due to the lack of her extant writing, her role as the subject of Vanderlyn’s hand is as powerful and important as the (now published) voices of other seventeenth and eighteenth century female authors. The male and female voices of the Dutch and British colonial periods, and the Early Republic are invaluable in their contributions to the norms, mores, and ethos of a burgeoning nation.
ADDITIONAL MATERIALS I:
Annetje Kool’s Contemporary History

“Portrait of Annetje Kool” (c. 1740) by Pieter Vanderlyn
(L) “Young Lady with a Fan” (c. 1737)
(R) “Portrait of Annetje Kool” (c. 1740)
Photos depicting the portrait prominently placed in the client’s family homes over the years.
From: auctioninc@aol.com [mailto:auctioninc@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2009 7:55 PM
To: Leigh
Subject: Re: Portrait

Dear Mark,

Once again, thank you for soliciting my advice regarding the wonderful circa 1743 Kingston County portrait of Anna Brodhead Oliver (m. Andrew Oliver Dec 3, 1739) attributed to the Gansevoort Limner. When you call me, it is usually because you have discovered a real gem. This portrait is no exception.

As compared to the roughly eleven other known examples attributed to the same artist, this painting, in my opinion, ranks in the top three. Considering its importance and knowing what lesser portraits by the same artist have sold at recent auction, I feel confident that its value would be in the range of $150,000.00 to $300,000.00.

My assessment is broad based. As you know well, I need to examine the work in person before I can be more specific to determine the true condition of the painting.

Also discussed was the mold issue appearing on the surface of the painting. This has accumulated since the circa 1969 black and white photo that was last taken. These spores should be removed before they cause the paint to exfoliate—which would be tragic.

Please let me know if I can be of further help. I look forward to hearing from you.

All the Best,
Leigh

P.S.: I checked with my insurance company, and just to confirm, if you remove the painting from your client’s home for me to examine, it would be insured immediately. Also, we can provide a facsimile of the painting, as well as a facsimile frame.

November 19, 2009

Dear [Redacted],

This letter serves to confirm our conversation of November 18, 2009 regarding the 18th century American framed oil on canvas of Anna Brodhead Oliver (circa 1740) by the Gansevoort Limner (refer Antiques Magazine, 1966).

It is understood that I will remove said painting from the residence to be viewed and assessed by Mr. Leigh Keno, 127 East 69th Street, New York, New York 10021, a recognized expert of American decorative arts, specifically early American portraiture. When the item is ultimately removed from your home, it is insured immediately by Mr. Keno’s insurance floater upon your consent signature on this document. I will be the acting agent on his behalf.

After Mr. Keno’s assessment, he will propose an opinion as to how best handle the possible de-accession of the portrait.

There will be no fee assigned to this initial process of evaluation. Any further potential negotiations will be discussed between the three parties with your obvious best financial interests at heart.

Regards,

Mark Hollander (Agent)

Owner

Nov. 19, 2009

November 19, 2009
Picked up: November 19, 2009
Seller: [redacted]
Seller Number: [redacted]
Commission: 20% (with no other fees or expenses)
Date of Sale: May 2010

Property referred to in Consignment Agreement (the “Property”)
Attributed to the Gansevoort Limner
Kingston, New York, circa 1743
Portrait of Anna Brodhead Oliver
oil on canvas
appears to retain original frame
H: 30 5/8 in. W: 25 1/4 in. (sight)

Mr. Leigh Keno: [signature] Dec. 19, 2009
Date: [signature] Dec. 19, 2009
CONSENTMENT AGREEMENT

[Page contains text related to a consent form with medical or legal implications.]
It was a pleasure to have met you both at your lovely home this past Thursday. Thank you for your hospitality!

The painting arrived safely here at my office in Manhattan and I have had time to inspect it carefully with the aid of a black light. The good news is that I am just as excited about the portrait as I was when I saw it that day. There is however, considerable loss to the paint around her head and neck (perhaps eight percent of her total canvas surface) and some very small areas of inpainting at the perimeter of the painting from frame wear and one two inch oblong spot on her left arm. Luckily, the pigment used to depict the skin and fabric work is relatively unscathed-- except for some very tiny spots on her face, etc. All of this is to be expected on a painting done over 250 years ago! I still feel that the frame, although repainted, has a very good chance of being original.

The value that we have placed on the painting for insurance is $350,000.00 (three hundred and fifty thousand dollars). We would rather be on the high side because an insurance value is a replacement value. This is the amount that we have reported to our insurance company so you are fully covered at the figure in the unlikely event of a loss.

We are getting the painting professionally photographed next week so that we can start the process of your having a painted/photo replica. You will be amazed at how similar it will look! The frame will be copied as well.

Yours sincerely,

Leigh

A letter from Mr. Leigh Keno to the client. December 1, 2009.
From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Subject: Re: Portrait
Date: Sun, Dec 27, 2009 11:14 am

And Merry Christmas and Happy New Year to you! To answer your first question, that IS the ad going in Antiques Magazine coming out in January. That was a copy of the pre-publication format and design. Again, the color will be adjusted. As regards your second concern, apparently the information developed by your grandmother and Ms. Black (author of the initial article in Antiques in the 60's) was sufficient. The information provided to me will be presented to the ultimate buyer. They can continue with their own research. I will pass your concerns on to Leigh and will get back to you if warranted. YES THE HUNT GOES ON. Talk to you soon. Give my best to George.

Regards,

Mark

-----Original Message-----
From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Sent: Fri, Dec 25, 2009 3:34 pm
Subject: Portrait

First off....Merry Christmas! Hope you're enjoying the heat wave and quality time with family! Was Santa good to you? Just being here is Christmas enough for me!

And I hope you don't mind that I'm emailing you but we had guests and we'll be off and running the next 2 days.

I got the picture in the mail yesterday. What timing! Merry Christmas to you and me! And yes the color is quite off and I'm glad you told me it will be corrected. I see that the Hollander's and [redacted] will be taking center stage. Awesome! I just have 2 questions...

Is this also going in Antiques Magazine?

and secondly,

I'm still perplexed by the fact that the proof I had of the painting said it was of Margaret Newkirk and yet it's being presented as Anna Brodhead Oliver. Obviously, I don't know who wrote that and how that was determined but I just wanted to be sure that further research wasn't warranted. Or maybe it doesn't matter that much? I thought when I was trying to trace it back, that Anne Oliver was not that old which would have a significant impact on the date of the painting. Unfortunately, I gave you copies of the lineage and didn't bring copies with me.

Look forward to hearing from you. Hope all is well and that the snow didn't hamper the hunt.

Take care,

Correspondence between the anonymous seller and Mark Hollander.
Leigh Keno comparing the original portrait with a Gicle print.
There was no reserve on the portrait, which had a pre-sale estimate of $40,000.00-$80,000.00.

The anonymous sellers were awarded $752,000.00 following the sale of Lot 422, which brought a hammer price of $940,000. This translated into a nearly $1.1 million sale.
May 3, 2010

Mr. Leigh Keno
Keno Auctions
127 East 69th Street
New York, NY 10021

Dear Leigh:

I really don’t know where to start….the gamut of emotions that I have been through cannot even hold a candle to yours I’m sure. But most of all I want to say thank you and congratulations!

I truly am, still in disbelief and shock. Having never watched or participated in an auction of any consequence I wasn’t sure what to expect. In hindsight, I am glad I decided to stay home and view the event from the internet. I was becoming increasingly nervous that we might not even realize the high end of the preliminary estimates and began to wish I’d kept the painting and just insured it for $60,000.00. Are you laughing now? No...more like...ye of little faith.

So when you started the bidding at $50,000.00 and there were takers, I felt some relief. About 10 seconds later, I started to cry and I think I stopped breathing for a moment which is probably what brought on the shakes as I contemplated moving to the floor in case my legs buckled. Wow! That was incredible!

Thank God that I was put in contact with Mark Hollander who realized the significance of the painting and could contact you about it. I always knew it was an important part of my ancestry but not it’s importance in art history. So here we sit in the livingroom like nothing ever happened. Anna is still over the fireplace and we’re looking at the “Results of the Sale” receipt. How special is that?!

You, Mark, and your staff deserve the utmost of praise! I can’t thank you enough for all your efforts and I’m glad to know she will be in good hands.

Very sincerely,

[Signature]

cc: M. Hollander
Friday, Dec. 6

Dear [Name],

I've been meaning to get a note off to you because I cannot thank you enough for putting me in contact with Marc Hollander! He has been instrumental in helping me sort through many of the items left behind by my parents and we continue to work together.

As I am unsure how well you know him, let me tell you, he is personable, extremely knowledgeable and has great contacts! And he's a gather so need I say more?!

I wouldn't hesitate a minute to recommend him to anyone who might need his services. I did have a brief encounter with a competitor shortly after my father's death, and Marc is far superior. So if you have other clients who are looking for information about antiques or collectibles, please share my note with them.

We are off to Florida in a few short days so if I don't see you before then, have a Very Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year and let's play more golf together in the spring.

Fondly,
Dear Mark,

It has been a pleasure to deal with you and I look forward to many more adventures.
Thank you!

Best,

Leigh Keno

This 18th century portrait, passed down through generations, hung for years over a fireplace in Falmouth.

Family finds $1M treasure

By KAREN JEFFREY
kj Jeffrey@capecodonline.com

She sits facing her portraitist in three-quarter profile, the blush upon her youthful cheek like that of a ripening peach.

Anna Brodhead Oliver was a young housewife in Colonial-era New York when an unknown painter captured her delicate beauty in a work that some 267 years later still dazzles.

see PAINTING, page 12
room and couldn’t take his eyes away from the painting above the fireplace. “I knew immediately it was a great piece of Americana.” Within short order, he called Leigh Keno and emailed him photographs of the painting. “I’m not embarrassed to say that when I looked at Mark’s photographs, I let out a scream,” Keno said in a telephone interview from Connecticut, headquarters for his newly launched auction house. “There are so many things about this picture that make it a wonderful piece of art, including the skill of the artist and the attractiveness of the subject.” He came to the Cape to evaluate the painting. The portrait depicts the young woman at the start of a marriage. She wears a wedding ring and jeweled ring on her left hand and the same hand clutches a flower. In her right hand, is a gold box inscribed with the letter A. Her forearms are frothed in delicate lace, her neck encircled by a chain of fine gold. Her narrow waist is emphasized by a notched belt and her dress embroidered with gold thread. All these are status details that point to the relative material success of her husband, according to the experts.

Her portrait sold to a dealer who bought it for a private collector. It brought the second highest price among the objects sold over the May 1 weekend at Keno’s new auction house in Connecticut. The highest sale was $1.48 million for a James Beekman mahogany chest.

The work itself is not signed, but the backdrop – a bannister and drapery and an arched window overlooking trees – is a signature of sorts.

Feast antiques wholesaler Mark Hollander, left, and Leigh Keno of PBS’s “Antiques Road Show,” knew immediately the 18th-century portrait “was a great piece of Americana.”

THE GANSEVOORT LIMNER

- Early American artist who painted in the mid-18th century in Dutch settlements along the Hudson River in New York.
- The name refers to both the style of painting and a group of stylistically similar paintings of the Gansevoort family. Limner is a term used to describe unattributed portraits.
- Some scholars believe The Gansevoort Limner was Pieter Van Derlyn born in Holland around 1667 and moved to New York around 1718.
- Works attributed to The Gansevoort Limner are held in several museums, including the National Gallery of Art in Washington, D.C., the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York City, and the Huntington Library in San Marino, Calif.

Sources: National Gallery of Art and Keno Antiques in Stamford, Conn.
Vanderlyn Hymn, c. 1735.
O, Heilige Trouster! Hemels Ligt,
Die aan de blinde geest 't gezicht,
Kamt kragtig in mij schijnen,
Zo dat der maal een hellere straal,
In mijn verdwijst het zeer daal,
De dat de nacht verdwijnt.
Naakt, mij! maakt mij
Toen een woning, voor mijn Koning voor mijn Vader,
Trekt mijn hert tot hem af neder.

O, Heimels vuur! ontrokent mijn geest,
Ik ben tot nog de lauw geweest,
Doet mij in vuur branden,
Zoetstuk in mij het idyl haf,
Breekt al de boze toegen af,
Verwarmt mijn ingewanden,
Ontsteept, en kweekt,
Heilige Zegten, doet mij vlugten, zeer beladen,
Toen den Troon van Gids genaden.

O, Sterke Geest! die als een wind,
Ter neder waarft al wat gij vind,
Zigt tegen u verheffen,
Werguson in mij neer der Zonden magt,
Die steeds na mijn verdruwen trage,
Stag komt mijhert zoel troffen!
Wrecht dog, Sterkt nog,
En mijn Logede, en behoede mij voor dwalen,
Dwaal ik, wist mij weder halen.

Vanderlyn Hymn, c. 1735.
ADDITIONAL MATERIALS II:
The Hollander Family: An American Legacy

Dr. Oscar Hollander, Jr. pictured with a wooden decoy.
Dr. and Mrs. Oscar K. Hollander with Abigail Hollander
Mark Hollander with Abigail Hollander.
Gramps, Abigail, and Doggins.
“Mermaids and Sailors” (c. 1993) by Colleen Sgroi.

Painting depicts mermaid and sailor motif in a now and then scenario. The left panel depicts Dr. Hollander starting his life as an ophthalmologist. The right panel is representative of Dr. Hollander’s later vocation as a collector of American Decorative Arts.

The painting was commissioned in 1993 by Mark R. Hollander, who developed the initial motif.
Dr. Oscar K. Hollander with great-granddaughter Malia R. Hollander.

Dr. and Mrs. Oscar K. Hollander and Abigail Hollander. Spring 2011.
Pulling into a client’s driveway begins the great treasure hunt. When I held my first silver teapot, or got out the magnifying glass to see John Adams’ signature on a letter to his beloved wife, I knew that my appreciation for Decorative Arts went further than a curiosity in museums behind red ropes and glass; I felt a passion; a passion, which created goose bumps and lit up my eyes. And from that moment on, I could tell that my future would lie in the Arts. These pieces became my treasures, my “things” to research.

Making house calls with my dad became customary; he would wake me up early when I was a toddler, and we’d venture on another hunt, digging through attics and basements, rummaging for the next best piece of American Decorative Arts. My dad always reminded me, “Remember to look people in the eyes, Abigail” as we approached a house call.

As a child, I sat in an American Queen Anne wingchair, innocently overlooking its important history for its practicality. It was merely a seat for a weary four-year-old. Watching, and helping my dad peel layers of upholstery and batting to expose the wooden essence of this chair fascinated me. With each tear of the upholstery, the name “Pulling” appeared, branded on the chair frame. Watching my dad’s facial expression change from perplexed and anxious to animated and awestruck, triggered my curiosity about the item. I later discovered that Captain John Pulling was a Patriot at the beginning of the American Revolution in Boston. This chair, representative of an ascending era, temporarily became mine.

__Application to Union College, Fall 2011__

232 NB: This is the exact document that was included with Abigail Hollander's application to Union College, and has not been modified to fit the needs of this thesis.
My dad leaves things on the mantle that he knows I will discover, examine, and research. Recently, I came across a portrait leaned delicately on the mantle, depicting Anna Brodhead Oliver. The intricate brushstrokes reveal the softness of her porcelain-like skin and the strength of her youthful figure is draped in her wedding gown before a classic pastoral background. We spent months researching “our portrait” before sending it to New York. I involved myself in the entire process, taking pictures, writing an appraisal, and finally sending it off to auction. It was the first instance where I was trained enough to fully participate in the process.

To the average onlooker, the painting and the chair were “things” in retrospect. They came. They went. However, I spent months studying Anna, learning her ancestry, and the significance of the silver box she clasped before sending the painting to New York. To me, antiques, they are not just “things.” They are an art-form with a history. Antiques are a tangible encyclopedia of our past. And for that moment, they were in my possession. To most, the item is mundane. To me, the item is an invitation and an obligation to reveal its past.
Dr. and Mrs. Oscar K. Hollander, and three grandchildren. Sarah Hollander Gilooly, Mark R. Hollander, Jr., and Abigail P. Hollander.
Dr. Oscar Karl Hollander, 98

WEST FALMOUTH - Dr. Oscar Karl Hollander, Jr. of West Falmouth, MA passed away on October 8 at the age of 98. A dedicated family man, with a keen mind and a big heart, Dr. Hollander’s life could be characterized by his three passions: his wife and family, his profession, and his avocation of collecting antiques.

Oscar was born in Brockton, Massachusetts on September 3, 1917. The son of Dr. Oscar Karl Hollander, Sr. and Margaret Sullivan, he received his Medical degree from Middlesex College, and completed his residency at the University of Illinois Eye and Ear Infirmary. It was there where he met his wife, Lois Forsberg. They married in Chicago on March 24, 1946, and returned to Brockton to raise a family and establish a medical practice as an Eye, Ear, Nose, and Throat specialist.

To Dr. Hollander family unity was paramount. He was a strong patriarch whose opinion was always sought before making any big decisions.

His homes were open to all and were always abuzz with activity. He was so proud to hear of the birth of a grandchild and in later years the births of great-grandchildren. "Grandpa" was an active participant in all of his children's lives and loved to follow their successes. Reciting poetry, or, reading a children's story that he wrote, was a special holiday memory for all.

A prominent physician in Brockton, Dr. Hollander was a member of the medical staff at both the Brockton and Phaneuf Hospitals for over forty years. In 1987, he sold his practice to Eye Health Services and retired to his home in West Falmouth. One of Oscar's proudest moments in his professional life occurred shortly thereafter when he "unretired" and was asked to join Eye Health Services as a consultant. Though he no longer operated, his diagnostic opinions and input were legendary.

At the age of 88, Dr. Hollander authored a medical text on eye refraction and developed a medical instrument to measure the inner cavity of the eye. In 2007, at the age of 90, he retired for the last time.

Together, Dr. and Mrs. Hollander loved to search for antiques. They spent their days off on the hunt for more "treasures" to add to their prized collections. Many weekends were spent walking Charles Street and Newbury Street, hoping to find a gem. As a former member on the Board of Directors of the Sandwich Glass Museum, as well as Heritage Museums and Gardens, he was a frequent "shopper" for rarities at most of the galleries and auction houses in the greater Boston area, especially on the Cape.

In addition to his wife, he is survived by his three children: Mark Hollander of West Falmouth, MA, Karen Thomsen of Rumford, RI, and Richard Hollander of Hingham, MA; ten grandchildren; eight great grandchildren; his brother, Dr. Richard C. Hollander, and a sister, Greta Hadges. He is predeceased by two sisters, Ann Canning and Evelyn Perkinson.

Dr. Hollander was "the consummate gentleman, the light in any room, a selfless human being, a profound leader, and the rock within his family." To quote from a dear friend and colleague, "Dr. Hollander was someone who touched many, many lives. His warmth, sincerity, and kindness were monumental in scope.

Dr. Hollander was a devotee also of literature, with a love of poetry. It is unfortunate that mere words cannot capture the essence of a man as great as Dr. Hollander."

He was an impressive man who graciously allowed us to share some of his 98 remarkable years, and he will be missed.

Burial and church services will be private. In lieu of flowers, donations can be made in his name to the Home for Little Wanderers, 20 Linden Street, Boston, MA 02134. For online guestbook, visit www.ccgfuneralhome.com.
Dr. and Mrs. Oscar K. Hollander's family home. October 2015.
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