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Introduction

Within two decades of Henry Hudson’s exploration of the river that would later carry his name, children from Europe had crossed the Atlantic to a new home in New Netherland. Upon arrival, they worked alongside their parents to build settlements. They were present when the walls of Fort New Amsterdam (now New York City) were erected. Imagine their excitement when a whale swam up the North (Hudson) River beyond Beverwijk (now Albany) in 1647 and their sense of wonder when comets were observed in the heavens in 1665. Children were rocked in their cradles, learned to walk on New Netherland’s soil, ran and skipped on the roads, dashed through the fields, and sometimes caused mischief. Many grew to adulthood; many died in infancy; many others became orphans. Filled with youthful exuberance, the healthy and capable went to school and worked, learning the skills that would see them through adulthood. Yet children left no written record describing their experiences; consequently, it is through the writings of adults that their activities are exposed. The numerous pages of extant colonial manuscripts reveal how important children were to their parents and the community. According to Nicasius de Sille, who was a prominent member of New Netherland’s society, children and pigs were abundant in New Amsterdam by 1654. Both multiplied, he wrote, “rapidly and more than anything else.” Little did De Sille realize that his oft-quoted words would be difficult to verify. The data required to corroborate his statement have, for the most part, been lost. The baptismal registers of the Dutch Reformed churches in New Amsterdam and Breuckelen (now Brooklyn) do chronicle the presence of over 2,600 children from 1639 through 1674, but such evidence is lacking for the colony’s other villages and towns and for other religious denominations for this period. Furthermore, the birth of some children was simply never recorded. Many were born elsewhere, then immigrated to the colony with their parents but remained nameless on ships’ registers or in various accounts. Furthermore, the total number of all children was greatly decreased by infant-mortality rates, which were high in the seventeenth century.

Birth and Baptism

It is possible, nevertheless, to begin with birth and baptism to tell the story of childhood in New Netherland, for the records reveal that babies of European heritage generally were born at home, their mothers attended by midwives and surrounded by female family members and friends. Immediately after birth,
a newborn was wrapped in warm diapers and laid in the arms of his or her grandmother or godmother. Lightly swaddled, the babe was then offered to its father, who, by his acceptance, acknowledged the infant to be legally his. The birth of a child was usually a joyous occasion and was celebrated in the Netherlands, and probably also in the colony, with sweets, pastries, and caudle (a drink made from wine, egg yolks, sugar, cinnamon, and cloves).\(^6\)

The Dutch customs associated with the birth of a child can be contrasted with the birthing rituals of Native Americans as they were recorded by two seventeenth-century commentators of Dutch origin. Adriaen van der Donck noted in 1653 that Native American babies were born in a simple hut or behind a screen of matting set up in “a quiet, sheltered spot [in the woods] near running water.” Their mothers gave birth “unaided,” he wrote. In 1644 Johannes Megapolensis observed that newborns of the Mohawk nation were washed by their mothers in the river or the snow. Van der Donck, on the other hand, asserted that if the child was a boy, he was immediately immersed in a nearby stream and left there for some time, so that he would be “hardened from the first...so as to grow up a brave man and a good hunter.” The infant was then dressed and wrapped in fur clothing, his mother watching him closely for fear that he might “die accidentally.” Mother and newborn returned to their home and friends within a few days.\(^7\)

Far different was the birth of a baby born to Dutch Reformed communicants. The infant was carried to church by a godparent within the first few days of life and presented to the minister for baptism by his or her father, the babe’s mother still confined to her bed after childbirth.\(^8\) During this religious ritual, a child was admitted into the congregation of believers. Godparents or baptismal witnesses assisted in this process and were chosen from among the nearest relatives or closest friends. They promised to ensure a godchild’s Christian upbringing, especially if the child became orphaned. Some presented the child with a christening gift. Kiliaen van Rensselaer, for example, who was baptized in Beverwijck in 1663, received two silver salt cellars from his grandmother Anna van Rensselaer, who was also his godmother.\(^9\)

During baptism a child also received his or her first name, which was carefully recorded in the church’s baptismal register, along with the names of the parents and witnesses. Dutch naming customs usually followed a distinctive pattern: first- and second-born daughters and first- and second-born sons were given the names of their paternal and maternal grandparents. Children were also named for parents, aunts, uncles, godparents, and friends. The pattern varied by alternately choosing from the paternal then the maternal line with the birth of each child. When a child died young, his or her name was given, at times, to the next child born of the same sex, thereby preserving the name that the dead child had carried.\(^10\) Of the six sons born to Cornelis Steenwijck and Margareta de Riemer, two were named Jacob, one Isaacq, two Cornelis, and one Jacobus. Beginning in 1659 Steenwijck had recorded their births in the family Bible, along with that of their sister Margariet. By 1684 all the children had been buried in the church in New York.\(^11\)
Infant and Childhood Mortality

How the Steenwijk children died is unknown. Disease and the lack of effective medical treatment certainly took many lives in the seventeenth century. Even a chest cold could be fatal. When five-year-old Maria Ebbingh caught a cold in October 1665, her parents called in two of New Amsterdam’s medical experts to treat her for congestion, but a fever developed and her body weakened. The last few days of her life were vividly described by her father, Jeronimus Ebbingh. During the day she played by the fire and sat at the table to eat the midday meal, although she had little appetite. During the night she tossed and turned in her bed and asked to sleep with her parents. Just an hour before her death she arose, and her stepbrothers were called in to see her. Shortly thereafter, surrounded by her family, she gave two little sobs, and with the last, her little mouth remained half open. The tragic death of one child from the complications of a cold can be contrasted to the devastating effects of a smallpox epidemic that affected children and adults alike in Beverwijk in 1662. The disease, wrote Jeremias van Rensselaer, the director of Rensselaerswijk (now part of Albany), was so severe that “hardly any one escaped who had not had it in the fatherland.” The frequent rental of the pall, both small and large, from the deacons of Beverwijk’s Dutch Reformed Church from September to December of that year supports Van Rensselaer’s claim. These special cloths, which covered the coffins of children and adults during burial rites, were rented fifteen (the small pall) and fourteen (large) times during that period. Before and after the epidemic, they were rented regularly but much less often.

While many youngsters died at birth or from childhood and contagious diseases, other potential hazards also threatened their lives. Toddlers wandered around in homes with open fireplaces and boiling pots and in yards with open wells. Danger also loomed on the crowded streets of New Amsterdam in 1665 (by then renamed New York), where a child was killed by a runaway horse belonging to Jan Smedes. The youngster was not identified, but it could have been five-year-old Lysbeth van Hooghten or her two-year-old brother, Johannes, both of whom had been baptized in the city’s Dutch Reformed Church. Frans van Hooghten, the dead child’s father, sued Smedes in the municipal court, where the magistrates concluded that the horse be “forfeited” and its owner ordered to pay the court costs and to satisfy Van Hooghten for the loss of his deceased child.

The perilous consequences of life in the seventeenth century resulted in high infant-mortality rates in New Netherland, as well as in other North American colonies and in Europe. Although mortality studies have not been done for the period under consideration in this paper, a study of the Haring family in Tappan, New Jersey, from 1688 to 1743 revealed that the first generations produced on average 9.3 children, with thirty percent dying in infancy or youth. In colonial Maryland forty to fifty-five percent of children never turned twenty, and only fifty percent of infants in the Netherlands lived to reach their twenty-fifth birthdays. Of those who survived, half would lose one or both parents, for,
as the rental of the large pall in Beverwijck suggests, parents were as susceptible to contagious diseases as their children. Surviving spouses in the Netherlands and in the colony usually remarried. Of the ninety-six marriages performed in the Reformed Church in New Amsterdam between 1661 and 1664, thirty involved a widow or a widower, and in ten more both parties had lost a spouse. Some of New Netherland’s youngsters, therefore, grew up in families that had a mixture of children and stepchildren.

With death occurring at relatively frequent intervals, the sight of a healthy baby was, by contrast, a great joy. Jeremias van Rensselaer is one of but a few parents who noted the pleasure he took in his children, although his remarks are brief and interspersed among the numerous pages of his correspondence (1651–1674). His eldest son, Kiliaen, born in August 1663, was, he wrote, “a beloved child to his mother and a welcome son to his father.” The babe had survived a bout of jaundice and a rash within the first three weeks of life, but he was also “fond of suckling,” all signs, remarked Van Rensselaer, that he would “abide with us.” In October 1664 the fourteen-month-old toddler was running “around everywhere.” At twenty months, he was talking “a little in broken language.” Shortly after his second birthday, Kiliaen remembered the departure of his grandmother Anneke Loockermans and other family members, who had probably been present at the birth of his sister Anna in August 1665. Van Rensselaer noted that “Kiliaen kept calling for a long time” for them, so that after their departure, when asked about them, he answered with a sad voice, “Ah,” and pointed to the yachts on the river. Kiliaen’s sister Anna was “quite a big baby,” her father observed, when he compared her to her brother’s birth size. At twenty-two months, she had begun “to say everything.” A second son, Hendrick, arrived in November 1667 and was “a strong little fellow” at eight months. In January 1670 tragedy struck when Van Rensselaer and his wife, Maria van Cortlandt, buried “the little body” of an unnamed son, “who [had] died in the agony of birth.” However, another son, Johannes, arrived in December 1670. Van Rensselaer used the endearment poppetie (poppet) to describe the babe to his father-in-law, Oloff van Cortlandt. He was “a strong child, like his brother Hen[d]rick,” he wrote. The births of Van Rensselaer’s last children, Maria and Jeremias, are not mentioned in the extant correspondence, although by June 29, 1674, he commented that his “five” children were well. Jeremias was born sometime after Van Rensselaer’s own death in October 1674.

Nurturing Infants

As noted above, Van Rensselaer declared in 1663 that his son Kiliaen was “fond of suckling.” Mother’s milk was, of course, vital for an infant’s survival. Whether Kiliaen was suckled by his mother was not mentioned in the correspondence. European women of rank often employed a wet nurse, but contemporaries encouraged healthy Dutch mothers, from all levels of society, to nurse their newborns. Adriaen van der Donck observed that Native American mothers,
regardless of rank, also nursed their babies for about a year. They did not “have
t heir children breast-fed or nursed by others,” he wrote. He does not mention what
occurred if mothers fell ill or died in childbed. Such events were not uncommon
in the seventeenth century, and among Dutch residents, the custom of employing
a wet nurse was followed in those situations.19 This practice is corroborated in
the accounts of the deacons of the Dutch Reformed Church of Beverwijck, who
offered relief to the town’s poor. In October 1665 two women were hired to nurse
the newborn twins of Carsten de Noorman after his wife died in childbed. The
contracts written to sustain the infants were valid for one year, and each wet nurse
received 35 guilders a month. The twins were probably weaned in December
1666, when the last nursing fees were paid, and new boarding contracts were
recorded for the children at 32 guilders a month each.20

The deacons also provided the twins, and other poor and/or orphaned
babies, with diapers made of blue or Osnabruck linen or of thick woolen fabrics,
like baize or duffel. These were used for swaddling, the baby being rolled in the
linen and then the woolen diaper. Caps of linen or durable serge covered their
heads, and yarn was knit into shirts to keep their bodies warm. When Beverwijck’s
babies became toddlers, they wore outfits made of baize or of a woolen cloth
called dosijntiens. These outfits, of which tops and bottoms were made out of one
piece of cloth, were worn underneath a sleeping gown.21

Childhood Activities: Punishment and Rewards
The accounts of Beverwijck’s deacons and Van Rensselaer’s correspondence make
it possible to imagine New Netherland’s babies wrapped in blue linen diapers and
toddlers running around in their baize outfits before they graduated to breeches or
petticoats and before their parents, or those entrusted with their care, anticipated
the weighty concerns about their futures. Extant records, however, rarely mention
the activities of childhood. Five-year-old Maria Ebbingh played with her silver
doll accessories during the last days of her life. Somewhat older children may
have participated in the games (trundling hoops, spinning tops, jumping rope,
and playing leapfrog) depicted in the numerous paintings, prints, and tiles of the
Dutch Republic’s Golden Age. Surely many of the amusements prohibited in New
Netherland on the Sabbath and on Days of Fasting and Prayer—including card
and ball games, backgammon, ticktack, ninepins, and dancing—must have been
learned in childhood, perhaps from grandparents, parents, or older siblings.22

Children were not caught breaking the Sabbath by indulging in one
of the forbidden pastimes, but an occasional younger was discovered behaving
boisterously. Take, for instance, Gerrit Hendricksz, who was eleven years old
when he stood before New Netherland’s Council in 1644. There he acknowledged
that he had accidentally hit Jacob Melyn in the eye with a potsherid, although
he claimed that he had actually been aiming for Jacob’s dog. Jacob’s sister had
struck Gerrit for his deed, and consequently during the fracas he had stepped on
and torn her neckerchief when it fell from her shoulders.23 Gerrit did not appear
again regarding this case, and it is unclear why Jacob’s father, Cornelis Melyn, had requested Gerrit’s statement; perhaps he wanted to seek damages from the boy’s father. The son of Frans Clasen, on the other hand, did not stand before the municipal court of New Amsterdam in 1656 when Jan Vinje accused him and his schoolmates of trampling his peas and corn. The clerk of the court did not bother to record the boy’s name and age, but his father defended him and his friends, protesting that the children had “not taken or injured anything to the value of a pea’s pod.” Besides, “many other children, when they came out of school,” had been among the peas. Vinje, who was Clasen’s neighbor, acknowledged that he had struck the boy because he “could not catch any other but him.” The boy’s folly, therefore, was that he had not scampered out of Vinje’s way as quickly as his mates, and thereby he had received such a beating from Vinje with a stick that he had arrived home black and blue, the other children having escaped unharmed. The court ruled that the boy had already received enough punishment for his deed, and Vinje, by his actions against the child, had “destroyed his rights” to sue for damages.24

Jan Vinje’s use of a stick or rod was not an unusual form of punishment to correct a recalcitrant youngster, like Frans Clasen’s son. A ferule and a cane, as well as the rod, were common disciplinary tools and were considered to be less severe than a whip. However, the pain produced by the rod may have depended on who wielded it or where it was applied (back or buttocks) and if that particular part of the body was covered, or not, with clothing.25 Some Dutch moralists urged parents not to spare the rod and to avoid spoiling their children; others advocated fear of the rod rather than its use, for harsh punishment could harden children “into expectations of brutality and wickedness.” Allowing “willfulness to go unchecked and unpunished,” on the other hand, was considered foolish.26

Nevertheless, the Dutch generally frowned upon corporal punishment. The harsh notions of “breaking the will” that were advocated by some Puritan and evangelical cultures were absent in the Netherlands. Humanist thought prevailed there, including the idea of curbing a child’s natural instincts, to some extent, and simultaneously coaxing him or her into learning.27 Some parents in New Amsterdam were apparently influenced by the humanistic philosophies of their Dutch homeland, for they prohibited the schoolmaster of the Latin School in 1661 from punishing their sons, though the boys had fought among themselves and torn “the clothes from each others bodies.”28 The incident in the school did not mean, however, that New Netherland’s parents failed to correct unruly children, but they did perhaps object to the punishment that was administered by someone other than themselves. Lambert Huybertsen Mol gave a bristling reply to the magistrates of New Amsterdam in 1663 when he and his son appeared before them for fighting and drawing a knife. He admitted giving his son a blow, “saying a father may well strike his child.”29

Dutch parents were equally responsible for the moral, as well as the physical and mental, development of their children. They were required to provide the necessities of life—food, drink, clothing, and shelter—and to give children comfort, ease, and discipline.30 Bringing them safely through infancy
and childhood was not always in the parents’ control, due to illness and accidents. Ensuring their futures, however, was achieved through several different means. Consider Leendert Aertsen and Joris Rapalje, two men who leased several cows from the West India Company in 1638. Their contracts stipulated that the first heifer calf produced by the leased herd would be kept for their daughters—that is, Aertsen’s unnamed youngest daughter and Rapalje’s daughter Judith. The cattle were valuable assets, and the arrangements made by their fathers offered two young girls an investment, not only in the colony, but also for their future well-being.31 Juriaen Blanck and Tryntie Claesen, on the other hand, provided for their children’s prospects by writing a joint will in 1662. They stipulated that the survivor of the two was “to bring up their children, clothe them, make them go to school, provide for all their needs, let them learn a trade or an art, by which they may earn their own living, educate them to be virtuous, teach them to know and fear God and to endow them, when they marry or arrive at some other approved condition, as the estate will allow in conscience and equity.”32 Many parents followed Blanck and Claesen’s example, assured that the community of New Netherland would adhere to the Dutch civil law and customs of inheritance.33

Unlike the English customs of primogeniture and entail, the Dutch followed the rules of partible inheritance. Upon the death of a parent (whether mother or father), an estate was divided in half, one portion given to the surviving spouse and the other divided equally among sons and daughters alike. When the second parent died, the offspring received the remaining half, again in equal shares. A surviving parent with underage children often retained the entire estate and presented each child with his or her portion at majority (twenty-five years) or at marriage, whichever came first.34 In cases of remarriage, some fathers or mothers made sure that the children from a previous marriage were cared for before the ceremony ensued. When the widow Geertruyt Jacobsen intended to marry Roulloff Jansen in 1643, a premarital contract was drawn up, whereby the bride promised to give her sons, Jan and Jacob van Vorst, 75 guilders each at the age of majority. The money was each boy’s portion of their deceased father’s estate and was apparently invested, for Jacobsen and her groom promised to rear the boys, “keeping their capital safe and not touching more than the interest.” Furthermore, they would “send them to school and have them taught reading, writing and a good trade, as decent and God-fearing and honest parent[s] are bound to do, but all according to their means and not more.”35

Education

The wills and marriage contracts preserved among New Netherland’s manuscripts stressed the importance of educating one’s children. It was, in fact, expected of parents “according to each one’s condition and opportunity.”36 Contemporary philosophers in the Netherlands maintained that an education, when combined with parental guidance, allowed children to make responsible choices between goodness and evil, diligence and sloth, duty and disloyalty.37 Learning was also a
fundamental part of becoming a responsible and vital member of the community, and New Netherland’s parents used various strategies in achieving that end. They sent their offspring to school, taught them at home, apprenticed them to skilled craftsmen, or used a combination of all three.

In matters of schooling, New Netherland followed the educational practices of the Netherlands, which differed from her European neighbors by her willingness to teach girls, as well as boys, to write and by the perception that it was beneficial to teach the poor. Therefore, boys and girls attended New Netherland’s elementary schools, generally at their parents’ expense, and the poor, who asked to be “taught for God’s sake,” were admitted for free. In the 1660s through the early 1680s, the curriculum in the schools of New Amsterdam and the village of Midwoud (now Flushing) on Long Island included reading, writing, and ciphering (essentially arithmetic), as well as studying the fundamentals of the Reformed or “true” religion. Attendance could begin as early as the age of three, as with Kiliaen van Rensselaer, whose parents sent him to school before his fourth birthday. Beginners first learned the alphabet, then spelling, reading, and grammar, each in turn as their skills increased. Learning to read took about three years in the city of Utrecht and probably a similar length of time in the colony. A child of six or seven could, therefore, have a full understanding of the reading skills. Writing, which took dexterity with the quill and the watchful eye of a demanding teacher, was not considered until reading had been mastered. Most pupils probably also learned to count and recognize figures; however, ciphering, like writing, was a separate subject and was only taught to those whose parents agreed to pay the schoolmaster for such instruction.

Religious instruction began by learning the answers to simple questions about the Bible, to which were added, over time, the catechism and the recitation of the “usual prayers,” the Ten Commandments, the Psalms, and other Bible verses. In 1661 the schoolmasters in New Amsterdam and Breuckelen were guided by the “very concise little catechism” entitled A Brief Method of Instructing the Youth in the Principles of the Christian Religion. Its author, Johannes Megapolensis, a minister of the Dutch Reformed Church in New Netherland, had it published in 1651. The book’s endorsement by the consistory (minister, elders, and deacons) of Breuckelen’s Reformed Church reads like the promotional material on the back covers of today’s paperbacks. It comprised, they noted, “not only the means to attain godliness and salvation, but also the explanation of the Apostles’ Creed and, moreover, of the Lord’s Prayer, both of which are explained by the Rev. in a very learned and concise way and are presented in the form of questions and answers.”

Children in New Netherland began their school day at 8 a.m. In Midwoud the schoolmaster chose a pupil to read the “morning prayer” as it was found in the catechism. Latecomers were warned by three to four pulls on the bell that lessons were starting. The morning session closed at 11 a.m. “with the prayer before meals,” and the afternoon session (1 to 4 p.m.) followed the same pattern, beginning and ending with “the prayer after dinner” and “the evening prayer,” respectively. The evening school, for which no time was stated, opened “with
the prayer of our Lord Jesus Christ and close[d] with a hymn from the Psalms of David.” Catechism instruction commenced on Wednesday and Saturday, so the children could recite the questions and answers before the congregation on Sundays before the afternoon sermon. In the Reformed Church of New Amsterdam, the catechism was also taught every Sunday afternoon. The forty-four boys and twenty-one girls, aged seven to fourteen, who had attended the catechism class of the Reverend Henricus Selyns in New York City in 1698 could recite “all the Psalms, hymns and prayers in rhyme.” The “girls,” noted Selyns, “although fewer in number, had learned and recited more in proportion than the boys.”

In the village of Midwoord pupils attended school for “nine months in succession” from September to June or May through November. During the summer months the schoolmaster was obliged to keep the school open for any number of children, as long as their parents would pay the tuition for a total of ten pupils. If just a few children appeared and agreed to pay the fee for ten, the schoolmaster’s wife took on the responsibilities of instruction. In New Amsterdam the school may have been open all year, as were the schools in the Netherlands. The desire for knowledge was apparently strong among New Netherlanders. According to the Evert Pietersz, the schoolmaster in Nieuw Amstel (now Newcastle, Delaware), in 1657, young and old appeared at his school to learn reading, writing, and ciphering as “soon as winter begins and they can no longer work the soil.” Schoolmasters like Evert Pietersz were allowed to charge a quarterly fee for imparting their knowledge to New Netherland’s children, the cost for each subject clearly delineated in their contracts. For example, in 1661 New Amsterdam’s parents paid 1½ guilders to have a child taught the ABCs, spelling, and reading; 2½ guilders for reading and writing; and 3 guilders for reading, writing, and ciphering. In 1670 Midwoud’s villagers paid their schoolmaster 2 guilders for “ABC children and spellers” and 2½ guilders “for reading and writing together.” Evening readers and writers in Midwoord paid 3 guilders for each subject.

The contracts recorded in Midwoord also stipulated that a schoolmaster be tacitful, sober, and industrious. He was to be patient with the children as the circumstances demanded and friendly in teaching them. He and his colleague in New Amsterdam were also required to keep strict discipline, while children were expected to behave and to follow instructions. In the Netherlands, the school rules were hung on the wall, and the pupils who had read such rules but failed to heed them received two whacks with the ferule or a whipping. Among the offenses were failing to take off one’s cap “before a man of honor”; running, screaming, swearing, gambling, lying, stealing, or playing with knives; racing “wildly or improperly through the streets”; chasing other people’s animals; resisting the wishes of one’s parents; “run[ning] into the fields, or jump[ing] into the hay with sticks”; “stay[ing] at home without the teacher’s or parents’ leave”; bathing in the nude and walking through peas and carrots; making “noise in church”; not saying one’s prayers; tearing books and spoiling paper; “call[ing] one another names”; slinging snot, fleas, and lice at each other; not going nicely to church and home again; and lastly, smiting each other with baskets or jugs.
While some of the seventeenth-century indiscretions above are dated, others are a telling reminder that the momentary blunders of youth change little with the passage of time. Whether or not schoolmasters in New Netherland hung the rules on the walls of their schools was not documented. Certainly, the boys who attended the Latin School in New Amsterdam went unpunished by their master, Alexander Carolus Curtius, when they fought and tore each other’s clothes, as noted earlier. Curtius was criticized by the city’s burgomasters for not keeping “strict discipline over the boys,” while Curtius entreated them to “make a rule or law for the school.”

Curtius’s appearance before the Burgomasters’ Court confirms that some of New Netherland’s boys graduated from the elementary school to the Latin School in New Amsterdam for more advanced learning. Girls would not have attended, for they were barred from higher education, both in Europe and the colonies. Some boys and girls ended their elementary schooling after they had learned to read and may have never acquired the ability to write. Sending a child to school was, in fact, a parental prerogative, and if a future occupation did not warrant reading, writing, or arithmetic, there was no social necessity to attend.

Labor and Vocational Training

Schooled or not, all children were expected to contribute to the household economy, infants and invalids being the only exceptions. Contemporary attitudes promoted the beneficial effects of labor that could begin at the age of seven or according to each child’s strength. Working without the benefit of instruction, however, was disapproved of, for the primary goal of labor was to teach young New Netherlanders an occupation, so that as adults they could make a positive contribution to their community.

Many of New Netherland’s parents prepared their own children for a lifetime of labor. Studies of New York City’s male residents have shown that more than a third of the sons born to men who were in the city in 1664 performed the same work as their fathers; forty-two percent did so in the following generation. Girls also learned various skills from their parents. Consider Maria van Cortlandt, who became a successful brewer in Rensselaerswijk after her marriage to Jeremias van Rensselaer, having learned her father’s brewing and entrepreneurial acumen while still at home in New Amsterdam. If parents opted to continue a child’s training beyond the household environment or elementary schooling, they could make other arrangements by binding their youngsters to the colony’s artisans, merchants, professionals, and farmers.

The system established in New Netherland for vocational training and indentures for service was based on Old World customs and regulated by Dutch civil law. Parents and guardians had a right to bind out a child or ward by means of a formal contract, which was usually executed by a local notary or secretary. Hans Jansen, for example, bound his daughter Marritjen, in 1644, to serve the tavern keeper Philip Gerritsen or his wife for three years. Gerritsen
agreed to provide the girl with “board, lodging and the necessary clothing, and also have her taught sewing, in such a manner as a father should or might do with his child, all however according to his circumstances.” Two days later, the secretary also recorded an indenture for Maria, “a young Negro girl belonging” to the West India Company and the daughter of Big Pieter. She was bound by director Willem Kieft and became the servant of Nicolaes Coorn, a resident of Rensselaerswijk. Maria received no prospects for special training. Her master was obliged to feed and clothe her for four years and then restore her to the director or his successor, “if she be living.”

The formal contracts of apprenticeship or service recorded in the secretarial registers were but one way to direct a child’s future. Many parents and guardians also made oral or casual agreements with neighbors and friends, and consequently their arrangements were never recorded. Countless contracts have also been lost through the passage of time, as is indicated by the fact that parents and masters presented copies of indentures as evidence on numerous occasions to court magistrates.

The contracts, whether oral and written, were binding, and contracting parties sued each other if the terms were neglected. Take the suit brought against Aert Pietersen Tack by Gerrit Heergrins in the court of Wiltwijck (now Kingston, New York), in 1662. Heergrins demanded the wages his son had earned, namely four schepels of wheat and a pair of leather breeches. The boy, however, had left his master’s service prematurely and had gone to Manhattan; therefore, Tack refused to pay. The court agreed and ordered Heergrins to return his son, because he had been hired out “under a written agreement,” which Tack himself had prepared. Also, the boy had left without his master’s consent. Several other parents, who were also sued to return their runaway children, accused masters of abusing them. For example, Grietje Provoost’s “little son” ran home without leave, but she charged his master, the shoemaker Adriaen van Laer, with beating and ill-treating the child. The boy still had a half-year to serve on a two-year contract, and his master demanded his return. Despite his mother’s assertions, the magistrates decreed that the boy serve out his time. Concurrently, they admonished his master to treat his apprentice “properly and not show him a bad example.” Local magistrates enforced the laws but used their discretionary power when necessary to serve the needs of the colony’s children.

Contracts and court cases concerning children and their work in New Netherland offer a window into the world of working children. They contain specific information, such as the names of the contracting parties and of the child involved. Some also record the intended vocation, the length of apprenticeship or service, the child’s age, the recompense, and whether the master would impart some form of education besides vocational training. The four-year apprenticeship contract of Françoys Pietersz, the fifteen-year-old son of Pieter Winne, can be used here as an example. In 1674 his father apprenticed him to the shoemaker Rutger Arentsz, who promised to feed Françoys, provide the materials to make his clothes, grant him time all winter to go to school every evening, and allow him to “help his father three weeks every year in the harvest.” At the end of four
years, he would fit François out “burgher wise with a workaday and a Sunday suit of clothes and linen to correspond.” François’ father agreed to have his son’s clothes made during the four-year period, both woolen and linen, and to have them mended and repaired. He would also arrange to have his linens washed. François promised to serve his master with “all diligence faithfulness as well in the shoemaking business as in all other work in which the master may need him.”

François Pietersz would spend four years with his master to learn the shoemaker’s trade. The term of apprenticeship or service in the contracts made on behalf of other children ranged from one to eleven years, with an average length of about four—younger children serving longer apprenticeships than older children. The occupations and skills mentioned included glazier (glassmaker), shoemaker, smith, tailor, gun-stock maker, carpenter, millwright, tile maker, bookkeeper, sewer or needle worker, surgeon, and turner. François Pietersz was also given the opportunity to attend the evening school in Albany during the winter in 1674. Not all contracts included this stipulation, but when masters agreed to provide learning other than vocational, they had various options. In 1662 the master of Jochim Anthony Robberts had to “teach him, or cause him to be taught, reading and writing”; Laurens Haf’s master had “to send him to school in the winter or teach him properly himself,” while Laurens’ half-sister Anna Tielemans could go to “school during the winter evenings.” Gysbert Schuyler was also allowed to attend school in the evening in 1665 “without neglecting his master’s service, but at his father’s expense.”

Clothing

The details in François Pietersz’s contract concerning his clothes allude to the challenge of keeping ever-growing youngsters properly clothed. Masters were obliged to provide their trainees with the basic necessities, which included clothing, and those who neglected to provide them were, at times, sued in the colony’s courts, as was Jan Hendrick. Caspar Stynmets demanded the “breeches, two shirts, one pr. stockings, and 1 pair shoes” that were due to his brother-in-law, who had served Hendrick for nine months in 1656. The clothes, Stynmets stated, would allow the boy to “engage with other persons,” meaning perhaps that he would make a good impression in his new outfit. The end-of-service clothing that children had earned by working for their masters saved them and their parents the costs of purchasing others, for clothes were dear and valuable possessions. Garments outgrown by older children were given to younger family members or auctioned off to the highest bidder. Garments of the deceased, like those of Teuntje Straetmans, were bequeathed to her eldest daughter, Margarit Meijring, who received her mother’s black undershirt, a linen undershirt, a black apron, a smaller apron, and a round handkerchief in 1662.

Clearly, children’s clothes, like those of adults, were made of linen and woolen textiles that were imported to the colony from the Netherlands and elsewhere in Europe. A child’s wardrobe usually consisted of old and new
clothes and garments for special occasions or for everyday use. There would be several pieces of underwear, including shirts, chemises, and drawers that were made of linen, a durable fabric that could be washed regularly. It was not unusual, therefore, for apprenticeship contracts to include arrangements for washing, either at the master's or a parent's expense. Linen underwear was worn next to the skin to protect it from the coarseness of the outerwear, which was made from a range of woolen fabrics like kersey, serge, and baize, as well as deerskin. These garments were rarely washed, and therefore underwear also protected the outerwear from body soils. Girls wore petticoats or skirts, coats, bodices with stays, and tight-fitting under-vests worn between an undershirt and the outerwear. Boys wore woolen coats, waistcoats, breeches, and mantles. The wardrobe would also have included sundries like head wear (hats and caps), neckwear, footwear, aprons, linen handkerchiefs, and removable sleeves made of durable baize and serge (these added warmth to the bodice or were worn as a protective covering). Ribbons, lace, braid, buttons, and buckles decorated and added color to the outerwear or adorned shoes, hats, caps, and stockings.

The list of clothes belonging to the fourteen-year-old orphan Laurens Haf allows a rare glimpse of one boy’s wardrobe. It was compiled in 1664 when Willem van Couwenhoven was given custody of Laurens by the deacons of the Dutch Reformed Church in Breuckelen. Laurens owned four new shirts, an innocent (a loose-fitting dressing gown), serge trousers, and a new red kersey dress coat. The coat may have matched a pair of red trousers made of barracan, a coarse woolen fabric that was durable and waterproof. Laurens also owned trousers made of white linen and another pair of leather. His sundries included stockings, Iceland stockings, new shoes, half-worn shoes, two black hats, a serge cap, gloves, two handkerchiefs, and two scarves. Whether or not Laurens Haf’s wardrobe was typical for a boy his age is difficult to determine. No list was made of the clothing belonging to his half-sister Anna Tielemans. When their mother Teuntje Straetmans died in October 1662, the inventory of her estate noted that part of the linen cloth found at her house would be made into shirts for the children, while some blue linen would be made into aprons for the eight-year-old Anna.66

Conclusion

Dressed in their woolens and linens, children like Laurens Haf and Anna Tielemans played along Hudson’s river, walked on New Netherland’s streets, attended her schools, and worked in her fields, shops, and homes. They were New Netherland’s future generations, and they occupy a unique niche in the colony’s history. For a brief moment in time—that is, from infancy through adolescence—they were not concerned about the burdensome matters of politics and government that so often preoccupied their elders. Neither were they responsible for the affairs of trade and the growth margins of crops. Yet, children’s lives were profoundly affected by the myriad of decisions made by their parents and those who governed them. How they reacted to the choices made on their behalf was seldom recorded.
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New Netherland’s records, nevertheless, allow us to peer into their world. Most children were born at home, swaddled in diapers, and nursed by their mothers. The devastating effects of childhood diseases and epidemics greatly reduced their numbers. Those who survived prepared for their futures. The glimpses of childhood in New Netherland remind us that a child’s journey toward adulthood in the seventeenth century was very different from that of a twenty-first-century child, yet, in certain respects, so similar.

I want to thank the editor Martha D. Shattuck for her comments on an earlier version of this paper.
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