WASHINGTON IRVING'S USE OF HISTORICAL SOURCES IN THE KNICKERBOCKER HISTORY OF NEW YORK

Thesis for the Degree of M. A.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
DONNA ROSE CASELLA KERN

1977

WASHINGTON IRVING'S USE OF HISTORICAL SOURCES IN THE KNICKERBOCKER HISTORY OF NEW YORK

By

Donna Rose Casella Kern

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of English

1977

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

More than a century and a half has passed since the first appearance of Washington Irving's The Knickerbocker History of New York,[1] but the book's sources remain essentially unexplored. A serious study of these sources entails distinguishing among the oral tradition and literary sources utilized throughout the book, the classical sources used in the early chapters and the colonial sources evident in Books IV - VII. Oral tradition, which adds local color to the book, provides the legend of St. Nicholas and legend of Stuyvesant's silver leg. Literary sources range from the Arthurian legends to the Eighteenth century romance, both of which Irving delightfully burlesques. Classical influences account for the pedantic lore exploited in the early chapters, where Irving drew considerably from Diogenes Laertius's De Clararum Philosophorum Vitis, Dogmatibus et Apophthegmatibus (Third century, A. D.?), Ralph Cudworth's The True Intellectual System of the Universe (London, 1678), and J. J. Brucker's Historia Critica Philosophiae (Leipzig, 1742-1767). The colonial sources, which include William Smith's The History of the Province of New York (London, 1757) and

[1] The edition used throughout is Washington Irving, The Knickerbocker History of New York, ed. Stanley Williams and Tremaine McDowell (1809; rpt. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1927). Hereafter cited as The History.

Ebenezer Hazard's Historical Collections (New York, 1794), shape the book as history and satire.

Little or no scholarly work has been done on each of these categories of sources. The classical motifs in the book remain virtually unexplored, and only recently have critics begun to explore the influences of literary works and oral tradition on the book. While most of the book's colonial sources have been established, no critic has seriously studied how Irving's use of colonial sources shapes the book as history and satire.

Stanley Williams and Tremain McDowell, in their introduction to the 1809 text (1927), and Harry Miller Lydenberg, in his source study of 1953, catalog the classical, literary, and colonial sources of The History. These studies, however, merely cite Irving's sources within the context of a general survey of the book's formative influences. During the last two decades, Thomas Condon and Robert C. Weiss have attempted to come to a general understanding of the historical influences shaping Irving's picture of the Dutch. Nevertheless, they only acknowledge the disparity between the Dutch as Irving satirically presents them and as they existed in fact in old New York.

In the following chapters, I will explore in depth the colonial sources used by Irving. The first chapter is a brief survey of Irving criticism intended to reveal the direction Irving study has taken in relation to Irving's historical and literary uses of his sources. The second chapter identifies and discusses the colonial sources used by Irving, both those

he acknowledges and documents and those he does not. Discovering the undocumented sources, of course, proves to be the more difficult task. In this instance, careful attention is paid to the 1814 Holdings of the New York Historical Society which include a number of possible works at Irving's disposal. In addition, any sources listed in a work from which Irving draws are also considered possible influences on Irving. Among the sources examined here are Smith's history, Hazard's Historical Collections, Robert Juet's Journal and Master Hariot's Journal in the 1625 edition of Samuel Purchas's Purchas his Pilgrimage, John Ogilby's America (London, 1671), and Hackluyt's The Principal Voyages (London, 1598).

This study does not merely list Irving's colonial sources, but attempts to explore the ways in which these sources shape the book as history and satire. Irving uses his colonial sources for both historical and satirical purposes. As an historian, Irving employs many of his sources to create an accurate historical base for his account of the rise and fall of the Dutch dynasty. For instance, Samuel L. Mitchell's partly historical Picture of New York (New York, 1807) strongly influenced the genesis of the book. Smith's history provided the historical framework. And John Pintard's active interest in St. Nicholas accounted for Irving's numerous references to the historical legend of the first Santa Claus.[2]

[2] Irving's use of the legends is considered part of the historical framework of the book.

A close study of these and other sources, reveals that Irving often differs with reliable historical sources. Sometimes these differences are the result of the careless mistakes. In his haste to put together The History, for example, he often misspells names of important historians and places. Sometimes, however, Irving's disputes with reliable historians are based on his own historical discretion. He disagrees, for instance, with two of his major historical sources -- Smith and David de Vries -- as to the dates the New York governors assumed office. Irving's own source for these dates remains a mystery, but his choice of dates does not violate the chronological framework of his book.

Irving's disputes with reliable sources are not, however, always the result of the historian's discretion. He often differs with his colonial sources for the purpose of satire. Irving satirizes characters in history, historians and the validity of historical works. His satire at times borders on the Juvenalian, since he sometimes lashes out at his victims. Predominately, however, Irving's satire is Horatian, because he more often endeavors to present mildly the follies and errors of the Dutch leaders. His satiric portrayal of Stuyvesant's gubernatorial days, for example, is a harsh condemnation of the ignorance and pomposity of this Dutch hero. But his satire of the inept Dutch burghers is milder, almost comically pleasant. Irving's satire on historians and the value of historical work is also light. He enjoys, for instance, challenging the credibility of one historian by comparing him with another historian and then fabricating a new historical source,

like the fictitious Stuyvesant manuscript. By creating this manuscript, Irving emphasizes the dearth of reliable historical sources about old New York.

Irving plays the role of both satirist and historian in his use of colonial sources in The History. As a satirist, he mocks historical figures, historians and history; as an historian, he accurately presents them. The interplay between satirist and historian sometimes results in an unresolved tension between the two. More often, however, the book emerges as a nice blend of satire and history.

The tension between Irving, the satirist, and Irving, the historian, exists because Irving sometimes finds it impossible to be both. As a satirist, he grossly distorts facts for the purpose of exemplifying the vices of those who came before him. He also exaggerates incidents like the interview between Hudson's crew and the natives to emphasize the folly of Dutch leadership.[3] But the distortion and exaggeration remove the historical value of Irving's facts. And, as an historian, Irving wants to present history accurately. He seriously argues with Smith and de Vries over the dates the governors assumed office, and he accurately and profusely quotes The Records of the Colony of New Plymouth in New England and The Records of the United Colonies

[3] Discussing Juet's Journal, Irving notes that he should pass over the interview between the crew of The Half Moon and the natives, because it is not pertinent to his history. In this instance, however, he makes an exception and tells of a "dry joke played by the old commodore and his schoolfellow Robert Juet; which does vast credit to their experimental philosophy, that I cannot refrain from inserting it." Irving, The History, p. 77. Historically, there was no dry joke and Juet was not Hudson's schoolfellow.

for no apparent satiric reason. His historical discretion and Dutch partisanship also result in long serious passages void of satire and replete with historical importance. Many of the discussions of the battles between New Amsterdam and surrounding villages, for example, are historically accurate and hold no importance except to provide historical validity to an otherwise satiric account.

Often, however, Irving neatly blends his satire and history. He uses Smith's chapter on the discover of New York until its surrender in 1664 as an historical basis for his satire. He takes accurate historical facts and colors, rather than distorts them, in order to characterize satirically figures like Kieft and Stuyvesant. In addition, Irving selects specific incidents which are historically accurate and inherently funnly, like Hans Megapolensis's account, in A Short Sketch of the Mohawk Indians, of the first Christians eating sturgeon. By selecting incidents and episodes which serve his own humorous aims, Irving allows historians to create the humor for him.

Irving, in his use of colonial sources in The History, is foremost a satirist. His skill as an historian makes possible his satiric vision. At times he is carried away with his sense of history; at these times the reader feels the tension between Irving the satirist and Irving the historian. But Irving does succeed in achieving a nice blend of history and satire.

CHAPTER I

A Survey of Criticism

When Washington Irving at 26 first published The History in 1809, he neither foresaw the wealth of praise and acknowledgment he would receive for creating a distinctly American work of literature, nor was he prepared for the open hostility of prominent Dutch families. Since its publication, Irving's book has been the subject of numerous critical appraisals that have viewed the work either as a piece of satire or history, or a combination of both. Only recently, has any scholar attempted to study how Irving molds the satiric, comic and historic in a work of literary art.

When The History was first published, few recognized its satire. Pierre Irving writes in The Life and Letters of Washington Irving that only Sir Walter Scott and an anonymous reviewer in the Monthly Anthology and Boston Review saw the concealed satire of the piece. Immediately after the publication of the book, Sir Walter Scott wrote Irving that his sides ached from laughing. In February of 1810, a Monthly Anthology reviewer noted, "The meagre annals of the short-lived Dutch colony have afforded the groundwork for this amusing book, which is certainly the wittiest our press has ever produced."[4]

[4] Pierre Irving, The Life and Letters of Washington Irving (1863; rpt. Detroit: Gale Research Company, 1967), I, pp. 237-241 Hereafter cited as Life and Letters.

With the publication of The History, on the other hand, Irving found himself at the mercy of numerous Dutch families who felt that their Dutch ancestors had been unjustifiably mocked. Pierre Irving writes in the Life and Letters that two months after the book was published, Irving was in Albany, headquarters of colonial authority,to seek a clerkship. One Dutch lady, utterly indignant at Irving's mocking of her ancestors, vowed to horsewhip him. Irving, highly amused at the woman's behavior, sought an introduction with this representative of Dutch ancestry. "She received him very stiffly at first," Pierre reports, "but before the end of the interview he had succeeded in making himself so aggreeable that she relaxed entirely from her hauteur, and they became very good friends."[5]

It was not so easy, however, for Irving to win the literary friendship of fellow Knickerbocker Gulian C. Verplanck. Verplanck, in an anniversary discourse delivered before the New York Historical Society on December 7, 1818, accused Irving of expending his talent on a slanderous theme: "It is painful to see a mind as admirable for its exquisite perception of the beautiful, as it is for its quick sense of the ridiculous, wasting the riches for its fancy on an ungrateful theme, and its exuberant humor in a coarse caricature."[6]

Several Nineteenth century critics recognized the book's comic, but not its satiric, elements. On December 18, 1859,

[5] Irving, Life and Letters, I, p. 247.

[6] Irving, Life and Letters, I, p. 241.

Edward Everett commented before the Massachusetts Historical Society that he knew of no work happier in our language than Irving's The History.[7] In 1887, literary critic Henry Beers, in An Outline Sketch of American Literature, marked the book as a real addition to the comic literature of the world, "a work of genuine humor, original and vital." Beers notes that Irving was the first American to reveal to his countryman the literary possibilities of their early history.[8]

Charles F. Richardson in American Literature, 1607-1885 (1889) also appreciates the distinctly humorous aspects of Irving's history, a theme picked up and developed later by Twentieth century critics. Calling Irving the George Washington of American literature, Richardson notes that Irving's history is original in scene, plot, anecdote and character. New Yorkers might be shocked at the transparent fraud, he notes, but the rest of the world "read, laughed and praised."[9]

At the close of the Nineteenth century, most Irving critics viewed The History as a piece of satire. A critic writing in The Saturday Review of 1894, recognizes a distinctly Eighteenth century quality in the satire. Asserting that Irving seemed to have been cradled in the Augustan age, the reviewer continues: "There is something Addisonian in the

[7] Williams and McDowell, eds., The History, p. xxxvii.

[8] Henry Beers, An Outline Sketch of American Literature (New York: Chautauqua Press, 1887), p. 97.

[9] Charles F. Richardson, American Literature, 1607-1885 (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1889), p. 265.

quality of humour, the choice of propriety and elegance in his phrase, and in the very character and construction of his periods, limpid yet nervous, so light yet so few."[10]

Williams and McDowell were the first critics in the Twentieth century to analyze Irving's blend of history and satire in the book. In a highly valuable introduction to the 1809 edition, the two editors paved the way for Knickerbocker scholarship for the next fifty years. Their study, published in 1927, encompasses: the development of Irving's literary career; the genesis of The History; burlesque elements in the book; the textual variations in the book's five editions; a critical review of the book; and the book's literary and historic sources. The editors particularly emphasize the long-forgotten, dominant mood evident in the book: political satire.[11]

Since 1927, critics of Irving's history have developed many of the themes introduced in Williams'and McDowell's study, particularly The History's sources and satire. E. L. Brooks and Harry Miller Lydenberg, writing in the 1950's, explore the book's origins. E. L. Brooks, in "A Note on Irving's Sources" (1953), adequately compiles the sources,[12] while Lydenberg separates the sources Irving used for satiric

[10] "An American Classic," rev. of The History, The Saturday Review, 20 January 1894, p. 70.

[11] Williams and McDowell, eds., The History, p. xxxvii.

[12] E. L. Brooks, "A Note on Irving's Sources," American Literature, 25 (May 1953), 229-230. Hereafter cited as AL.

purposes and "those used as a basis for such a history as the work contains."[13]

Donald A. Ringe and James E. Evans, writing a decade later, both interpret the book's satire. Ringe, in "New York and New England: Irving's Criticism of American Society" (1967), notes that Irving satirizes the Dutch by creating an antipathy between the Dutch and the Yankees and placing the blame often on the Dutch.[14] Evans in "The English Lineage of Diedrich Knickerbocker" (1974) explores the Augustan influences in the book, a theme first introduced by an anonymous critic in The Saturday Review of 1894. Evans contends that Diedrich Knickerbocker "revivifies a prominent figure in English comic fiction, the self-conscious narrator." According to Evans, Diedrich, like the Tubbian hack and Tristram Shandy, is the real subject of the work.[15]

More recently, Robert C. Weiss, Thomas Condon, Charles Viele, and Michael Black have all dealt in some way with the historical elements of the book. Both Weiss and Condon explore Irving's image of the Dutch. Weiss, in his dissertation (Notre Dame, 1971), examines the historical background of the

[13] Harry Miller Lydenberg, Irving's Knickerbocker and Some of its Sources (New York: The New York Public Library, 1953), p. 20.

[14] Donald A. Ringe, "New York and New England: Irving's Criticism of American Society," AL, 38 (January 1967), 455-467.

[15] Donald Evans, "The English Lineage of Diedrich Knickerbocker," Early American Literature, 10 (Spring 1974), 3-12. Hereafter cited as EAL.

Dutch and the way in which Irving portrays them.[16] Condon, in "New York's Dutch Period: An Interpretive Problem" (1961), demonstrates the ways in which Irving's portrayal of the Dutch in his book has colored America's perception of the period. The book's influences, Condon concludes, have determined "the extent of our present knowledge of the Dutch period."[17]

Viele in "The Knickerbockers of Upstate New York: IV" (1973) also explores Irving's use of the Dutch in The History. He examines Irving's family source for the Knickerbocker name and the influence of the name on New York society. Viele concludes that Irving recognized all too well the influences of the Knickerbocker name upon all aspects of New York society in his "The Author's Apology" prefixed to the 1849 edition of The History. Irving writes:

> '. . .and when I find, after a lapse of nearly forty years, this haphazard production of my youth still cherished (among descendants of Dutch worthies); when I find its very name become a "household word," and used to give the home stamp to every thing recommended for popular acceptation, such as Knickerbocker societies; Knickerbocker insurance companies; Knickerbocker steamboats; Knickerbocker omnibuses; Knickerbocker bread and Knickerbocker ice; and when I find New-Yorkers of Dutch descent priding themselves upon being "genuine Knickerbockers," I please myself with the persuasion that I have struck the right chord . . .'[18]

[16] Robert C. Weiss, "The Image and Use of the Dutch in the Literary Works of Washington Irving," Dissertation Abstracts, 31 (1967), 4799A-4800A (Notre Dame). Hereafter cited as DA.

[17] Thomas Condon, "New York's Dutch Period: An Interpretive Problem," De Halve Maen, 36, No. 3 (1961), 14-15. Hereafter cited as DHM.

[18] Charles Viele, "The Knickerbockers of Upstate New York: IV," DHM, 48, No. 2 (1973), 11-12, 14.

Other contemporary scholars have taken a variety of approaches on The History's sources. Michael Black, now an established Irving scholar, studies the 1848 revision and its sources in his 1967 Columbia University dissertation. Black claims that, in 1849, Irving softened his satire on the Dutch because he felt he had been to offensive in 1849.[19]

The first critic to explore the blend of history and comedy or satire in The History is Martin Roth. In Comedy and America: The Lost World of Washington Irving (1976), Roth considers the comic framework of The History. In his chapter on The History, Roth explores the shifts of comic modality that occur in accord with the changing values that the book traces:

> The reigns of the three Dutch governors -- the overt historical organization of the major part of The History -- are treated in different comic modes: that of Wouter Van Twiller as burlesque comedy and, to a minor extent, domestic humor; William Kieft's as political satire (the only comic mode that Irving felt could be used to treat the present); and Peter Stuyvesant's in the more conventionally lower forms of burlesque comedy -- burlesque epic and romance.[20]

Roth also points out that Knickerbocker, and hence Irving, finds it difficult to reconcile history with the comic myth. Roth sees a conflict between Knickerbocker, the historian, who sees "myth as fog or shadow in contrast to the clear light

[19] Michael Black, "Washington Irving's A History of New York with emphasis on 1849 Revision," DA, 28 (1967), 1386A-1387A (Columbia).

[20] Martin Roth, Comedy and America: The Lost World of Washington Irving (Port Washington: Kennikat Press, 1976), p. 115. Hereafter cited as Comedy and America.

of history," and Knickerbocker, the poet, who sees "the past of myth and legend glowing richly in contrast to the dull matter-of-fact grey of history."[21] Throughout the book, Roth continues, Irving, without consciously knowing what he was doing, demanded that the historian, in order to serve his culture, be its mythographer. He concludes, "The world's literature offers very few examples of histories of wholeness and festive celebration. Irving believed that a new world might at least provide such an occasion."[22]

A century and a half of criticism of Irving's history has quite obviously taken a variety of forms. Over the years, critics have come to accept Irving's book as a nice blend of history and literature written in a mock-epic manner. Some of these writers have looked at the historical sources of the book. Others have explored its comedy or satire. But, except for Roth, no scholar has seriously considered Irving as a satirical historian; and even Roth does not explore how and why Irving's use of colonial sources demonstrates and clarifies the blend of history and satire in Irving's history or the tension between Irving, the historian, and Irving, the satirist.

[21] Roth, Comedy and America, p. 146.

[22] Roth, Comedy and America, p. 148.

CHAPTER II

Inspiration and Initial Sources

The colonial influences, which shape and form Irving's history, comprise an interesting,but confusing,collection. Except for specific references to historians and diarists, we can in many instances only surmise what those sources were. Pierre in Life and Letters notes that a "wealth of erudition" formed the historical base for Irving's burlesque, but he gives no clue as to specific sources of this "erudition." The best clue to the book's sources can be found in Irving's and his early collaborator brother Peter's relationship with the New York Historical Society. When Irving and his brother were compiling notes for The History, in 1807, the New York Historical Society had just been formed.[23] The Irving brothers'

[23] John Pintard, Clerk of the Corporation of New York and City Inspector, initiated plans for the organization of the Society early in 1804. Through several meetings with associates, Pintard engendered interest in a society and on November 20, 1804, the associates appointed a committee to draft a constitution. On December 10, Egbert Benson, revolutionary hero and judge of the New York State Supreme Court, Reverend Samuel Miller and Pintard drafted a constitution calling the Society, "The New York Historical Society." The constitution stated that the principle design of the society should be to discover, procure and preserve whatever may relate to the natural, civil, literary, and ecclesiastical history of the United States in general, and this State in particular." R. W. G. Vail, Knickerbocker Birthday (New York: The New York Historical Society, 1954), pp. 1-47.

association with the literary members of the Society and the availability of the Society's books proved to be their most valuable aids.[24]

Samuel Mitchell, an early member of the Society's Standing Committee, unknowingly played a vital role in the organization of The History. Mitchell's The Picture of New York (1807) provided the genesis of Irving's history. The Irving brothers' original idea for The History was a jeu d'esprit in burlesque of Mitchell's book, then just published, and "with this view they took a vast quantity of notes, in emulation of the erudition displayed in the commencement of that work, which begun with an account of the Aborigines."[25] Like Mitchell, they started with the creation of the world, then dealt with a brief history of early New York,and continued on to an exploration of the post Dutch period in New York.

In 1808, however, Peter sailed for Europe on business[26] leaving Irving to proceed with The History on his own: "It was then that the latter changed the whole plan of the work, and discarding what had reference to a later period than the Dutch dynasty, and grappling with the other mass of notes,

[24] Irving's debt to the Society is clearly acknowledged in Preface to the 1809 edition: "I have been assisted by that admirable and praiseworthy institution, the New York Historical Society, to which I here publicly return my sincere acknowledgment." Irving, The History, pp. 8-9.

[25] Irving, Life and Letters, I, p. 214.

[26] Brother Ebenezer was a partner in a trading house in Europe called Irving and Smith.

undertook to frame a work according to his new conception."[27] He compressed the burlesque of erudition, which characterized the beginning of Mitchell's book, into five introductory chapters and dealt with the Dutch dynasty in the remainder of his book. His new concept was a satire of the Dutch from the founding of New Amsterdam through the last Dutch governor, Peter Stuyvesant.

We can only speculate as to why Irving chose to abandon the original intent of burlesquing Mitchell's book. Since an accurate historical framework was important to Irving's conception, he may have disregarded Mitchell because he was an unreliable historical source. Most of their historical accounts are factually different. For example, Irving relates that in 1614 Captain Sir Samuel Argal, sailing under a commission from Governor Dale of Virginia, visited the Dutch settlements and demanded submission to the English crown. According to Irving, the Dutch submitted for a brief number of years. Mitchell, on the other hand, notes that in 1618, Sir Samuel Argal, Governor of South Virginia Company, regarding the Dutch as intrudors upon his territory, drove them off. (See APPENDIX A)

Another possible reason for abandoning Mitchell as a source could be that Irving's new conception of parodying Dutch New York, instead of Mitchell's book, provided him with richer material for his satiric vision. Pierre, in his biography of Irving, notes that it was a fortunate circumstance that the book was not completed in conjunction, for brother

[27] Irving, Life and Letters, I, p. 220.

Peter did not have the rich comic vein of Irving, "and though his (Peter's) taste was pure and classic, it was a little too nice and fastidious not to have sometimes operated as a drawback upon the genial play of his brother's exuberant humor."[28]

John Pintard, founder of the Society, proved a more valuable influence than Mitchell. Irving's debt to Pintard is reflected in the numerous references to the legend of St. Nicholas throughout the 1809 edition and subsequent editions of The History. Pintard, interested in early New York history, had acquired, through reading and research, a unique understanding of Dutch New York and the rites associated with St. Nicholas, patron saint of the Dutch. Charles W. Jones in "Knickerbocker Santa Claus" (1954) sees Pintard as a direct source for Irving's references to St. Nicholas and the tradition of Santa Claus within the old Dutch families. According to Jones, Pintard's devotion to the Saint was transferred to Irving and the Society.[29] In 1810, Jones notes, the Society held its first anniversary dinner for St. Nicholas and agreed thereafter to hold its meetings on December 6, the saint's feast day.[30]

[28] Irving, Life and Letters, I, p. 220.

[29] Pintard kept journal and almanack entries which consistently refer to rites associated with St. Nicholas.

[30] Charles W. Jones, "Knickerbocker Santa Claus," The New York Historical Society Quarterly, 38, No. 4 (October 1954), 357-383. Hereafter cited as NYHSQ.

Irving's use of the legend of St. Nicholas reflects his desire to play the role of mythographer. Irving enlarges the legend of St. Nicholas into epic proportions in The History. For example, Irving credits St. Nicholas with guiding the Goede Vrouw to America and with insuring the survival of the early city. In the 1812 edition, Irving extends his references to St. Nicholas, describing him several times as a Santa Claus type of figure riding his wagon of gifts and gesturing with his finger beside his nose. (See APPENDIX B)

Pintard further aided Irving in the author's search for sources on early New York, when he called attention to the Society's need for more books and manuscripts and a library to store them. At the time that Irving began The History, the Society's collection was meager. On April 13, 1807, however, Pintard sold to the Society his own substantial library of American history and made a public plea for additional books and manuscripts for the Society. While writing The History, then, Irving had at his disposal Pintard's collection and the constant influx of books and manuscripts.[31]

The specific books and manuscripts in the Society between 1807 and 1809 are unknown, however, since the first catalog of the Society's collections was not published until 1814. Nevertheless, a list of possible colonial sources in the Society

[31] A permanent library for the Society was established at Pintard's request on September 15, 1809, two months before The History was published.

between those years can be ascertained from a comparison of the 1814 catalog with Irving's allusions.[32] The sources in the catalog, which Irving documented, include William Smith Jr.'s The History of the Province of New York (London, 1757); Johannes de Laet's Nieuwe Wereldt ofte beschryninshe van Wist Indien (London, 1625;[33] Ebenezer Hazard's Historical Collections; Consisting of State Papers (Philadelphia, 1792-1794); Dominie Johannes Megapolensis's A Short Sketch of the Mohawk Indians in Hazard's State Papers, Vol. I; Richard Hackluyt's The Principal Navigations, Voyages Traffiques, and Discoveries of the English Nation Within 1500 Years, 12 vols. (London, 1598); John Josselyn's An Account of Two Voyages to New England (London, 1647); Cotton Mather's Magnalia Christi Americana (London, 1702); Benjamin Trumbull's Complete History of Connecticutt (Hartford, 1797); and Master Hariot's Brief and True Report of New Found Land of Virginia (1588) in Principal Voyages, Vol. III.[34]

[32] The earliest recorded date of accessions to the Society's library is 1813 when the catalog was prepared. The collections, including the catalog, were published in 1814.

[33] Though this work is listed in the first catalog of the New York Historical Society, Irving did not use it directly. He used, instead, references to de Laet's work found in a translation of Charlevoix's Journal of a Voyage to North America (London, 1761). However, Irving does not footnote these references.

[34] Irving employs two of Master Hariot's journals. One is recorded in Purchas's Purchas his Pilgrimage and the other in Hackluyt's Principal Voyages.

Not all of the scholarly materials that Irving cites are listed in the 1814 holdings. The sources which are documented in The History, but are not in the catalog, include Pierre de Charlevoix's Journal of a Voyage to North America (London, 1761);[35] Samuel Purchas's Purchas his Pilgrimage (London, 1625); Robert Juet's The Third Voyage of Master Henrye Hudson in Purchas, Part 2, Book III; John Ogilby's America (London, 1671); David de Vries Korte historiael ende Journaels aenteyckeninge van verscheyden Voyagiens in de vier deelen des Wereldtes Ronde (Alckmaer, 1655);[36] and The New Plymouth Records. Since many of the documented sources, like Hariot's and Juet's journals, were avilable only within collections of early historical accounts, we can conjecture that Irving was familiar with other accounts in these collections.

[35] Irving used this edition, a translation, not the French edition in the Library's 1814 holdings. He also lifted several passages in the early chapters verbatim from Charlevoix.

[36] At the time Irving wrote The History, de Vries's account was available only in a manuscript of some thirty pages prepared by Du Simitiere and deposited with the Philadelphia Library Company after his death. The manuscript was in the library at the time Irving was preparing The History. Collections of the New York Historical Society, Second Series (New York: H. Ludwig, 1841), p. 247. A letter to Brevoort on October 23, 1809, indicates that Irving had access to the manuscript: "I have been delayed in putting my work to press by some minute and curious facts which I found in a Ms. in the Phila^{d} Library and which has obliged me to make alterations in the first vol. but tomorrow I begin -- by God."

CHAPTER III

Irving's Major Source: William Smith Jr.

A close study of Irving's history suggests that William Smith Jr.'s chapter "From the Discovery of New York to the Surrender in 1664" in The History of The Province of New York forms the skeleton of Irving's book. The similarity in the general outline of Irving's book and Smith's chapter and the fact that Smith's account was the only reliable source available at the time, leaves little doubt that Smith was Irving's major source. Smith's chapter, like Irving's account of the rise and fall of the Dutch dynasty, covers the discovery of New Amsterdam, the boundaries of the colony, the first governors, the British and Swedish invasions of the colony and the surrender of Peter Stuyvesant.

Irving's use of Smith's chapter does not reveal the tension between Irving, the historian, and Irving, the satirist; instead, it reveals the nice blend of history and satire in the book. As both historian and satirist, Irving relies closely on Smith's general outline of events.. Irving, the historian, values Smith's historical detail. In many cases, their accounts of Dutch New York are very similar, but in two substantive instances, Irving, the historian, concerned with historical accuracy, differs with Smith in details.

Irving, the satirist, on the other hand, creates his satire within Smith's historical framework. Facts pertaining to Smith's outline are colored, not distorted, for satiric purposes. Through his satire, Irving frames the character of the Dutch by blowing the early invasions of Communipaw into epic proportions, mocking Kieft's propensity for proclamations and burlesquing the madness of the epic hero Stuyvesant. The satire that is created out of Smith's historical framework, therefore, does not invalidate the history.

As an historian, Irving relies heavily on Smith for details of many early accounts. Compare, for example, the following passages. In the first one, Smith relates that after driving the British out of Oyster Bay in 1642, Dutch Governor William Kieft "fitted out two sloops to drive the English out of Schuylkill, of which the Marylanders had lately possessed themselves. The instructions, dated May 22, to Jan Jansen Alpendam, who commanded in that enterprise, are upon record, and strongly assert the right of the Dutch, both to the soil and trade there."[37] Irving dutifully notes that the reader can trace Kieft's paper war to

> an armament which he fitted out in 1642 in a moment of great wrath; consisting of two sloops and thirty men, under the command of Mynheer Jan Jansen Alpendam, as admiral of the fleet, and commander in chief of the forces. This formidable expedition, which can only be

[37] William Smith Jr., The History of the Province of New York, From the First Discovery to the Year M.DCC.XXII (London: Thomas Wilcox, 1757), p. 13. Hereafter cited as History of the Province.

> paralleled by some of the daring cruizes of our infant navy, about the bay and up the Sound; was intended to drive the Marylanders from the Schuylkill, of which they had recently taken possession -- and which was claimed as part of the province of New Nederlants.[38]

Another example of how closely Irving relies on Smith is evident in their accounts of the invasion of Maryland. Smith notes,

> In the year 1659, fresh troubles arose from the Maryland claim to the lands on South River; and in September, Colonel Nathaniel Utie, as Commissioner from Fendal, Lord Baltimore's Governour, arrived at Niewer Amstel from Maryland. The country was ordered to be evacuated, Lord Baltimore claiming all the land, between 38 and 40 degrees of latitude, from sea to sea.[39]

Irving writes,

> The rebellious Swedes who had so graciously been suffered to remain about the Delaware, already began to shew signs of mutiny and disaffection. But what was worse, a peremptory claim was laid to the whole territory, as the rightful property of Lord Baltimore, by Fendal, a chieftain who ruled over the colony of Maryland.[40]

As evidenced by a comparison of the above passages, Smith was a reliable historical source. But Irving, concerned with historical accuracy, differs with Smith in two substantive instances: the date that Hudson discovered New York and the dates the New York governors assumed office. Both sets of dates were subjects of controversy at the time that Irving was writing. In selecting 1607 as the date that Hudson discovered New York, Irving alligns himself with the school

[38] Irving, The History, p. 209.

[39] Smith, History of the Province, p. 17

of historians that included Charlevoix. Smith, together with an opposing school, agrees upon the 1608 date.[41]

Irving also differs with Smith on the dates that the New York governors assumed office. Smith lists Van Twiller as assuming the duties of governor in 1629, Kieft in 1638 and Stuyvesant in 1647, while Irving claims the dates were 1629, 1634 and 1647 respectively. In this instance, Irving's own source is a mystery. At the time he was writing, many historians differed on these dates, since primary sources were scarce. It is not unusual, therefore, that Irving should differ with Smith. (See APPENDIX C)

Despite these differences, Irving found Smith's chapter indispensible as an historical framework on which he could build his satire. As a satirist, Irving uses Smith's historical outline to humorously frame the character of the Dutch, a people who believed they lived in a land of paradise. Irving also uses Smith's general outline of details on governors Kieft and Stuyvesant to burlesque the Dutch leaders' inabilities to save the colony of New Amsterdam from British incursion.

In discussing one of the earliest British invasions, Irving begins to create a picture of Dutch ineptitude in warfare. As recorded in Smith's and Irving's histories, the invasions began as early as 1614 when Captain Sir Samuel Argal sailing under a commission from Governor Dale of Virginia,

[41] Smith refers to Charlevoix in his text and in footnotes, and he may have introduced Irving to the French historian. Irving uses Charlevoix profusely in the first five chapters.

visited the Dutch settlements and demanded their submission to the English crown. Smith writes:

> Captain Argal was sent out by Sir Thomas Dale, Governour of Virginia, in the same year, to dispossess the French of the towns of Port-Royal and St. Croix, lying on each side of the Bay of Fundy in Acadia, then claimed as part of Virginia. In his return, he visited the Dutch on Hudson's River, who being unable to resist him, prudently submitted for the present to the King of England, and under him to the governor of Virginia.[42]

Irving's account is similar in fact, but the satirist is careful to emphasize that these ignorant burghers, who believed that Communipaw was indeed a paradise, could do nothing in the face of danger, except smoke their pipes:

> To this arrogant demand, as they were in no condition to resist it, they submitted for the time, like discreet and reasonable men.
>
> It does not appear that the valiant Argal molested the settlement of Communipaw; on the contrary, I am told that when his vessel first hove in sight the worthy burghers were seized with such a panic, that they fell to smoking their pies with astonishing vehemence.[43]

The Dutch ineptitude in warfare during Argal's invasion is expressed through Irving's good-natured satire. Irving's satire becomes harsher when he represents the inner disintegration of the Dutch citizens during Kieft's administration. During the days of Communipaw and the reign of Wouter Van Twiller, the Dutch were respectable, fat and cheerful people. Under the administration of Wilhelmus Kieft, however,

> the disposition of the inhabitants of New Amsterdam experienced an essential change, so that they become very meddlesome and factious. The constant sacerbations

Smith, History of the Province, p. 10.

Irving, The History, pp. 87-88.

> of temper into which the little governor was thrown, by the maraudings on his frontiers, and his unfortunate propensity to experiment and innovation, occasioned him to keep his council in a continual worry.[44]

Kieft's administration reflected, according to Irving, the factiousness, moral disintegration and meddlesomeness of the Dutch citizens.

Dutch leaders are not spared from Irving's satiric poke at the Dutch character. Using Smith's details concerning Kieft's propensity for proclamations and his confrontations with the Yankees, Irving creates a literary caricature of the governor. The caricature begins with Irving's ridiculing description of the dignified William and his ancestry. Irving describes Kieft as "a brisk, wapish, little old gentleman, who had dried and wilted away, partly through the natural process of years and partly from being parched and burnt up by his fiery soul."[45] His name, Irving continues, is a corruption of Kyver which is a wrangler or scolder "and expressed the hereditary position of his family which for nearly two centuries, had kept the windy town of Saardum in hot water." Kieft's reign, Irving concludes, saw "the tranquil current of history depart forever from its peaceful haunts and brawl through many a turbulent and rugged scene."[46]

Irving's satire assumes a political tone with his biting condemnation of Kieft's gubernatorial endeavors, which were

[44] Irving, The History, pp. 218-219.

[45] Irving, The History, p. 178.

[46] Irving, The History, p. 181.

marked by edicts and proclamations. While Smith's history emphasizes Kieft's propensity for proclamations, Irving's clearly mocks it:

> Having thus artfully wrought up his talke of terror to a climax, he assumed a self satisfied look, and declared with a nod of knowing import, that he had taken measures to put a final stop to these encroachments -- that he had been obliged to have recourse to a dreadful engine of warfare, lately invented, awful in its effects, but authorized by direful necessity. In a word, he resolved to conquer the Yankees -- by proclamation.[47]

In Irving's discussion of Kieft's gubernatorial days, he moves away from his role as historian. History is secondary to satire. This is particularly evident in his account of the Yankee invasions and Kieft's response. Irving draws the bare facts from Smith, who notes that "under William Kieft, who first appears in 1638, a prohibition was issued forbidding the English trade at Fort Good Hope; shortly after, on complaint of the insolence of the English, an order of Council was made for sending more forces there to maintain the Dutch territories."[48] Smith also notes that in 1640, the British, under the command of Jacob Van Curler, seized the Dutch garrison at Fort Good Hope and drove them from the banks of the river.[49]

Irving colors these facts by emphasizing Kieft's ignorant dependence on proclamations. Kieft, says Irving, first issued a proclamation of war and then a non-intercourse bill forbidding all commerce between Fort Good Hope and the Yankees.

[47] Irving, The History, p. 183

[48] Smith, History of the Province, p. 12.

[49] Smith, History of the Province, p. 49.

When both proved futile and the Yankees began encroaching on Fort Good Hope, Kieft depended on Jacobus Van Curlet[50] to protect the fort. Eventually, a force was sent to help Curlet, but, according to Irving, the decision was accidental: "the profound council, as I have said, in their pursuit of Jack-o-lanterns, accidently stumbled on the very measure they were in need of." They decided to send 13 men and in 12 months they were ready to march: "By then Curlet and his crew of tatterdemalions had suffered defeat."[51] (See APPENDIX D)

In contrast to Kieft, Stuyvesant is portrayed as a hero. But Irving's representation of Stuyvesant mocks the historical picture of Stuyvesant as a great hero. Stuyvesant's administration, like Kieft's, is presented within an accurate historical framework, but colored with a satiric tone. Irving satirizes the Dutch character of Stuyvesant by embodying his version of Stuyvesant's qualities in two antithetical characters: Jacobus Von Poffenburgh and Peter Stuyvesant. Poffenburgh is a bungling warrior who would relate for hours of "surprising victories -- he had never gained: and dreadful battles -- from which he had run away,"[52] while Irving's Stuyvesant is an illustrious warrior who won the title of Peter the Great and Peter the Headstrong. Both, however, are extreme in their behavior to the point of madness.[53]

[50] Notice that Irving refers to the intrepid warrior as Jacobus Van Curlet and Smith refers to him as Jacob Van Curler.

[51] Irving, The History, p. 191.

[52] Irving, The History, p. 287.

[53] According to Smith, Stuyvesant led the Dutch forces in the Swedish-Dutch disputes. Irving parodies the Stuyvesant who led the Dutch forces, in the character of Jacobus Von Poffenburgh.

Irving caricatures Poffenburgh as a typical Dutch warrior, bungling and unintelligent. For example, he burlesques the warrior's intelligence by describing how he built and named Fort Casimir on the South River. Utilizing the opportunity to play on words, create his own definitions, and generally heighten his satire, Irving notes that Fort Casimir, "a redoubtable redoubt" was named in honor of "a favorite pair of brimstone colored trunk breeches of the governor's."[54] He further points out that the Fort was later called Neiuw Amstel which soon flourished into the town of New Castle, "an appellation erroneously substituted for No Castle, there neither being, nor ever having been a castle, or anything of the kind upon the premises."[55]

In contrast to Poffenburgh, Irving represents Stuyvesant as an illustrious warrior, a hero; but the hero is mad. Irving uses Smith for the facts concerning Stuyvesant's administration, but elevates the governor's deeds to heroic proportions. Irving's account of Stuyvesant's laurels at Fort Christina, for example, follow closely in fact to Smith's historical account. According to both Smith and Irving, Risingh commanded Fort Christina. Smith relates that on September 25, 1655, Stuyvesant came before the Fort and demanded the British surrender. Risingh promptly surrendered and his men vowed obedience to the Dutch West India Company.[56] Irving, however,

[54] Irving, The History, pp. 290-291.

[55] Irving, The History, p. 291.

[56] Smith, History of the Province, p. 16.

elevates the battle to epic proportions. Calling it the most "horrible battle very recorded," the author points out that the Dutch won because of Stuyvesant's cunning scheme of concealing the Dutch in a cover of smoke from their pipes while they charged and chanted the great "song of St. Nicholas."[57]

The surrender of Peter Stuyvesant to the British is also a mock-heroic representation of a factually accurate event. Here Irving represents the last days of glory of a mad hero, determined to protect his beloved colony from British encroachment. Stuyvesant refused to acknowledge Governor Winthrop's letter calling for surrender of the colony and he refused to allow his burgomasters to see the summons of surrender. When they indicated their interest in surrendering, Stuyvesant, in heroic indignation, according to Irving, shouted "that they deserved, every one of them, to be hung, drawn and quartered for traitorously daring to question the infallibility of government."[58] Irving overdramatizes Stuyvesant's reaction to Winthrop's letter and the burgomasters' desire to surrender in order to portray the madness of the epic hero. According to Irving:

> He tore the letter in a thousand pieces -- thre it in the face of the nearest Burgomaster -- broke his pipe over the head of the next -- hurled his spitting box at an unlucky Schepen, who was just making a masterly retreat out at the dorr, and finally dissolved the whole meeting sine die, by kicking them down stairs with his wooden leg![59]

[57] Irving, The History, p. 354.

[58] Irving, The History, p. 423.

[59] Irving, The History, p. 431.

Irving's satiric treatment of Stuyvesant, Kieft and the Dutch character, set within an accurate historic framework drawn from Smith's chapter, exemplifies the blend of history and satire that marks the book. In fact, Irving's satire is made possible by Smith's history. For example, Irving's mockery of Kieft's propensity for proclamations is humorous because Kieft's administration was historically marked by edicts and proclamations. Irving's caricature of Stuyvesant as a mad hero is also appropriate since historically Stuyvesant fought valiantly to preserve New Amsterdam as a Dutch colony. Smith's general outline was no doubt an invaluable source for Irving. In the succeeding chapters, we shall see how Irving distorts facts to preserve his satire and how he allows the sources themselves to provide the humor.

CHAPTER IV

Two Valuable Sources: Charlevoix and Hazard

Irving uses two valuable historians, Pierre de Charlevoix and Ebenezer Hazard to embroider The History with historical facts. Charlevoix's Journal of a Voyage to North America is a principal source in the first two books on the creation of the world and Hazard's State Papers is an important source in the books dealing with the founding of New Amsterdam and the rise and fall of the Dutch dynasty. Irving also employs Charlevoix's allusions to Hans de Laet's Nieuwe Wereldt and Hazard's record of Hans Megapolensis's journal. Irving's use of these sources sometimes reveals the tension between historian and satirist. As an historian, Irving occasionally negates his satiric purpose by quoting lengthy passages from these sources for no apparent satiric reason. As the satirist, however, he often uses these facts to mock ancient and contemporary controversies, pompous historians and inherently ridiculous historical accounts. At these times, Irving's history and satire neatly work together.

Irving employs Charlevoix to parody the great historical debates among early historians who went to great lengths to explain the origins of North America. Like Charlevoix, he explores the studies of historians and scientists and the

controversies over migrations by land or sea. But Irving's exploration is a mockery of Charlevoix's account and the theories themselves. Compare, for example, the following passages. Charlevoix deals seriously with the various theories on the populating of North America:

> The Friselanders have likewise had their partisans with respect to the origin of the Americans. Ussridus Petri and Manconius, assert that the inhabitants of Peru and Chili came from Friseland. James Charron and William Postel do the same honour to the Gauls, Abraham Milius to the ancient Celtae, Father Kirker to the Egyptians, and Robert Le Compte to the Phenicians; every one of them at the same time excluding all the rest.[60]

Irving, on the other hand, satirically attacks the value of these theories:

> I pass over the supposition of the learned Grotius, who being both an ambassador and a Dutchman to boot, is entitled to great respect; that North America, was peopled by a strolling company of Norwegians, and that Peru was founded by a colony from China -- Mancor of Mungo Capac, the first Incas, being himself a Chinese. Nor shall I more than barely mention that Father Kircher, ascribes the settlement of America to the Egyptions, Budbeck to the Scandinavians, Charron to the Gauls, Juffredus Petri to a skating party from Friesland, Milius to the Celtae, Marinocus the Sicilian to the Romans, Le Compte to the Phoenicians, Postel to the Moors, Martyn d'Angleria to the Abyssinians.[61]

As he does with Smith's history, Irving colors Charlevoix's facts to create his satire of these great historical debates.

[60] Pierre de Charlevoix, Journal of A Voyage to North America (1720-1722), rpt. in March of America Facsimili Series, No. 36 (Ann Arbor: Xerox Corp., 1966), p. 23. Hereafter cited as Voyage to North America.

[61] Irving, The History, p. 45.

Charlevoix is also valuable to Irving for his references to de Laet's Nieuwe Wereldt.[62] The Dutch edition of the work is listed in the 1814 holdings, but Irving uses Charlevoix's lengthy interpretation because it is inherently ridiculous. Irving allows Charlevoix to create the humour for him. Without footnoting the French historian,[63] Irving states that

> Hans, in fact, contradicts outright all the Israelitish claims to the first settlement of his country, attributing all those equivocal symptoms, and traces of Christianity and Judaism, which have been said to be found in divers provinces of the new world, to the Devil, who has always affected to counterfeit the worship of the true Deity.[64]

Irving copies the passage almost exactly from Charlevoix who notes,

> He (de Laet) adds, that it is much more natural to attribute all those equivocal marks of Christianity and Judaism, which have been believed to subsist in divers provinces of the New World, to the Devil, who has always affected to counterfeit the worship of the true God.[65]

Irving employs Charlevoix extensively for satiric purposes in the early books. Hazard is a major source in the

[62] De Laet, director of the Dutch West India Company and later co-patroon of Rensselaerswyck, wrote his New World as a work of geographic description. The book consists of numerous tables and deals chiefly with geographic location in the new world, particularly in the colony of New Amsterdam. Franklin J. Jameson, Narratives of New Netherland: 1609-1664 (New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1967), pp. 31-33.

[63] Irving does not footnote Charlevoix when he copies this passage. But he is playing the role of satirist here, not historian.

[64] Irving, The History, pp. 44-45.

[65] Charlevoix , Voyage to North America, pp. 25-26.

later books.[66] Irving's use of Hazard most definately reveals the tension between and blend of history and satire in Irving's book. In one instance, Irving uses Hazard to make fun of the contemporary Hurl Gate-Hell Gate controversy. At the same time, he quotes long passages replete with historic importance from Hazard's records. Irving also uses Hazard as an historical base on which to create a caricature of Peter Stuyvesant. In addition, he alludes to Hazard for the purpose of challenging Smith. Finally, he picks passages, like Megapolensis's Short Sketch, which are inherently funny and serve his own humorous purposes.

Irving uses Hazard, and later Ogilby, to exploit the contemporary Hurl Gate-Hell Gate controversy. In a footnote, Irving points out that the name of Hell Gate "as given by our author, is supported by a journal still extant, written in the Sixteenth century, and to be found in Hazard's State Papers."[67] Irving's concern with the pronunciation is a mockery of the debate over whether the combination of rocks and whilpools in the Sound above New York should be called Hurl Gate or Hell Gate. (See APPENDIX E).

In the same chapters in which he exploits this controversy, Irving quotes accurately and extensively from Hazard for no

[66] A publisher and postmaster general of the Federation, Hazard published a collection of state papers in Philadelphia during the years 1792 through 1794. According to Williams and McDowell, Irving is most indebted to Hazard for specific details. He directly quotes and footnotes Hazard several times throughout The History.

[67] Irving, The History, p. 94.

apparent satiric purpose. In discussing the atrocities of the Yankees, for example, he quotes:

> '24 June 1641. Some of the Hartford haue taken a hogg out of the vlact or common and shut it vp out of meer hate or other prejudice, causing it to starve for hunger in the stye!
>
> 26 July. The foremencioned English did againe driue the companies hoggs out of the vlact of Sicojoke into Hartford; contending daily with reproaches, blows, beating the people with all disgrace that they could imagine.
>
> May 20, 1642. The English of Hartford haue violently cut loose a horse of the honored companies, that stood bound vpon the common or vlact.
>
> May 9, 1643. The companies horses pastured vpon the companies ground, were driven away by them of Connecticott or Hartford, and the heardsman was lustily beaten with hatchets and sticks.
>
> 6. Again they sold a young Hogg belonging to the Companie which piggs had pastured on the Companies land.'[68]

Another direct quote tells of a deputation requesting admission into the recently formed league of east countries,[69] on behalf of the plantation of Rhode Island. Irving extracts only the last paragraph of the letter which appears in its entirety in a group of papers in Hazard's collection pertaining to the organization and operations of the United Colonies:

> 'Mr. Will Cottington and captain Partridg of Rhoode Iland presented this insewing request to the commissioners in wrighting ---
>
> 'Our request and motion is in behalfe of Rhoode Iland, that wee the Ilanders of Rhoode Iland may be rescauied into combination with the united colonyes of New England in a firme and perpetuall league of friendship and amity of ofence and defence,

[68] Irving, The History, pp. 231-232.

[69] Irving refers to the league under several titles often calling it the Council of Amphyctions. Both Irving and Hazard call it the United Colonies and the League of the East Countries.

> mutual advice and succor upon all just occasions for our mutuall safety and well-faire, &c
>
> Will Cottington,
> Alicxsander Partridg' .[70]

The above passages hold no importance except to provide historical validity in an otherwise satiric account.

In some instances, however, Irving uses Hazard as an historical base from which he can create his caricature of Peter Stuyvesant. In a footnote, he states that his source for the following passage is Hazard:

> Struck with the gallant spirit of the brave old Peter and convinced by the chivalric frankness and heroic warmth of his vindication, they refused to believe him guilty of the infamous plot most wrongfully laid at his door, with a generosity for which I would yield them immortal honour, they declared, that no determination of the grand council of the league, to join in an offensive war, which should appear to such general court to be unjust.[71]

In addition to using Hazard's collection as an historical base for serious and comic discussions, Irving also alludes to Hazard for the purpose of challenging Smith. Before the fall of the Dutch dynasty, Stuyvesant, eager to alleviate the tension between New Amsterdam and the Council, made a journey to the east country to consult the league. Referring to this journey, Irving notes that Hazard, unlike Smith, details these negotiations in the State Papers: "For certain of the particulars of this ancient negotiations see Haz. Col. State Pap. It is singular that Smith is entirely silent with respect to the memorable expedition of Peter Stuyvesant

[70] Irving, The History, pp. 231-232.

[71] Irving, The History, p. 279.

above treated by Mr. Knickerbocker. EDITOR (Irving's note)"[72] Throughout The History, Irving mocks historians who think they are the foremost authority, by challenging the validity of one source against that of another.

Irving uses Hazard as an historical base on which he can play the role of satirist and historian. In one case, he allows an historian, Megapolensis,[73] whose A Short Sketch of the Mohawk Indians appears in Hazard, to create the satire for him. Irving mocks Christians, Indians, and historians by quoting two inherently funny passages from the sketch:

> Domine Hans Megapolensis, treating of the country about Albany in a letter, which was written some time after the settlement there of, says, 'There is in the river great plenty of Sturgeon, which we christians do not make use of; but the Indians eate them greedilie.

and

> 'For', says he 'if theye can get to bedd with another mans wife, theye thinke it a piece of wit.'[74]

When dealing with sources like Hazard, Charlevoix, and de Laet, Irving satirizes the historians, history and figures in history. In his use of these sources, we can see the tension between and the blend of satire and history. Irving, for example, while accurately reporting historical details

[72] Irving, The History, p. 403. The "Articles of Agreement, Sept. 19, 1650," is one of several agreements between Stuyvesant and the Council which appear in The Records of the United Colonies of New England.

[73] Megapolensis came to New Amsterdam in 1642 as minister of Rensselaerswyck. Jameson, Narratives, pp. 165-167.

[74] Irving, The History, p. 109, 323.

for no satiric purpose, suddenly quotes a ridiculous passage on loose Indians. At the same time, Irving can neatly blend history and satire by using Hazard as an historical base from which he can create the mock-heroic character of Peter Stuyvesant.

CHAPTER V

Other Sources

The previous works discussed -- Smith's History of the Province, Charlevoix's Voyage to North America, de Laet's Nieuwe Wereldt and Hazard's State Papers -- were Irving's major sources. A close analysis of these sources revealed the tension between and blend of satire and history in the book. This tension and blend is also evident in other less prominent sources of The History: the journals of Robert Juet and Master Hariot in Samuel Purchas's Purchas his Pilgrimage, Richard Hackluyt's The Principal Navigations, David de Vries's Journal, Benjamin Trumbull's History of Connecituct, John Ogilby's America, John Josselyn's An Account of Two Voyages to New England, Cotton Mather's Magnalia Christi Americana, and the Stuyvesant manuscript.

Irving uses Juet, Hariot, Hackluyt, de Vries and Trumbull to mock historians and to attack Dutch rivals. For example, he grossly distorts Juet's facts to parody many historian's mythical portrayal of the New World as a land of paradise. He allows passages in Hariot's journal to create the humor for him and he accurately uses Hackluyt's records, but invalidates the records by poking fun at the competence of its authors. He completely abandons satire when using

de Vries as a source and uses Trumbull as an historical base from which he can satirize the Yankees.

Both Juet's[75] and Hariot's journals are found in Samuel Purchas's Purchas his Pilgrimage.[76] The book, in twenty volumes is a collection of the history of the world in sea voyages and land travels. Juet's journal is an account of the voyages of Henry Hudson on the ship The Half Moon and Hariot's journal is an account of the New World.

Irving grossly distorts a number of Juet's facts in order to show that historians have painted a false picture of America as a mythical land of paradise. In fact, he plays the very role he satirizes. Irving ignores the historic detail that Juet was one of the leaders who mutinied against the explorer, emphasizing, instead, that there was an amiable atmosphere on The Half Moon. Irving also establishes Juet as Hudson's first mate and childhood friend. Irving's intent to perpetuate this discrepancy is evident in the fact that the passage he chooses to quote is the only one in Juet's Journal that does not hint of mutiny:

> 'Our master and his mate determined to try some of the chiefe men of the countrey, whether they had any treacherie in them. So they tooke them downe into the

[75] A copy of Juet's Journal is listed in the 1814 holdings. The journal, however, was reprinted for the Society and included in its collections in 1811, two years after Irving completed The History.

[76] The Reverend Purchas (1577-1626), chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury and rector of St. Mark's, Ludgate, was a geographer who assisted cosmographer Reverend Richard Hackluyt, another Irving source. When Hackluyt died in 1616 he left all his materials to Purchas who published them under the title of Hackluytus Posthumus of Purchas his Pilgrimage. Jameson, Narratives, pp. 13-14.

> cabin, and gave them so much wine aqua vitae that they were all merrie; and one of them had his wife with him which sate so modestly, as any of our countrey women would do in a strange place. In the ende, one of them was drunke, which had been abroad of our ship at the time that we had been there, and that was strange to them, for they could not tell how to take it.'[77]

Another narrative recorded in Purchas is Master Hariot's Journal. Irving refers to the work as an "interesting history" and does not distort any of the journal's facts as he does with Juet's journal. The journal already contains numerous, curious, and comic accounts which Irving uses to poke fun at Stuyvesant's archrivals. As he does with Megapolensis's sketch, Irving selects those passages which by their humorous nature add to Irving's satire. For example, he employs Hariot's description of the gargantuan Susquesahanocks because it adds to the humor of Irving's account of the mosstroopers of the east and the giants of Maryland molesting Stuyvesant. The traveller describes the Marylanders as "'giantly people, strange in proportion, behavior, (sic) and attire -- their voice sounding from them as if out a cafe.'" Hariot further claims that their tobacco pipes were three-quarters of a yard long and "'the calfe of one of their legges was measured three quarters of a yard about, the rest of his limbs proportional.'"[78]

The objects of Irving's satire in the above passages are Dutch rivals and Dutch historians. On occasion, he

[77] Irving, The History, p. 77. Juet's Journal originally appeared in 1625 in the third volume of Purchas. The passage quoted here is from the thirteenth volume of the 1906 edition of Purchas.

[78] Irving, The History, p. 143.

satirizes other European nationalities, like the Italians, Irving accurately records John Verrazano's discovery of the Hudson River,[79] but satirizes the Florentine's character to invalidate the record and express his partisanship towards the Dutch. He pokes fun at the Florentine by noting that Verrazano could not have possibly discovered the Hudson River, since he was not Dutch. The account of the discovery, says Irving "applies as well to the Bay of New York as it does to my nightcap." He calls Verazano a crafty native Florentine whose Italian heritage presupposes an inability to discover such a delightful bay. Hudson, on the other hand, was Dutch and "inasmuch as his expedition sailed from Holland, being truly and absolutely a Dutch enterprise -- and though all the proofs in the world were introduced on the other side, I would set them at naught as undeserving my attention."[80]

Irving completely abandons his satiric tone when using David de Vries as an historical source. In dealing seriously with the Dutch, Irving is very concerned with historical accuracy.. Playing the role of historian, as he does with Smith, Irving records de Vries's account, but at times disputes it. He accurately employs de Vries extensively throughout The History, principally in reference to Anthony Van Corlear,

[79] The record of the discovery is found in a letter from Verrazano to Francis the First appearing in Hackluyt's The Principal Navigations, Traffiques and Discoveries of the English Nation, 12 vols. (New York: McMillan Company, 1904), pp. 430-431.

[80] Irving, The History, p. 74.

but also in explaining Smits Vleye, where the Dutch overhauled their ships, and the windmill which stood on the southeast bastion of Fort Amsterdam. De Vries's expertise on the subject was gained during three voyages to New Amsterdam made during the reigns of Van Willer and Kieft.

In discussing Corlear, Irving finds de Vries helpful, but not always correct.[81] Irving uses de Vries as a source for the names of Corlear's Hook, Corlear's Plantagie and Bouwery, but claims the traveller erred on dates: "De Vries makes mention in one of his voyages of Corleas Hoek, and Corleas Plantagie, or Bouwery; and that too, at an early date than the one given by Mr. Knickerbocker -- De Vries is no doubt a little incorrect in this particular. EDITOR, (Irving's note.)"[82] Irving explains that Stuyvesant awarded Van Corlear for services in protecting Fort Amsterdam by naming Corlear's Hook after him. De Vries contends the award was made during the governorship of Kieft.

Irving is not disputing de Vries here to satirize the historian, his work, or figures in history. As evidenced earlier, a close study of Irving's dates in The History reveals a considerable discrepancy between Irving and some of the major historians of New York, particularly Smith. De Vries lists Van Twiller as taking office in 1633 and Kieft in 1643. Irving, however, claims Van Twiller became

[81] Irving's differences with de Vries may have resulted from the conflict between the traveller's pro-British and Irving's pro-Dutch attitudes.

[82] Irving, The History, p. 341.

governor in 1629 and Kieft in 1634. Irving's altered chronology may account for an honest dispute with de Vries over Corlear's Hook.

Irving is accurate in the information he drew from de Vries's journal; but the proof that he resented the traveller's pro-British attitude may be found in what Irving does not include in The History. Irving ignores, for example, the third journal of a voyage in 1638, where de Vries expresses discontent with the Dutch rulers, particularly their treatment of the Indians, because it portrays the Dutch as barbaric rulers. In the 1643 entry, de Vries recounts an incident during the reign of William Kieft in which 40 Indians were attacked and brutally murdered by Dutch soldiers at Corler's Hook on Corler's plantation.[83] The Indians retaliated by burning homes, but not by murdering Dutch women and children as the Dutch had done to the Indians. According to de Vries,

> When now the Indians had destroyed so many farms and ment in revenge for their people, I went to Governor William Kieft, and asked him if it was not as I had said it would be, that he would only effect the spilling of Christian blood. Who would now compensate us for our losses? But he gave me no answer. He said he wondered that no Indians came to the fort. I told him that I did not wonder at it 'why should the Indians come here where you have so treated them.[84]

Irving also expresses a pro-Dutch bias when discussing Trumbull's Complete History of Connecticut. Irving disagrees with Trumbull's main contention that the "Dutch were mere

[83] De Vries refers to the Dutchman as Van Corler, while Irving calls him Van Corlear..

[84] David de Vries, Voyages from Holland to America: A.D. 1632-1644, in Jameson's Narratives, pp.181-234.

intrudors." Trumbull, according to Irving, claims that the Dutch made every effort to prevent the British from establishing trade up the Connecticut River. Irving disputes him, noting that the Dutch were not intrudors, because they had established trading rights long before the Yankees had arrived.

Trumbull, as a source, however, was more useful as a base for Irving's satire of the Yankees. Eager to disprove Trumbull's contention that the Dutch were intrudors, Irving embarks on a satiric campaign against the Connecticut Yankees. Throughout The History, he emphasizes their barbaric behavior:

> That my reader may the more full comprehend the extent of the calamity, at this very moment impending over the honest, unsuspecting province of Nieuw Nederlandts, and its dubious Governor, it is necessary that I should give some account of a horde of strange barbarians, bordering upon the eastern frontier.[85]

Irving jocosely criticizes the Yankees for boisterousness, banishing, scourging and hanging. Irving further claims that this gang of marauders constantly penetrated Dutch settlements, haunting families with their "unparalleled volubility and their intolerable inquisitiveness." The Yankees, according to Irving, consistently beleagued Fort Good Hope, the trading post which the Dutch erected in the 1620's, nearly two years before the British arrived.[86]

[85] Irving, The History, p. 154.

[86] In satirizing the Yankees, Irving disagrees with Trumbull's contention that the British and Dutch had equal rights to trade along the river. The Connecticut historian notes that in 1633 William Holmes, commissioned by the governor of Plymouth, established a trading house on the mouth of the

Irving abandons his attack on the Yankees when he uses the sources Ogilby, Josselyn, Mather and the Stuyvesant manuscript. He employs Ogilby for his inherently humorous passages and for his references to Hell Gate. Josselyn's and Mather's irrational statements on witchcraft allow Irving to take a good-natured satiric poke at misused erudition. And he uses the Stuyvesant manuscript to mock the dearth of scholarly material on old New York.

Irving depends on Ogilby's America[87] for its map and description of the northeast. Irving accurately records the locations of Tappan Bay, the country beyond Fort Aurania, the Mohegan River and Hell Gate, but his accounts are humorous because he lifts them from Ogilby's already fantastic descriptions. For example, Irving notes that the Bay's name is a corruption of Top-paun, so called from a tribe of Indians "which boasted 150 fighting men." North of this bay and beyond Fort Aurania is a group of lions. Farther north, on the border of Canada, is a strange beast: "On the borders of Canada there is seen sometimes a kind of beast, which hath some resemblance with a horse, having cloven feet, shaggy

---

Connecticut River in Windsor. At the same time, he notes, the Dutch set up a house of "good hope" on the river. Trumbull contends that the Yankees had legitimate trading rights along the river the Dutch claimed was all theirs. Smith is Irving's source for his argument that the Dutch set up trading rights ten years earlier. Benjamin Trumbull, Complete History of Connecticut, 2 vols. (New Haven: Maltby, Goldsmith and Company, 1818), pp. 34-37.

[87] Ogilby's America (London, 1671) is an account of the New World, its vegetation, geographic points, settlements and people. The History contains five separate references to America, references to location and names.

mayn, one horn just on the forehead, a tail like that of wild hog, and a deer's neck.[88] In this passage, Irving is parodying Ogilby's descriptions and other ridiculous historic accounts.

Using Ogilby's geographic data, Irving also mocks the controversy over the names of Hurl Gate and Hell Gate. He emphasizes the irrationality of the controversy by taking a side. Jocosely supporting Hell Gate as the ture name of the combination or rocks and whirlpools in the Sound above New York, Irving notes that "certain wise men who instruct these modern days have softened this characteristic name into Hurl Gate." The original name, he continues, as laid down in the Dutch manuscript and an old manuscript written in French, calls it Hellgat. The name as "given by our author is supported by Ogilvie's History of America published 1671." Ogilby's references state that the settlers raised forts "near the Branch of the Nordt River, which they call Hell-Gate." (See APPENDIX E)

Irving also uses Ogilby together with Josselyn to challenge the validity of one historian against that of another.[89] As geographer and historian respectively, both

[88] Though Irving obviously drew from Ogilby, he does not footnote the goegrapher here. Ogilby's account reads: "On the Borders of Canada there is seen sometimes a kind of Beast which hath some resemblance with a Horse, having Cloven Feet, Shaggy Mayn, one Horn just on their Forehead, a Tail like that of a wild Hog, black Eyes, and a Deer's Neck. Ogilby, America, p. 10.

[89] Eventually, Irving solves the problem of finding a respectable source by creating his own, the Stuyvesant manuscript.

disagree on the name of the river that the Indians called Shatemuck. Irving, poking fun at these scholars, emphasizes their differences. Irving notes that Ogilby's nomenclature is Manhattan. However, in "an excellent little account published in 1674" the river is called by John Josselyn, Gent., the Mohegan. In An Account of Two Voyages to New England, Made during the years 1638, 1663,[90] Josselyn states that New York is situated at the mouth "of the great River Mohegan."[91] We have already seen that challenging one source against another is a common ploy in The History.

Josselyn's work is also important to Irving for its references to witchcraft. Irving uses Josselyn's statements on witchcraft to take a good-natured satiric poke at misused erudition. Josselyn's account of witchcraft, which Irving ironically calls both "authentic" and "judicious," states,

> There are none that bey in the Country, but there be Witches too many, bottle-bellied Witches amongst the Quakers, and others that produce many strange apparitions, if you will believe report, of a Shallop at Sea man'd with women; of a Ship and a great red Horse standing by the main mast, the Ship being in a small Cove to the East-ward vanished of a suddain, of a Witch that appeared aboard of a Ship twenty leagues to the Sea to a Mariner who took up the carpenters broad axe and cleft her head with it, the Witch dying of the Wound at home, with such like bugbears and Terri culamentaes.[92]

[90] Though Irving states the book was published in 1674, Josselyn's account was published in 1672 and released in 1674. John Josselyn, An Account of Two Voyages to New England, Made During the Years 1638, 1663 (Boston: William Veazie, 1865). Hereafter cited as Account.

[91] Josselyn, in his journal, earlier describes New England as an island "surrounded on the North with the Spacious River of Canada" and "on the South with Mahegan or Hudson River."

[92] Josselyn, Account, p. 53.

Irving also satirizes misused erudition when discussing Cotton Mather's account of witchcraft. The author prefaces his comments on Mather's account of Salem witchcraft by informing his reader that he will now offer them some remarkable histories. Irving notes that for every one of these, according to Mather, "We have had such sufficient evidence, that no reasonable man in the whole country ever did question them."[93] Irving achieves his satire here by emphasizing Mather's own irrational belief that no reasonable man could deny the existence of witchcraft.

Irving also distorts Mather's account in order to heighten his satire on misused erudition. He quotes from Mather's chapter "Theumatographia Pneumatic" in Magnalia Christi Americana, where Mather lists several examples of persons charged with witchcraft because of strange fits, violent agitations and premonitions of death. Parodying Mather's irrationality, Irving calls witchcraft the dark crime which continued to increase at an alarming degree. It was marked by black cats, broomsticks and women weeping three tears out of the left eye. Irving captures the tone of Mather's account and succeeds in establishing his satire by mentioning broomsticks and black cats, neither of which are included in Mather's chapter.[94]

[93] Irving, The History, p. 283.

[94] Irving also uses The New Plymouth Records to validate his satiric attack on witchcraft and its protagonists. He notes that, according to these records "judicious and bloody laws had been erected against all solemn conversing or compacting with the devil by way of conjuracer or the like." Irving, The History, p. 281.

Irving's attempt to find historical validity in the accounts of Mather and Josselyn often proves futile. When history fails him, he becomes the satirist. In order to parody all his legitimate sources, Irving creates his own source: the Stuyvesant manuscript. When information can not be found in other sources, it is usually found in the Stuyvesant manuscript. Irving notes, for example, that the Stuyvesant manuscript is one of the few which mentions the renowned patroon Michael Paw. In the end, however, even this source fails Irving as it recounts little of the Stuyvesant expedition to the Council of Amphyctions. By the fall of the Dutch dynasty, Irving, the historian, concedes that there is a dearth of legitimate sources on old New York.

CONCLUSION

A study of how Irving uses his sources for The History involves considerably more than a detailed exploration of colonial influences. Scholarship is still meager in several areas including source studies in each of the successively revised editions and explorations of the classical and literary sources which shape and form Irving's satire.

A study of the sources in the revised editions is valuable, since Irving significantly revised his book three times: 1812, 1819 and 1849. In each of these revisions, he added both classical and colonial sources. Adrian Van der Donck, for instance, is an added colonial source in the 1812 edition. Irving acknowledges the historian together with the New York Historical Society in his Preface. In addition, Irving's satire of the Dutch in the 1848 edition is not as harsh as in earlier editions. In the later years, Irving, concerned that he may have offended the Dutch, polished what a good part of his public thought was mere scandal.

Few source studies have been conducted on the classical and literary sources. The classical sources, as mentioned earlier, dominate in the early pages of Irving's book. Here Irving not only refers to the writing of the classical philosophers and scientists, but creates a tone of scholarly inquisitiveness that clearly mocks the classical mind.

Irving also mocks the literary mind by adopting the satiric caste of Sterne and Fielding. His style of directly addressing both his sources and the reader is reminiscent of these English satirists who ridiculed literary conventions. Irving's satire, however, is not limited to this school of writers. His characterization of the chivalric Dutch leaders, for instance, is a mockery of the Arthurian legend.

Any source study of Irving's history is incomplete unless the classical, literary and colonial sources are explored fully, for each of these sources influence the book as a whole. For example, the classical references dominate in the early books, but Irving also refers to classical philosophers, like Diogenes, throughout the later books on New Amsterdam. Any further consideration of the colonial sources, therefore, must include a study of the classical sources.

An analysis of the classical, literary and colonial throughout The History reveals a complete picture of how Irving is both satirist and historian. As a satirist, he mocks history, the historian, figures in history and even himself. As an historian, he wants to frame an accurate historic picture of the rise and fall of the Dutch dynasty. A study of his sources points to both a tension between the satire and history and a nice blend of satire and history..

The History holds a special place in Irving's literary career, because it reveals how well Irving can be both satirist and historian. In The History Irving discovered he could not be both. In the years following the publication of the first edition, Irving abandoned this dual role in his other writing.

He became either an historian looking back at the past and writing sketchbooks, which blend history and legend, or a satirist poking fun at his contemporaries. In his later years, he gave himself totally over to historical pursuits writing biographies of Columbus and Washington. As a lover of the past, Irving discovered in The History that he could not both appreciate the past and satirize it.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Samuel Mitchell's A Picture of New York and Washington Irving's The Knickerbocker History of New York

The original idea for Irving's book was a jeu d'esprit in burlesque of Mitchell's book, then just published. Mitchell collected in his book a number of interesting facts together with a brief history of New York. The beginning of The History satirically emulates the scholarly material at the opening of Mitchell's work, but differs drastically in the remaining pages. Irving principally parodies Mitchell's use of erudite sources and his detailed descriptions of New York.

Mitchell begins his book by denouncing Guthrie's New System of Modern Geography, because in the work "there is hardly anything that there ought to be."[95] Morse's American Geography is of greater merit, according to Mitchell, since "he has done more justice to his country than any other writer."[96] In a similar manner, Irving begins by referring to renowned philosophers, like Hesiod, Bishop Burnet and Zenophanes, as "outlandish philosophers whose deplorable ignorance, in spite

[95] Samuel Mitchell, A Picture of New York (1807; rpt. Ann Arbor: Xerox Corp., 1975), p.iv. Hereafter cited as A Picture.

[96] Mitchell, A Picture, p. v.

of all their erudition compelled them to write in languages which but few of my readers can understand."[97]

Irving's detailed descriptions of the composition of the world is also reminiscent of Mitchell's descriptions of New York. In talking of the earth, Irving notes:

> The world in which we dwell is a huge, opake, reflecting, inanimate mass, floating in the baste etherial ocean of infinite space. It has the form of an orange, being a oblate spheroid, curiously flattened at opposite parts, for the insertion of two imaginary poles, which are supposed to penetrate and unite at the center.[98]

Mitchell's description of New York is similar in tone and detail:

> The island from north to south is about sixteen miles long; and its breadth varies from a quarter of a mile to a mile and a half. Its basis is very rocky, and consists principally of grey granite, though in some places, especially where the city has been built, there are great quantities of soap-stone and magnesien-stars, and stained with aborescent figures.[99]

Irving's chapters on the history of New York indicate how he began to modify the initial plan of parodying Mitchell's book. Mitchell devotes only five pages to the history of America and New York beginning with Cabot's discovery of the northeast coast in 1497 to the English rule in 1680. In the remainder of his book there are only scattered references to New York history. Irving, on the other hand, devotes over half of his book to the history of New York during the Dutch period.

[97] Irving, The History, p. 28.

[98] Irving, The History, p. 15.

[99] Mitchell, A Picture, pp. 1-2.

APPENDIX B

The Legend of St. Nicholas

Irving's use of the legend of St. Nicholas in the 1809 edition of The History reflects the growing interest among New Yorkers in this legend. At the time that Irving was writing, St. Nicholas was designated patron saint of New York City and the New York Historical Society. John Pintard, founder of the society was directly responsible for engendering interest in the legend. Pintard kept numerous journals containing explanations of the rites of St. Nicholas. He also urged the Society to schedule its annual meetings on the Saint's feast day, December 6.

A year before the first of these meetings, Dr. David Hosack, who often gave utterance to Pintard's ideas, offered a toast to St. Nicholas, requesting that "the virtuous habits and simple manners of our Dutch ancestors be not lost in the luxuries and refinements of the present time." At that meeting, months before the appearance of The History, Irving's name was proposed for membership.

Irving's contact with the Society's members no doubt influenced his interest in perpetuating the legend. There are numerous references throughout the 1809 edition to St. Nicholas. The custom of honoring St. Nicholas accompanied

the settlers to New Amsterdam. Irving writes that at the head of the ship Goede Vrouw, which carried the settlers of Communipaw, was a "goodly image of St. Nicholas, equipped with a low broad brimmed hat; a huge pair of Flemish trunk hose, and a pipe that reached the end of the bow-spirit."[100] Under the Saint's guidance, the settlers safely reached the shores of what is now Manhattan and set up the community of Communipaw. Throughout the growth of Communipaw into New Amsterdam and its struggle to remain free of British rule, St. Nicholas emerged as the village's patron saint. According to Irving, the Saint's feast day was considered a festive occasion, a time in which the otherwise unneighborly Dutch would open their doors to greet guests. In addition, under the early directors of New Amsterdam, a chapel,known as the Old Dutch Church was built within Fort Amsterdam and dedicated to St. Nicholas.

A few months after the publication of the 1809 edition, Irving became a member of the New York Historical Society. Eager to further perpetuate the legend of the Society's patron saint, Irving nearly doubled his references to St. Nicholas in the 1812 edition. One important reference that he added in the 1812 edition concerns Oloffe's vision of St. Nicholas. In the 1809 edition, Oloffe and several other leaders decide where to build New Amsterdam. In the 1812 edition, however, Oloffe is led in a dream by St. Nicholas to the site where he should build New Amsterdam. In the dream, St. Nicholas is

[100] Irving, The History, pp. 80-81.

riding a wagon, "the selfsame wagon wherein he brings his yearly presents to children." Irving notes that "when St. Nicholas had smoked his pipe, he twisted it in his hat-band, and laying his finger beside his nose, gave the astonished Van Kortlandt a very significant look."[101]

With the 1812 edition, St. Nicholas as a Santa Claus figure riding his wagon of gifts and frequently making the gesture of the finger beside his nose, became a legend. Irving never refers to St. Nicholas as a Santa Claus, but references in Salmagundi (1808) indicate that he was aware of the German legend of Santeclaus:

> In his days, according to my grand-father, were first invented notable cakes, high new-year cookies, which originally were impressed on one side with the honest burly countenance of the illustrious Rip (Van Dam); and on the other with that of the noted St. Nicholas, vulgarly called Santeclaus: of all the saints of the calendar the most venerated by true Hollanders, and their unsophisticated descendants. These cakes are to this time given on the first of January to all visitors, together with a glass of cherry-bounce or raspberry brandy.[102]

Though Irving did not create the legend of Santa Claus, he certainly helped to promote it. Ten years after Irving's second edition, Clement Moore immortalized the saint as Santa Claus in "A Visit of St. Nicholas" (1822). In 1830 James Paulding published The Book of St. Nicholas and in 1835 Irving started the St. Nicholas Society in New York. In the years that followed, the legend became a distinctly American myth.

[101] Washington Irving, A History of New York, ed. Edwin T. Bowden (1812; rpt. New Haven: College and University Press, 1964), p. 103.

[102] Jones, "Knickerbocker Santa Claus," p. 372.

APPENDIX C

The Controversial Dates

Perhaps the most significant difference between Smith's and Irving's histories concerns the dates the governors assumed office. Smith lists Van Twiller as assuming the duties of governor in 1629, Kieft in 1638 and Stuyvesant in 1647, while Irving claims the dates were 1629, 1634 and 1647 respectively. Interestingly, Smith lists Stuyvesant as assuming office on May 27, 1647 and Irving lists the date as May 29, 1647. Either Irving was careless in copying the date or had another source. Williams and McDowell note, however, that no reliable source books existed at the time for these years and, therefore, Smith could have been incorrect. Smith claims, rather apologetically, that his source is Jacob Goelet:

> We have no books among our Dutch records remaining in the Secretary's office relating to state matters, before Kieft's time, nor any enrollment of patents, till a year after Van Twiller arrived here. Mr. Jacob Goelet supplied us with several Dutch records.[103]

Williams and McDowell also point out that these records could have been erroneous, since many of them were kept in Holland. Even the journal of David de Vries, another

[103] Smith, History of the Province, p. 12.

Irving source, who made three voyages to New Amsterdam during the governorships of Van Twiller and Kieft, lists different dates in his Dutch records. According to de Vires, Van Twiller became governor in 1633 and Kieft in 1643.

Williams and McDowell were the first critics to partially clarify these discrepancies, noting that, according to the chronology in the New York State Library Bulletin, Van Twiller became governor in 1633 and Kieft 1638. The bulletin's chronology also lists four governors previous to Van Twiller: Cornelius Jacobsen, William Verhulst, Peter Minuit and Bastiaen Janzz Kral.[104] Smith and Irving must have been aware of the governorship of Minuit, though both claim Van Twiller was the first governor. Smith quotes a letter from William Kieft to Peter Minuit in which Kieft refers to Minuit's gubernatorial days:

> I find in the Dutch records, a copy of a letter from William Kieft, May 6, 1638, directed to Peter Minuit, who seems by the tenour of it, to be the Swedish Governour of New-Sweden, asserting, 'that the whole South River of New Netherlands, had been in the Dutch possession many years above and below, beset with Forts, and sealed with their blood.' Which Kieft adds, has happened even during your administration 'in New Netherlands, and so well known to you'.[105]

In a footnote, Smith adds that if Kieft's letter alludes to the affair in which several Dutchmen were murdered at South River by the Indians over a taking away of State Arms which the Dutch had erected during the first discovery of the country "then Minuit preceded Van Twiller." He adds that

[104] Bulletin of the New York State Public Library, No. 56 (1901), p. 336.

[105] Smith, History of the Province, pp. 12-13.

Minuit "being perhaps disobliged by the Dutch entered into the service of the Queen of Sweden."[106] Smith only conjectures on the governorship even though the letter appears to establish indisputably Minuit as an early governor.

[106] Smith, History of the Province, p. 13.

APPENDIX D

The Book's Topical Satire

Irving's representation of the Yankee-Dutch dispute and his caricature of Kieft is an important part of the book's topical satire. Exploring various newspaper accounts during the two years prior to the publication of The History reveals that in describing this dispute Irving drew considerably from contemporary journalism's negative attitude towards the Republicans. Irving's referral to Kieft's proclamation as a non-intercourse act and the controversy surrounding it has topical importance. In 1807, then President Thomas Jefferson issued the Embargo Act establishing severe non-intercourse and non-importation policies with Britain and any country trading with Britain. Britain in its war with France, had been impressing seamen and seizing United States ships. In 1809 the act was replaced by the slightly less severe Non-Intercourse Act.

Jefferson's actions, however, remained subject to staunch criticism up to the time that Irving published The History. Repbulicans and Federalists blaimed Jefferson's foreign policy for the United States trading disputes with Britain in 1809. An article in The Freeman's Journal entitled "The New Embargo" criticized Jefferson for coming

out of retirement each month to "sanction the system with a volunteer toast."[107] The system referred to was the United States trade policy governed by Jefferson's Embargo Act of 1807.

At this time, United states-British relations were also marked by scandal as Republican President Jefferson, Secretary of State James Madison, Secretary of the Navy, Robert Smith and Secretary of the Treasury Robert Gallatin allegedly misrepresented United States trading policy with British minister D. M. Erskine. The Erskine Affair, as it was called, instilled doubt in the minds of many newspapers and their public as to the administrative ability of the Republican party. When Irving published The History and described Kieft's propensity for proclamations, the United States was in a political turmoil and most of the country, including Irving, were blaiming the Republicans.

107 "From The Freeman's Journal." New York Evening Post, 1 Dec. 1809, p. 3, col. 1.

APPENDIX E

Hell Gate

Hell Gate is the name given by the Dutch to a narrow passage on the northern border of Astoria. The strait is marked by angry currents making cragged and zig-zag courses among hidden rocks. Some historians say that Adrian Block, a Dutchman, was the first white man to sail through the strait.[108] In 1614 Block was sailing up the East River when he came upon a terrible whirlpool of water running between a narrow strait. He promptly called it Hellegat or Hellgate and claimed he was the first white man to have sailed through it.[109] Since his discovery all sorts of wild tales about Hellegat were told to frighten mariners:

> 'Hellegat is as dangerous as a Norway Maelstrom. . . In this narrow passage runneth a rapid, violent stream both upon flood and ebb; and in the middle lieth some islands of rocks upon which the current sets so violently that it threateneth present shipwreck; and upon the flood is a large whirlpool, which sends forth a continual hideous roaring.'[110]

It was said that the devil was there "sitting astride a rock

[108] Benjamin F. Thompson, The History of Long Island, Vol. II (New York: Gould, Banks and Co., 1843), p. 161.

[109] Jacqueline Overton, Long Island's Story (Garden City: Doubleday, Doran and Company, 1932), pp. 14-14.

[110] Overton, Long Island's Story, p. 15.

called the Hog Back and playing on a fiddle." One rock was called the Devil's Frying Pan where "he broiled fish there before a storm"; another rock was the Devil's Gridiron.

Irving mentions Hell Gate several times throughout The History to recount the story of Oloffe and the Goede Vrouw and to poke fun at the contemporary Hurl Gate-Hell Gate controversy. Mocking the Dutch settlers and navigators, Irving relates that Oloffe Van Kortlandt, sometimes called Oloffe, the Dreamer, made an exploring trip around Manhattan Island in the jolly boat Goede Vrouw. Suddenly, "in the whirlpool called the Pot they spun about in a giddy maze and when the Commander and his crew came to their senses they found themselves stranded on the Long Island shore." After the incident, Oloffe related many stories about how he saw spectres flung in the air and heard the yelling of hobgoblins.

Irving also calls attention to the Hurl Gate-Hell Gate controversy. At the time he was writing, certain scholars insisted on pronouncing the strait Hurl Gate. James Fenimore in Gleaning in Europe: England makes reference to the controversy. While dining with Mr. William Spencer, the issue of how the English abused words came up:

> To put him in good humour, I then told him an anecdote of a near relative of my own, whom you may have known a man of singular readiness and of great wit. We have a puerile and a half-bred school of orthoepists in America who failing in a practical knowledge of the world, affect to pronounce words as they are spelt and who are ever on the rack to give some sentimental or fanciful evasion to any thing shocking. These are the gentry that call Hell Gate, "Hurl Gate," and who are at the head of the rooster school.[111]

[111] James Fenimore Cooper, Gleanings in Europe: England, Vol. II, ed. Robert E. Spiller (New York: Oxford University Press, 1930), p. 86.

APPENDIX F

Some Minor Sources

In addition to the sources mentioned in the text, Irving uses Justic Danker's maps to provide his reader with a geographic perspective. Justice Danker is an interesting source in that he is the only geographer whose maps Irving published. Danker's map of New Amsterdam is folded in the 1809 edition of The History. Irving, referring to the map in a footnote, points out that de Vries's account describes the windmill and flagstaff appearing in Danker's map:

> De Vries mentions that this windmill stood on the south-east bastion, and it is likewise to be seen, together with the flagstaff, in Justus Danker's View of New Amsterdam, which I have taken the liberty of prefixing to Mr. Knickerbocker's history.[112]

Later Irving again relates that the gibbet erected during Kieft's reign also appears in the map: "Both the biggets as mentioned above by our author, may be seen in the sketch of Justius Danker which we have prefixed to the work."[113]

Irving must have employed other sources than those to which he directly alludes. The identity of these sources, however, remains a mystery. Some of the journals available at

[112] Irving, The History, p. 196.

[113] Irving, The History, p. 213.

the time Irving wrote, but not documented by Irving were: Van Corlear's Journal (1634) and Emanuel Van Meteren's History of the Netherlanders (Deift, 1599, 1605 and London, 1610). Irving could have used one or all of these sources in his history.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anon. "An American Classic." Review of The Knickerbocker History of New York. The Saturday Review, 20 January 1894.

Beers, Henry. An Outline Sketch of American Literature. New York: Chautauqua Press, 1887.

Black, Michael. "Washington Irving's A History of New York with emphasis on 1849 Revision." Dissertation Abstracts, 28 (1967), 1386A-1387A (Columbia).

Brooks, E. L. "A Note on Irving's Sources." American Literature, 25 (May 1953).

Charlevoix, Pierre de. Journal of A Voyage to North America (1720-1722). rpt. Ann Arbor: Xerox Corp., 1966.

Condon, Thomas. "New York's Dutch Period: An Interpretive Problem." De Halve Maen, 36, No. 3 (1961).

Cooper, James Fenimore. Gleanings in Europe: England. Ed. Robert E. Spiller. New York: Oxford University Press, 1930.

Evans, Donald. "The English Lineage of Diedrich Knickerbocker." Early American Literature, 10 (Spring 1974).

Hackluyt, Richard. The Principal Navigations, Traffiques and Discoveries of the English Nation. 12 vols. New York: McMillan Company, 1904.

Irving, Pierre. The Life and Letters of Washington Irving. 4 vols. Detroit: Gale Research Company, 1967.

Irving, Washington. A History of New York. Ed. Edwin T. Bowden. 1812; rpt. New Haven: College and University Press, 1964.

Irving, Washington. The Knickerbocker History of New York. Ed. Stanley Williams and Tremaine McDowell. 1809; rpt. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1927.

Jameson, Franklin J. Narratives of Netherland: 1609-1664. New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1967.

Jones, Charles W. "Knickerbocker Santa Claus." The New York Historical Society Quarterly, 38, No. 4 (October 1954).

Josselyn, John. An Account of Two Voyages to New England, Made During the Years 1638, 1663. Boston: William Veazie, 1865.

Lydenberg, Harry Miller. Irving's Knickerbocker and Some of its Sources. New York: The New York Public Library, 1953.

Mather, Cotton. Magnalia Christi Americana. London, 1702.

Mitchell, Samuel. A Picture of New York. 1807; rpt. Ann Arbor: Xerox Corp., 1975.

New Plymouth Colony. Records of the Colony of New Plymouth in New England. Ed. Nathaniel B. Shurtleff, M. D. Boston: William White, 1856.

New York Historical Society. Collections of the New York Historical Society, Second Series. Vol. I. New York: H. Ludwig, 1841.

New York State Public Library. Bulletin. No. 56. Albany, 1901.

Ogilby, John. America. London, 1671.

Overton, Jacqueline. Long Island's Story. Garden City: Doubleday, Doran and Company, 1932.

Purchas, Samuel. Purchas his Pilgrimage. Glasgow: J. MacLehose and Sons, 1906.

Richardson, Charles F. American Literature, 1607-1885. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1889.

Ringe, Donald A. "New York and New England: Irving's Criticism of American Society." American Literature, 38 (January 1967).

Roth, Martin. Comedy and America: The Lost World of Washington Irving. Port Washington: Kennikat Press, 1976.

Smith, William Jr. The History of the Province of New York From the First Discovery to the Year M.DCC.XXII. London: Thomas Wilcox, 1757.

Thompson, Benjamin F. The History of Long Island. Vol. II. New York: Gould, Banks and Company, 1843.

Trumbull, Benjamin. Complete History of Connecticut. 2 vols. New Haven: Maltby, Goldsmith and Company, 1818.

Vail, R. W. G. Knickerbocker Birthday. New York: The New York Historical Society, 1954.

Viele, Charles. "The Knickerbockers of Upstate New York: IV." De Halve Maen, 48, No. 2 (1973).

Weiss, Robert C. "The Image and Use of the Dutch in the Literary Works of Washington Irving." Dissertation Abstracts, 31 (1967), 4799A-47800A (Notre Dame).