On a day in mid-February 1690, Joris Aersen was an angry young man. He had been provoked to frustration and not a little daring by Robert Livingston's arrogant "slanders" toward the Prince of Orange as "Chief Rebel" against the king of England, James II. In an outburst of vexation, Aersen announced the worthiness of the prince and the basis of his own loyalty to him. I am, he cried, "an Amsterdam boy."1

Such instances of self-identification are rare "finds" for the historian. Clues to a structure that helped an individual make sense of his life are fugitive and few. Even more elusive are those that would help the historian discover how a whole group of people constructed a sense of self-respect, order or well-being for themselves. Often the evidence is thought to be found in examining political institutions or political behavior. "Politics," it is assumed, somehow gives a fundamental measure of another people's sense of order. Yet while it is certainly true that the ceremonies and daily enactments that we call "political" reveal a people's sense of self-regard as a group as well as individually, it is nonetheless misleading to assume that such actions are a privileged way of measuring a past people's sense of self-esteem. Nor were they necessarily the pre-eminent "performances" in which a people of the past saw that they were creating proper social formations or properly-constructed channels of power among themselves.

Such a misunderstanding has particularly colored our understanding of the Dutch men and women of seventeenth-century New Netherland. All too often, historians have assumed that a study of Dutch political culture would afford a special grasp of the settlers' values, ambitions and sense of proprieties. Yet, repeatedly, they have been disappointed. They have failed to find the signs of the political order they expected: there was no evidence of representative government as it was developing in other North American colonies; there were few signs of concern about the place of loyalty to or rebellion against authority; there were no marks of a people given to political vision or ideals. As a consequence, such scholars were led to write of an errant sense of self-respect, and an impaired sense of social order. John Garraty and Robert A. McCaughey implied this in their 1987 edition of *The American Nation: A History of the United States to 1870*. Referring to New York under the Dutch rule and then under the governance of the Duke of York, they wrote, "New York had no local assembly, until the 1680s, but there had been no such body under the Dutch either."2 Clearly, the authors were using the absence of a representative assembly as a metaphor for a whole set of repressive political practices after the English conquest of 1664. However, they were also using it as a metaphor for a people lacking the will to explore or institutionalize "modern democracy." In failing to display a vigorous impulse toward a mode of representation like an assembly—the single institution which Americans have always taken to symbolize liberal democracy—the Dutch signalled an incapacity to appreciate and enjoy the fundamental building block, as it were, of proper social order.

It would be possible, of course, to make the argument that in fact Dutch men and women duplicated in New Netherland the structures of republicanism established in the Low Countries. For all the inefficiency and arrogance of the directors of the West India Company, republican political forms were nonetheless transplanted to the New World. However, New Netherlanders disposed of power and constructed "the good society" in non-political "performances" as much as in those described as political.

They enacted a stable and meaningful society in countless ways. The Dutch of New Netherland took a sense of "first and last things" from all the socializing actions of life. Thus rituals, like those surrounding so seemingly commonplace a set of practices as trading, caught up the meanings of power and order, of the good life and self, as much as those we specify as "political," like voting. The rituals of *Handelstijd* show us that the men and women of seventeenth-century Beverwijck had constructed a rich and complex way of life for themselves. It was one in which power was shared in a particular way. It was one where daily rituals, even those as seemingly trivial as public auctions, made a man or
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woman part of a society unequal in our terms but nevertheless sustaining and elaborately well-ordered.

I

Like all people, the townspeople of Beverwijck had many ways to relate themselves to their past and present. Even for the passage of the days of the year, they had devices for fixing time’s sequences into meaningful parts. We know, for example, that they lived out a year rich liturgical, agricultural and trading cycles. But above all, time was *burgerschijn*. That is, it was organized around civic occurrences, when civic virtues (and vices) were displayed, when townscape—as distinct from the countryside—was the stage of meaningful action. And the dominant rhythm was the annual recurrence of the trading season, *handelsstijd*.

*Handelsstijd* began on May 1 and ended in November. It was a time when population swelled and merchandise brought within the town palisades doubled or perhaps tripled in bulk and value. Mirrors, gold rings, New Testaments, guns, blankets and velvet cloaks arrived for sale. In a single season, as many as 50,000 beaver pelts might have entered the market town in one year as well. Somehow the goods found space in about 127 houses. In 1657, 40,940 beaver pelts were taken in trade. The value was 327,520 guilders. If only half of them were strung and exchanged. Moreover, if the 40,940 pelts had been evenly divided among the 105 men and women who claimed to be traders in 1659, each would have had 390 pelts, an earning of 3120 guilders. Half of that as profits was equal to six years’ wages as a local farmhand. The profits were, of course, not equally distributed. Quite the contrary. *Handelsstijd* was a time when fortunes were made and lost: it cheated some, ruined others and rewarded a few. It set all men gambling.

May 1, then, was a day when it profited an outsider to move into town. House rentals to transients were common. Some entered into contracts for “one month, 6 days” as early as March; others legally squatted on properties for which only the first installment would have been required. It was a time of strangers. They came to trade, sell sevante, bake, auction yachts, deliver merchandise, sue residents for debt, gamble at auctions. Youths, men from outlying farms, agents for Boston, buyers and wealthy wholesalers of New Amsterdam and Hartford arrived. From 1652 to 1664, thirty-two non-resident merchants appeared in the Beverwijck court suing for claims generally arising from the ill-conceived and risky business transactions of residents. The strangers’ presence undoubtedly pleased townsmen with wares to auction. But their presence was also troublesome and a danger.

Ordinarily the Indians arrived with furs in mid-June. So the first weeks of May were those of preparation. However, they were nonetheless intense for that. Townsmen arranged the assets that might give them a win in the gambling of *handelsstijd*. They purged themselves of debt, rented out rooms, built sheds for natives, sold properties, all in order to be in the trade with merchandise and sevante. Jeremias van Rensselaer inadvertently registered the edginess of these first weeks. “The beaver trade,” the director of Rensselaerswijck wrote of the waiting-game in May, 1659, “if all the Indians come home with beaver, may turn out to be very good for almost all the river Indians are out hunting.”

Public festivities in the first weeks of *handelsstijd* announced it as a season of heightened and potentially dangerous competition. The men of the town engaged in “shooting the parrot.” Under the supervision of a prominent burgher, they competed to discover and honor the best marksman among the burgher guard (*schutterij*). These men of the local militia set a wooden *paapegaai* (parrot) on a pole and fired from positions at possibly eighteen feet distance. The competition was a universal festivity among the Dutch. Some continental cities feasted the marksmen after the occasion; at Table Bay in South Africa “the whole body of shooters” escorted the winner to his home “in state” after the event. He won the title, “King of the Marksmen.”

In Beverwijck, the revels of the *paapegaayschoet* in 1655 were in the care of Hendrick Jochemsz. He was a burgher at whose inn the West India Company’s soldiers were often found drinking and creating scenes of “assault” and “fighting.” So it is likely that the *schoet* was not only a ritual of some violence in itself but that some of the contestants were men of violence as well. Certainly the community recognized some of this. The court admonished Jochemsz to avoid the recurrence of “accidents . . . [that] occur or result” from the *paapegaayschoet* and breaches of “good order.” Yet the court gave its permission. It acquiesced in a ritual contest which allowedburghers to fire weapons, a practice otherwise never sanctioned. For a moment, it set aside the familiar structures of conduct, keynoting the way it would consent to the larger “happening,” *handelsstijd*.
We can only assume that the men played out the competition on the plain near Fort Orange south of town and from there, full of drink and ready to cause "accidents," they escort the victor through the south gate back into town.

The shooting competition was the preparation for the dangerous trading contests of handelslijd. July to mid-October was especially the gambling time. And no man or woman in the game was unaware of its risks. Natives came with the knowledge that they would be wooed for their beaver by the same Dutch buyers who would then brutalize and cheat them. Dutch men entered the competition knowing they needed answers to some of these questions: at which of the several auctions of merchandise should one bid? When should one hold back? Would prices of merchandise fall within the month? Could one gamble on the magistrates closing their eyes to forestalling and selling liquor to natives? Would the court be severe with those luring natives into their homes and shops?

The pace of handelslijd was fast and barely controlled. Roman law, still in use among the Dutch, was the merchants' law. So the magistrates processed cases before the court with alacrity, conducting sessions twice and often three times a week. Vendors at auctions wanted payment within twenty-four hours. Men were desperate to get "canoes, rowboats or other vessels" to search the reaches of Normanskill and the Catskills for natives. Some went in twos and threes, fighting among themselves and running the risk of discovery and confiscation of sails and rudder. Others went alone, their dark activities betrayed only in reports like "he used the canoe many times last summer." Townspeople bartered from four o'clock a.m. when the nightwatch made its last rounds, until nine o'clock p.m. and (illegally) into the night.
There was drinking "at unreasonable hours of the night." Ordinary, itinerant women, who all day long roamed along the streets and made a vile spectacle of themselves were imprisoned until "sober and slept out." Ordinarily, inns, like individuals' homes, were carefully regulated and subject to known sets of proprieties. They were accepted as places of the herbergvolk, people of drink and derring-do, pipes and song, gossip and gambling, contests of physical strength. In handelstijd they required careful surveillance. Yet inns were also the places for auctions, the agonistic competitions where "The King of the Marksmen" took the prizes.

II

Auctions were carefully staged. A number of performers had to play their parts with accuracy, speed and authority. The auctions had their "acts," discreet stages of performance that were tightly synchronized. They took place, as I stated, at inns and taverns (herbergen). In Beverwijck, they might have been conducted in any one of ten houses. Here at the homes of people licensed to sell beer and spirits, those lured to the contests played out the role the occasion evoked. Inns, churchmen thought, brought people to the most ill-considered business transactions, trading in deals that were evil, foolhardy, prankish and contemptible. However, the men of the seventeenth century, wrote one Dutch scholar "liked to gamble, and always with money."16

Merchandise for sale was often bulky and may have been displayed in the rear of the licensee's property. Or it may have been "exposed for sale"—as townspeople put it—where bidding took place, in the room reached immediately from the stoep. The size of the room was probably 18 feet by 25 feet with easy room for thirty people, such as the "8 to 10 persons playing ninepins and two at backgammon, and as many as 15 or 16 either bowling or drinking" in New Amsterdam in 1663.17 Whatever the case, the herbergier kept the competitors and on-lookers plying with drink and handed vendors the bill. When such costs exceeded the purse of one burgher (f12 for brandy, f18 for beer) he was "constrained to pay said sum by apprehension of his person."18 Perhaps such misfortunes reminded participants of the popular Dutch axiom: "Purchases and sales in inns or taverns may be reversed within 24 hours."19

A placard was usually posted three weeks before the sale and announced the auction. Placards from the period have not been preserved but would have been similar to those of Amsterdam in the mid-seventeenth century—with the exception of being handwritten rather than printed. Even the paper used for some Amsterdam placards matched that used for account books in Beverwijck. The Amsterdam placards announced goods for sale in the customary mix of exaggeration and detail. Those in both Amsterdam and Beverwijck carried a formula which asked readers to further advertise the sale: "segget voort" ("Pass it along").20 Auctions took place throughout the day and evening. In Amsterdam, summer-time auctions of ships seem to have been conducted in the evening: at six and seven o'clock "precis."21 We have only scattered data for Beverwijck, but auctions at all hours of the day seem probable: the house that went to auction at "two o'clock in the afternoon" would seem unexceptionable.22

Consider two or three auctions and then we may draw conclusions. Roeloff Janse and Lambert Cornelis arranged for a placard to announce their auction on August 23, 1654. At the tavern, the actors assembled. The Company's officer arrived to record sales and collect a tax on imports sold. The speel of the auctioneer—who was not necessarily the vendor—probably followed the style of house auctions, beginning the drama by reading pertinent documents "to the bystanders."23 Janse and Cornelis stipulated payment in beaver within twenty-four hours. There were twenty-six successful buyers of sixty-one items or sets of items. Regrettably we do not have a record of the number of townspeople attending, but the twenty-six buyers there were 25% of the 105 traders. Janse and Cornelis realized f377,08 or 47.5 beaver, if they got the kind of payment asked.24 At almost the same time, a placard was circulating for an auction at Pieter Bronck's tavern, and thirteen days later a third auction was held by Gerrit Teunisse van Vechten. It was an auction of household goods as well as items of considerable expense where there was no place for lesser traders in the bidding. Unlike Janse's and Cornelis's auction, only leading merchants were successful competitors. Twenty-three men bought wares to the amount of f386.90 and paid "good whole beaver or half-beaver."25

During handelstijd of 1658, Pieter Pietersz van Nesten, Jan de Groot and Bastiaen de Winter auctioned merchandise. Pietersz was the agent for a New Amsterdam wholesaler and offered a fully-rigged, fully-equipped sloop on his behalf. De Groot chose July 22 for his auction, perhaps waiting until natives arrived with pelts. Twenty-nine men and women bought an ordinary
assortment of wares—shovels, old coats, women’s stockings, jugs, hats and cravats. De Groot took f364.1. The prominent traders stayed away. De Winter selected a day that fell within Beverwijck’s celebration of kermis (Amsterdam fair days), September 23. His sale of furniture netted him f844,11. Although he accepted sewant in payment for goods, De Winter, like the others, demanded payment within twenty-four hours. Forty to fifty of the leading townsmen bid for his miscellany of wares. None of the small traders competed, perhaps because sewant was scarce in 1658.26

Auctions after 1658 and into 1664 continued to pit townsmen against one another and outsiders. A final sale is worth considering. In 1659, Pieter Claerbout auctioned merchandise sixteen days after its arrival up the Hudson river from Manhattan Island. The delivery of the goods had brought its own difficulties. Two chairs and a lamp had blown overboard on route and this involved Claerbout in laying charges against the skipper and refusing freight costs. He had some reason to worry about the safety of his goods. First, his expenses were considerable. Charges for the auction and freight amounted to 22% of his profit of f500,08. Second, his merchandise was luxury items such as gold rings, porcelain, curtains with valances, pictures, costly coats and mantles. Twenty-one prominent merchants were buyers.27 Jan de Kuyper from New Amsterdam carried off three porcelain cups. Two years earlier, he had sent 2000 beaver to “the Manhattans,” that is, fur to the value of f16,000 in North America but as much as f57,000 in Europe.28 Abraham Staats was also in the competition, bidding on a black mantle, a picture and a child’s petticoat, and pledging f48,00. In 1657 he sent to New Amsterdam twice the number of De Kuyper’s pelts, beaver valued at f35,200 in New Netherland or, again, f125,400 in Europe.29 Cornells Teunisse (Bosch) won the bid for a picture (f14:10) and a smoothing iron and lamp (f10:5). He was a handelaar (wholesale merchant) whose fortunes were already in jeopardy. By 1664 he had died, but the handelaars who were his associates continued to participate in the auctions. In handelstijd of that year, one of them conducted an auction for Dirck Janse Croon. He had goods of a consistently high quality and twenty-seven burghers bid successfully. Croon received f427,05.30

Auctions were intense moments of self-presentation. Feelings of envy, frustration and resentment must have been provoked. Profits arose from precisely that mix of emotions. Auctioneers relied on it. Yet the records, which more than adequately document physical violence or verbal abuse in other situations, contain no evidence of violence either at the gatherings or as a direct result of them. Moreover, a man was also publicly tested in his knowledge of the market, in his expertise as judge of himself and his competitors. Such cunning turned a purchase into a prize. It made the highest bidder a prize-winner, the best “marksman.” Lack of such knowledge showed a man to himself and others to be a loser. Whatever else, he was inadequate, perhaps again and again, against the same fellow burghers.

Still no violence occurred. There was a redressive machinery working to resolve antagonisms. First, by its structure a “Dutch auction” amplified the tension of the competition but diminished the visibility of the contestants. The seller offered goods at a high price which he or she lowered periodically until one of the buyers accepted. High prices were obtained in a “Dutch auction” because each buyer knew that the item was sold as soon as one of his competitors made a move. Excepting the winner, however, the identity of the other contestants was guesswork. Second, the costliness of items at auction influenced the constituency of bidders. Burghers of little substance were able to anticipate the prices merchandise would fetch. They stayed away from auctions like Claerbout’s and De Winter’s or, more likely, attended but remained silent. The prosperous handelaars, on the other hand, failed to grace Janse’s and Cornelis’s sales. Burghers knew their own assets and status—the auctions were instructive on that. And, at least in these instances, the townsmen and—women seemed to bring ambition into line with actuality.

Auctions, then, undeniably instructed the community about an economic hierarchy. Yet they also taught that no man was above the continual public examination, and perhaps public humiliation, to which auctions—exactly like the papegaayschoet, in its way—contributed. Jeremias van Rensselaer, the director of Rensse-laerswijck and son of the first patroon, and Rut Jacobsz, a noted burgher and handelaar, are cases in point. Van Rensselaer regularly put his own moveable property to auction. On one occasion, the items were quite personal belongings. In 1654, his mother in Holland sent the clothing of two brothers to sell.31 One has to assume that, despite van Rensselaer being “a cut above” other folk, the two cloth suits were “exposed for sale,” commented upon by the herbergvolk, perhaps knocked down for a mean price and then worn by a fellow-townsman in a face-to-face society.
Rut Jacobsz was a leading handelaar and had been magistrate for six years between 1652 and 1663 when his fortunes turned sour. From 1659 to 1662 the town would have seen his properties auctioned, one by one, and, after his death, some of his personal effects—a gold ring, a diamond ring, a silver dish, a gold bodkin, eight silver spoons—exposed to public view and given into the hands of friends and competitors. In that sense, auctions were not dramas that uniformly denoted an elevated social or economic space where some townsmen or—women moved above others. On the contrary. They had a leveling effect. Like the papegaayschoet and handelstijd itself, they dramatized if not the easy accessibility of the “prizes” then at least the openness of the competition. Putting it another way, the context of handelstijd auction drew some of its venom. Thus, a predictable sequence of events closed it, even as ordered sequences of events concluded the rituals of the papegaayschoet and handelstijd as a season. The recorder of the auction published the “take,” the vendor provided libations, the buyers exchanged beaver for merchandise with the required rapidity and order.

Taken solely as financial transactions, the auctions of commodities were “small change.” The amounts spent were of little consequence. Even sums realized by vendors usually ranged below five hundred guilders. Those merchants with large investments in the trade relied on their own brokers for merchandise. Their purchases at auctions were useful but supplementary. For example, one week before Teunisse realized f386,90 at his auction, Philip Pietersz Schuyler privately sent f2562 to Juriaen Thysen in Amsterdam for goods received. Such large transactions and deeper risk takings had their own “theater”—in private meetings, at the strand beyond the south gate, at the end of journeys to Holland. It was, in fact, the ability to multiply risks and succeed—to manage a portfolio of investments—that made the successful merchant “king” over others and brought him or her admiration and honor. For all townspeople, however, being in the game mattered, and mattered in a fundamental way.

III

They called it “earning a beaver.” The phrase was used in 1660, a time when desperation about the trade was general and fear was rife that the powerful handelaars would more than ever monopolize it. To counteract this, eighty smaller traders petitioned the court that “everyone be allowed to do the best he can” in the trading months. In that way, “many a poor person could earn a beaver and the community would be better served.” Jacob Thyssen was one of the petitioners and managed to send five pelts to Holland at the end of handelstijd in 1661. In the same consignment, Jeremias van Rensselaer sent 151 whole beaver pelts on the account of his brother in Amsterdam, Jan Baptiste van Rensselaer. What did Thyssen and the other poor traders mean by being allowed to “earn a beaver”? Certainly they demanded the right to be kept from economic deprivation by proper legislation. But the rituals of handelstijd that form the context of the demand allow us to read richer meanings into the request. For when one notes the townspeople at the papegaayschoet or auctions, or catches them in observances of kermis or court days—indeed when one is standing back and catching the structure of handelstijd within that of the whole calendric year—it becomes clear that so-called economic activities were not merely economic at all.

Such activities also were “social,” “political,” “religious” and “familial.” For example, the significance of May 1 as the beginning of the trading season was multiplied by the burgurers’ designation of it as the day for the installation of the town’s magistrates. Or, again, the conclusion of the trading season coincided with a religious holy day, All Saints’ day. To take a third example, it was as families that some townspeople appeared before the court for evading the laws prohibiting bartering with Indians in “the woods” surrounding the town. But clearly to list the multiple meanings embedded in the daily social occasions of a community is already to destroy a sense of how those occasions worked. It is enough to recognize here that the acts by which the townspeople organized and observed their lives in the small occasions of handelstijd were not merely economic in nature and function. They were, at one and the same time, political and ethical, moral and aesthetic. The “performances” enacted values and did so in the properly civilized way: that is, in the properly Dutch way. They were performances that told participants—and all townspeople were participants in one way or another—that the town and its people were set in proper order. In that sense, the rituals stood as cosmological statements.

Denial of “earning a beaver,” then, was denial of a way of life. Consider Jeremias van Rensselaer and Jacob Thyssen, each of whom sent pelts to Amsterdam in 1661. The Van Rensselaer correspondence during this time is vivid testimony to the way a consignment of furs aroused baroque plans for their best use on behalf of a substan-
tially well-off family. Should they be reserved from sale, given the sluggish market in Amsterdam and Europe? If the fur trade was faltering, should the family make entirely different arrangements for its role in New Netherland? Would pelts once again fetch nine or ten guilders in Holland? The family’s maneuvers over consignments like that of 1661 involved tens of thousands of guilders, hundreds of individuals and dozens of crucial factors.

The five pelts of Jacob Thyssen, however, aroused elaborate plans as well. He intended to sell them in Holland and use the profits to pay the passage of one or two farmhands to Beverwijck. Jan Baptiste van Rensselaer was to arrange it in Amsterdam. If that failed, Thyssen expected him to send linen, providing the purchase price were “13 or 14 stivers a yard.” Both Jeremias and Jan Baptiste added further elaborations to Thyssen plans. First, Jeremias wrote Jan Baptiste a lengthy identification of Thyssen, suggesting the man might be someone Jan Baptiste remembered and asking that he “be kind enough” to give assistance. Jan Baptiste saw to the sale of the pelts and, paying 15.6 stivers the yard, sent Thyssen forty yards of linen. When Thyssen and the other burghers stated in 1660 that every man had the right to “earn a beaver,” they were expressing their right to exercise all the skills that the complexities of the trade demanded: the opportunity to exercise memory and to take stock of a complex commodity market, to send and receive consignments along the riverfront, to meet the challenge of envisioning and manipulating a portfolio of investments, however small it might be. It meant calculating and waiting, comparing and counting, complaining, fighting, appearing in court, marrying, farming, making a will, all in terms of the trade. It meant sharing the risks of handelstijd: being in the game with the marksmen.

Writing the history of another people is always dangerous. It means that scenes of apparent disorder—all the revelries and heedlessness, the extravagances and contests of handelstijd—need to be seen as partial views of what was going on. For valid interpretation, they need to be set within the wider structure of a culture. Dutch culture in New Netherland was prodigal with complexities. It was filled with painfully careful rituals. Beverwijck may not have replicated the elaborate richness of a Dutch city like Amsterdam. Certainly it did not. It was, however, structurally the same: the order was there. We have only to find it.
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