

– Introduction –

THE DUTCH-MUNSEE FRONTIER



“We regard the frontier not as a boundary or line, but as a territory or zone of interpenetration between two previously distinct societies.”

Howard Lamar and Leonard Thompson, *The Frontier in History*¹

In New Netherland, the Dutch colony that would later become New York, Europeans and Native Americans coexisted, interacting with one another throughout the life of the colony. Europeans and the indigenous inhabitants of the Hudson River valley first encountered one another in 1524 during the voyage of Giovanni da Verrazzano. Sustained contact between the two groups began in 1609 when Henry Hudson rediscovered the region for Europeans. He was quickly followed by Dutch merchants and traders, transient settlers, and finally permanent European colonists. Over time, the Dutch extended their political sovereignty over land already claimed by Native Americans. In this territory, Indians and Europeans interacted on a number of levels. They exchanged land and goods, lived as neighbors, and faced one another in European courts. During their interaction, periods of peace and relative harmony were punctuated by outbreaks of violence and warfare. After seventy years, Europeans and Indians continued to coexist in the lower Hudson River valley. Some Native people had been vanquished from their traditional homelands such as Manhattan Island. Others remained, many living in close proximity to the Dutch and other Europeans. While many native people maintained their own cultural outlook, others clearly became acculturated to one degree or another. All lived in a society which was dominated politically and economically by Europeans, forcing Native Americans to at least accommodate themselves to the Dutch, and at times to modify their cultural practices in order to survive in an increasingly European-dominated context.

* * *

Frontiers are created wherever distinct cultural and political entities come into contact, and in New Netherland, several groups of Europeans—under the auspices of Dutch colonization—came into contact with several different Native American peoples, especially the Mohawks, Mahicans, and Munsees in the Hudson Valley, but also the Unamis of the Delaware Bay region, Susquehannocks and Iroquois tribes of the interior, and the Algonquian people of the Connecticut Valley and Long Island Sound. This study, however, primarily focuses upon the Munsees who lived on western Long Island and the islands of New York Bay, along both sides of the Hudson river north from there to just beyond modern Kingston, and west into what is now New Jersey. There is good reason for limiting the scope of this work. Claiming territory that stretched from the Delaware River to the Connecticut, and establishing outposts throughout that region, Dutch trade and colonization centered primarily on two locales. The Dutch established Fort Orange just short of the fall-line of the Hudson River in order to engage in the rich fur trade to which the Mahicans and Mohawks offered access. After the conclusion of the Mohawk-Mahican War in 1628, the fort lay well within the sphere of the Mohawks.² Obviously, the Mohawks and other Iroquois are of great significance. They have also been extensively studied by others.³ The other center of Dutch colonization, New Amsterdam, lay in the heart of the Munsees' territory, yet in the histories of the Northeast the Munsees tend to get overshadowed by their more famous neighbors to the north. Histories of Native Americans in New York usually begin with the Munsees, but quickly shift to the Iroquois; they return their attention to the Munsees when major events such as Kieft's War emerge, but ultimately leave the Munsees to the dustbin of history while focusing upon the Mohawks and other Iroquois.⁴

In their own right, the Munsees and their relations with the Dutch are important. They offer a prime example of native people who were immediately and continually exposed to European explorers, traders, and settlers once European colonization began in the region in earnest.⁵ The Munsees, far more than any other group during New Netherland's history, experienced the wide range of European colonization. In many ways, during the Dutch period in the Hudson River valley, contact between the two was more intensive, more intimate, and more violent. Furthermore, the Munsees offered Europeans not only furs to trade, but also wampum, a commodity over which they shared a monopoly with other coastal peoples and which played a vital role in trade and diplomacy throughout the Northeast. When the Dutch first came to the Hudson River region, they traded with Indians around Manhattan Island, and it was on the tip of this island that the Dutch West India Company established its headquarters in North America. Guarding the mouth of the Hudson River and ostensibly controlling the flow of trade in and out of the Hudson River watershed, Fort Amsterdam and the sur-



Map 1: The Dutch-Munsee Frontier

New Netherland showing the approximate extent of Munsee territory at time of contact and the principal Dutch outposts circa 1630. For reference, modern geographic designations are given.

rounding village played a vital role in the life of the colony. From a European perspective, the story of Dutch and Native American relations should perhaps include all Indians who fell within the boundaries of the Dutch colony. From an Indian perspective, the story should relate to all the Munsees and their interactions with Europeans. The realities of the frontier, however, meant that in New Netherland the worlds of Europeans and Native Americans intersected in certain locales. This work focuses upon the distinct pattern of relations which developed at the convergence of Dutch and Munsee societies in the lower Hudson River region.

There exists some difficulty in finding a suitable term to describe the Indian participants in this story. Although the terms Munsees, Indians, native people or inhabitants, and Native Americans will usually be used, none of these accurately reflect the aboriginal sense of self-identity and thus they tend to be anachronistic. The people of the lower Hudson valley and surrounding region can be grouped as the Munsees because of their shared cultural traits and the use of the Munsee dialect. The term Munsee means “people of the Minisink,” Minisink referring to an area surrounding the Delaware Water Gap, where one particular band of Munsees lived and where many of the people sharing the Munsee dialect came to dwell in the eighteenth century after selling the remainder of their lands to Europeans. Although sometimes considered a branch of the Lenapes or Delawares, with whom they shared an ethnic and linguistic heritage, the Munsees more closely associated with that group in the eighteenth century and beyond.⁶ The Lenapes (defined here as those who spoke the Unami dialect) comprised those Woodland Indians who, at the time of contact with Europeans, lived South of the Munsees in the region surrounding the Delaware Bay and River. Together, their territory includes all of modern New Jersey, and portions of northeast Delaware, southeast Pennsylvania, and southeast New York.⁷

Although the Munsees may be generalized along such linguistic and cultural lines, at the beginning of the seventeenth century they identified themselves in much smaller groups. Thus they did not use the terms Munsee or Lenape to describe themselves in the seventeenth century. Anthropologist Robert Grumet argues that the Munsees grouped themselves neither as a nation or tribe, nor even as only small-scale villages. Instead, their sociopolitical groups can be defined in a number of levels including villages, districts, and maximal groups.⁸ Munsee people most commonly organized themselves in villages and related territories. Villages or groups of villages also claimed sovereignty over larger territories such as tracts and districts. Beyond this level of organization, Munsees could also form themselves into maximal groups when the need for broad Munsee cooperation or consultation presented itself. The Munsees used unique names to identify these various groupings (usually at the village level or close to it) by which the Dutch knew them and recorded in their observations. These included the Esopus (including the



Map 2: Munsee Bands in the Early Seventeenth Century

Approximate location of several Munsee bands and groups in the early seventeenth century with modern geographic designations.

Waoronecks and Warranawankongs), Minisinks, Haverstraws, Tappans, Hackensacks, Raritans, Navasinks, Wappingers, Kichtawanks, Sinsinks, Wiechquaeskecks, Rechgawawanks, Tankitekes, Nayacks, Marechkawiecks, Canarsees, Rockaways, Massapeguas, and Matinecocks (see Map 2).⁹ Throughout this book, these groups will be referred to by these names when the actions of individual groups are identifiable and when generalizations are inappropriate.

The Munsee people shared a frontier with a variety of Europeans who traded and settled in the Dutch-established colony. For simplicity's sake, they will generally be referred to as the Dutch, but for the sake of accuracy it should be remembered that there were Europeans other than the Dutch. Within the fold of European society were Englishmen, Walloons, Huguenots, Germans, and others. In fact, perhaps only fifty percent of the European population of New Netherland was in fact Dutch.¹⁰ Furthermore, the colony included many Africans, some of whom were enslaved, others of whom led lives that reflected the relative freedom which Europeans shared, and all of whom lived primarily in a European colonial context rather than in an African one, although some studies suggest the persistence of an African-centered identity and community.¹¹ Yet,

because these various Europeans and Africans lived in a Dutch colony and under the influence of Dutch culture—in fact, many Europeans had Dutch spouses or they shared the Calvinist brand of Protestantism with the Dutch—and were under the authority of the Dutch magistrate in New Amsterdam, it is fitting and accurate to generally refer to members of this Dutch colonial society as the Dutch.¹²

* * *

In order to understand the developing relations of the Dutch and the Munsees, this volume works with specific definitions of the terms *frontier* and *culture*. The frontier, as I use the term, refers to a zone and process of crosscultural interaction. I am not alone in using this definition. Over twenty years ago, a group of historians from Canada, Great Britain, the Netherlands, South Africa, and the United States, with common interests in the history of European-indigenous relations in North America and South Africa, gathered in a seminar to comparatively explore these relations. In the resulting volume, *The Frontier in History: North America and Southern Africa Compared*, editors Howard Lamar and Leonard Thompson gave voice to this newly evolving, broader frontier perspective. They declared that the frontier should be seen “not as a boundary or line, but as a territory or zone of interpenetration between two previously distinct societies.”¹³ Even before the publication of this volume, historian James Axtell wrote that “the frontiers where [Europeans, Africans, and Indians] met were thus human spaces, not geographical spaces accidentally occupied by the people. Wherever diverse cultures came together, whether for trade, war, or love, there was the frontier.”¹⁴

This definition of the frontier and its importance to the study of early America has been widely adopted and reiterated by historians of the colonial period. In his 1989 work, *The Formation of a Planter Elite*, Alan Galloway stated that “on the ... frontier people of different races, religions, and ethnic groups lived in close proximity and greatly influenced each other’s lives.” “Peoples of the ... frontier,” Galloway also wrote, “had to learn from each other and adapt themselves and their institutions to an environment undergoing vast demographic, social, economic, and political changes.” Gregory Nobels has claimed that “the real significance of the North American frontier lies not only in the single-minded conquest eventually achieved by one people over others, but also in the complex roles played by all the peoples that took part in the struggle.”¹⁵ In recent years, it seems that most historians of early America agree that a complete understanding of the colonial experience must include a discussion of the frontier as defined by Lamar and Thompson. As Colin Calloway has argued in *New Worlds for All*, Europeans and Native Americans shared a vast geographic, cultural, material, and linguistic landscape in early America. Andrew Cayton and Fredrika Teute also emphasize the central role of the frontier in their edited volume *Contact Points*: “Historians may dismiss eighteenth-century assumptions about development as

ethnocentric—even racist—but they cannot deny that the European conquest of North America, and the frontiers it created, must be at the center of any analysis of the history of this continent.”¹⁶

In order to describe and unravel the complex processes of cultural change and interaction on the frontier, it is also necessary to define culture and consider how to delineate and identify measurable aspects of culture.¹⁷ My understanding of culture borrows from the work of C.T. McIntire, a Canadian historian and philosopher of history. McIntire associates culture

with literally everything brought into existence by humans, the whole way of life of a people and all its ingredients—not just our indicators of meaning, our arts, or our manners—and with all aspects of our humanity, not just our suprabio-physical characteristics. Culture is the outcome of the creative process as well as the condition of the ongoing process of human creativity. We might say that culture represents the ongoing results of our creative acts.

Culture, then, is not a static thing, but a dynamic entity, and, as such, represents the basic expression of human experience, the thing that sets humans apart from other forms of life. Highlighting the creative activities of human beings, McIntire affirms that “human acts are how we express our humanity.” The products of culture or the results of human culture-making are many. They range from biological functions such as procreation to the “totality results, like societies, peoples, humanity ... and civilizations.” Among these many products “are the societal results, the institutions, associations, and relationships, and their features, like churches, families and friendships, governments, states and city-states, factories and markets, feudal relationships, patron-artist relationships, social classes, tribes, communes, cities, and farms.”¹⁸

When using the concept of culture in this way, it is useful to somewhat simplify the broad definition offered above by defining culture in terms of *worldview*, which influences human behavior, and *societal structures*, the results or products of that behavior. The terms *worldview*, *cultural outlook*, *cultural ideals*, and *societal values* all relate to the same basic notion: that at the heart of human motivation lies fundamental religious belief. This is not to say that religious practices, as associated with a particular church or other recognized religious structure, guide human behavior. Instead this understanding of *worldview* emphasizes the collection of ideas, thoughts, and impulses which under gird all human activity. *Societal structures*, in contrast, are the various tangible and intangible ways in which those core beliefs and ideas are manifest. By *societal structures* I mean various aspects of society—economic systems, political structures, social arrangements, religious activities, aesthetic products, and so forth.¹⁹

But one must be careful not to oversimplify. *Worldview*, in particular, should not be confused with a particular ideology. Ideologies are more-or-less uniform collections of ideas with inner-coherence. *Worldviews*, on

the other hand, may comprise more than one ideology. Worldviews reflect the composite of ideas, morés, values, and commitments which guide an individual's or society's pattern of living. Particular ideologies may predominate within a worldview, but generally human beings, being complex and existing in the flux of historical development, experience worldviews in more complicated ways than simply pursuing a particular ideology. For example, the Puritans who established New England maintained certain traditional, medieval values, but at the same time pursued values which anticipated the modernity of the eighteenth century and beyond. These values in turn were reflected in the various structures they erected in their society—the open field system as a throwback to the Middle Ages which existed side by side with more modern commercial and economic practices emerging during their time.

History, then, can be understood as the story of ongoing cultural development: the creation and evolution of various structures and changing cultural outlooks or worldviews. Yet historical development takes place in a complex environment in which not only worldviews shape society, but changes in societal structures in turn shape a people's cultural outlook. In addition, worldviews and societal structures overlap and interact in myriad ways. Forces outside one's society can also significantly shape the process of history. For example, environment and geography can shape the structure and value system of a particular society. Furthermore, historians cannot simply generalize about the actions of groups of people in terms of worldview and related societal structures. From the ground-level perspective, societies are comprised of individuals who reflect a complex of ideas and who may find themselves navigating among competing structures. Such real people make real choices which can transcend the boundaries of worldview and societal structures, especially on the frontier. Out of their individual and collective choices comes historical change and development. Despite these complexities of culture and historical change, historians who attune themselves to both worldview and societal structures as a framework or context for analyzing historical development and cultural change have a significant advantage when investigating frontier processes.

Having defined culture and described its relationship to history, further consideration needs to be given to the definition of the frontier and the role of culture and acculturation in the frontier context. As noted earlier, historians have come to define the frontier as a place of cultural mixing. But while questions of acculturation can be considered whenever two cultures come into contact, cultural interaction does not always mean a frontier has been created.²⁰ Here the work of Lamar and Thompson continues to be helpful in defining the frontier. Arguing that the concept of the frontier can be universally applied, they have defined the opening and closing of the frontier not only in terms of racial or cultural interaction, but also in terms of political control of the region in which such interaction took place. Thus, they suggest that a frontier opens when one

or more societies intrude into a region with an indigenous population. During the frontier process, the question of political control of the region remains contested. The frontier closes when “a single political authority has established hegemony over the zone.” Such an outcome might be expressed in a number of ways: “the intruders may have exterminated the indigenous people ... , they may have expelled them ... , they may have subjected them and incorporated them into their own political and economic systems ... , the intruders may themselves have been incorporated by the indigenous people ... , or they may have reached a stalemate.” Gregory Nobles offers a similar definition: “My own working definition of ‘frontier’ is a region in which no culture, group, or government can claim effective control or hegemony over others. In that regard, contact often involves conflict, a sometimes multisided struggle with an undetermined outcome.”²¹

Thus the frontier represents a unique context in which intercultural contact and mixing occur alongside a struggle or competition for sovereignty in a particular region. The frontier is not simply an open meeting of two cultural groups, but a crosscultural encounter which takes place in the context of real political, economic, religious, and social struggle. Narrowly defining the frontier this way makes it possible to distinguish cultural mixing here from the cultural interaction that takes place whenever two or more groups of people come into contact. Within the context created by this contest over sovereignty, and shaped by it, lie important developments related to the interaction of cultures. During the intervening years of the frontier, a process takes place in which both groups seek to assert their representative cultures and learn to contend with the other while also struggling over political control of the region. As one or more groups claim political or national sovereignty over a territory containing others, they consciously or unconsciously impose a number of new societal structures upon the other group, thus providing external stimuli for cultural change. On the frontier we observe a struggle for sovereignty over territory coinciding with a struggle for sovereignty over cultural development. As one society extends its structures upon a group with differing cultural ideals or worldview, a crisis ensues in which members of that group are forced to find ways to address the new cultural and societal situation. In the case of the Munsees, their responses generally fell into three categories: *resistance*, *accommodation*, and *acculturation*.²²

Moreover, cultural change on the frontier is not isolated from broader historical changes. People from both sides of the frontier represent societies in the process of ongoing change and cultural development. In recognition of this reality, it can be argued that the frontier progresses through stages or phases. For example, South African historians Richard Elphick and V.C. Malherbe have demonstrated that contact between the Dutch and native Khoesan on the Cape frontier during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries followed stages which were influenced by the

nature of the European “agents” who visited the region. A series of traders, cultivators, and pastoral farmers came to the southern tip of Africa in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and the history of their interaction with the native Khoesan peoples followed a corresponding evolution of frontiers—a trade frontier in which the European actors were mainly company employees engaged with the indigenous inhabitants in the trade of European goods for fresh meat and other foodstuffs, an agricultural frontier in which Dutch settlers began to conduct intensive farming on land purchased from the African owners, and a third frontier of pastoral European farmers who adopted the southern African practice of cattle herding and hired or enslaved the native population to aid them in their venture.²³ In my analysis of Dutch-Munsee relations, I have adopted the concept of a frontier as a zone of intercultural interaction which can be traced through stages. Like the seventeenth-century Cape situation, the character of the Dutch-Munsee frontier also evolved as the motivations behind European colonization and immigration changed over the years and as stimuli from the Native American side of the frontier also changed. Briefly, these stages can be identified as *first contact*, *trade*, and *settlement*. It is important to note that these are not fixed stages, but overlapping phases. They describe what happened, but do not dictate what had to develop.

This approach towards the frontier and the process of acculturation has several advantages.²⁴ First, it assumes that intercultural relations were a process, not a single event in which two static cultures encountered one another and reacted. Rather than generalizing about a particular group’s attitudes and response to a foreign culture, this framework allows for the study of a vibrant and changing relationship between two or more cultural groups over time. Once one has defined the geographic and temporal scope of a particular frontier, the various factors which affected intercultural relations become more clear. How did Europeans and Indians respond to one another upon first contact? What changes took place in their relationship when driven by different goals during the period of trade? How did the European focus upon settlement-style colonization on the one side and shifting inter-Indian relations on the other side affect relations between Europeans and Indians?

Relations between two peoples are never just a matter of clashing cultures, but of how those societies, and individuals within those societies, interacted over time and how their actions towards one another were shaped not just by cultural outlook or worldview, but by environment, foreign affairs with other groups, personal differences and actions, developments in Europe, and so on. In New Netherland, it is not enough to describe Dutch and Indian attitudes towards one another and then summarize how relations between the two developed as a result. Other questions should be asked. How did Dutch attitudes and company policy change? How did Indian perceptions of the Dutch change over time? Did this affect their strategies for dealing with the newcomers? How did

relations among various Indian peoples affect their dealings with the Dutch? How did the changing nature of the colonists affect intercultural relations? How did the changing nature of European colonization change the impact of imposed societal structures on native people? And most importantly, how did Native Americans respond to the increasing imposition of those European structures on their own society? Asking these and other questions leaves behind the image of monolithic Indian affairs and leads us to a picture of evolving relations in which cultural change, adaptation, and accommodation, as well as persistence, took place in the context of an ongoing struggle for political control of a particular region. In each phase of European expansion and colonization, different forces came into play which affected cultural interaction and change.

But while culture is dynamic and changing, it cannot be diminished or increased. Culture is a dimension of human experience and the expression of human behavior. It is the context in which human beings exist. Thus a society or group of people cannot have more or less culture, they can only have a changing and developing culture. True, one can identify certain characteristics of European society at a particular point in time and trace the changes from that point, but to assess such cultural change as the loss of culture implies that culture is a quantifiable substance. The same is also true for Native Americans. Historians may be able to identify a number of aspects of Native American culture at the point of contact with Europeans and call it Native American culture. But five hundred years before or one hundred years later, that same ethnic group's culture may look very different from the practices and beliefs of those people which came into contact with Europeans. In this regard, historians need to be careful not to define any one society or group of people in such a fixed manner as to assume that historical people simply fall into cultural categories such as "Native American" or "European." In this regard, it is important to distinguish between *ethnicity* and *culture* and keep in mind the ever-changing nature of culture.²⁵ This study looks at the culture and society of the ethnic group the Munsees, and considers how their culture and society changed as they entered a frontier relationship with the Dutch.

Thus it is not helpful to simply point to certain changes in the culture of a person or group and pronounce that they have become less Native American and more European, or vice versa. Culture changes on multiple levels. Historians are likely to be more accurate in their assessments if they trace specific changes and developments in worldview or societal structure and avoid labeling those changes in terms of broad transformations of one group becoming more or less like another. This seems particularly true with regard to structural developments. People can choose or be forced to wear different clothing, eat different food, even speak a different language, but that does not mean that they have adopted an entirely new or different worldview. They may even be compelled or volunteer to participate in different economic, political, and legal systems,

perhaps even new religious practices, but this does not necessarily reflect a fundamental change in cultural outlook and identity. Examining cultural change in terms of changing societal structures and worldviews will avoid some of the ambiguity which exists when scholars speak loosely and vaguely of cultural change, accommodation, and acculturation.

Furthermore, historians can make distinctions between more permanent changes—acculturation, and more temporary measures—accommodation. These terms have been used interchangeably by historians, leading to some confusion, but making clear distinctions between these two is particularly useful when used in conjunction with a concrete definition of culture. If historians observe economic changes among native people which parallel European practices, for example, did these represent a permanent adoption of such practices, or a tactical or pragmatic short-term move? When European traders chose to live among native people and take Indian brides, was this a step on the road to becoming native, or did this simply represent accommodation to Indian ways to achieve some other end?

Moreover, this approach to culture and the frontier takes a longer view of frontier processes than many of the frontier studies appearing in recent years. These microhistories have done much to identify important encounters between representatives of two societies, but they can only point to the possibility of broader cultural change and interaction.²⁶ What insights can be gleaned from microstudies should be tested in the broader context of contact and interaction between different societies over time. In such a context, more focused attention can be given to those aspects of culture in which change took place—in worldviews or societal structures, and what *kind* of change took place—accommodation or acculturation.

Finally, the approach adopted here makes more possible a historical analysis aimed at maintaining a relative ambivalence to the groups and cultures under study. In 1978, James Axtell emphasized the need for cultural relativism in the study of intercultural relations and argued “that each culture must be understood in its own terms, and that we must not only see the ethnocentric biases in each culture, but understand the reasons for them.”²⁷ But many scholars fail to maintain such a stance. Part of the difficulty lies in knowing how to apply cultural relativism. On the one hand, scholars need to treat the subjects of their historical inquiry with evenhandedness. Yet on the other hand, it is impossible to transcend one’s own system of values. Fearing to acknowledge any cultural standpoint in the name of cultural relativism, scholars lack an independent standard or framework by which to understand any culture. In place of that standard, they tend to absolutize a particular culture at a certain moment in time. That is, they establish one society’s culture at a certain historical moment as the standard by which to evaluate later cultural development and change, or as the standard by which to examine other cultures and societies. In current scholarship, this most often occurs when scholars identify an indigenous ethnic group as “Indians” at the point of

contact with Europeans, but see them as having lost their essential Indian-ness after years of contact and varying degrees of acculturation and accommodation. Or, they may find European society as wanting after measuring it against the yardstick of Native American culture.

Closely related to the practice of absolutizing Native American culture is the tendency to romanticize the frontier by focusing on the Indians as victims or heroes. In contrast to earlier narratives of European and Euro-American conquest of the continent, many scholars turned their attention to the native side of the frontier, seeking to counter the earlier imbalance. In doing so, however, they did not adjust the framework of analysis, but simply shifted the focus to a different group of people. For example, contemporary scholars often judge that the cultural change among Native Americans that resulted from contact with another society is an unfortunate and undesired outcome of the frontier. In this regard, many historians today highlight and celebrate the persistence of “traditional” indigenous culture much in the same way that older scholarship tended to make European cultural traditions the standard by which to evaluate other societies.

The key to achieving cultural relativism in our study of past peoples is not to avoid any cultural standard whatsoever, but to accept the reality that scholars can never transcend their own cultures. We exist in culture and can never see or observe without our vision conditioned by the various values and systems by which we organize our thought, undertake our research, and construct our words. Does this mean that the ideal of cultural relativism is too elusive to try to ascertain? Certainly some scholars have given up the goal. The very recognition of our culturally-bound scholarship, however, is the most important step in trying to approximate a culturally-relativistic study of the frontier and to avoid absolutizing or romanticizing the culture of historical societies. Once scholars identify their own framework for understanding the past, their own perspective out of which their research and writing stems, they can distance themselves from past peoples in their efforts to understand them and study their interactions on the frontier. Scholars cannot and should not take sides with historical Europeans or Native Americans. Instead, historians should honestly admit their own cultural moorings and seek to understand past peoples as much as possible in terms of the cultural values and societal structures of these peoples.

In this volume, I seek to avoid establishing either Native American or European culture as the standard of evaluation for the other. I assume neither evolving culture is necessarily better than the other: both groups followed practices which are commendable or worthy of criticism when considered by twenty-first-century standards. I assume that neither society is static, and that over time, as the nature of contact changed, so did the nature of their relationship with one another. The crucial issue for my research is to move beyond condemnations or commendations and consider instead the nature and degree of cultural change and the strategies

people—both individuals and groups—followed to deal with that change. Understanding the complexity of culture in terms of worldview and societal structures and analyzing changes in culture through developing stages of the frontier provide a guide to do so. This makes it possible to identify ways in which Munsee society changed and ways it remained the same: to see when Munsee people *acculturated*—changed their society and outlook to better fit the new frontier context of their experience; *accommodated*—maintained their own worldview and structures, but made short-term changes to meet the needs of intercultural relations on the frontier; or *resisted*—maintained their own culture and resisted any imposition of Dutch societal structures and sovereignty over them. Specifically, the evidence presented in this volume demonstrates that while many Munsees maintained a worldview closely tied to their precontact outlook, changes in the economic and political structures of their society in particular reflected the evolving impact of European colonization.

Tracing this pattern of accommodation, resistance, and acculturation among the Munsees has proved challenging. In particular, this study has been limited by the paucity of sources relating to the Munsees. Very few records remain from the earliest years of Dutch trade and colonization, leaving researchers with little basis upon which to describe change among the Munsees from the earliest periods. Many official records, especially from the late 1630s and early 1640s have been lost, leaving gaps at a crucial period of Dutch-Munsee interaction when the first war erupted between them.²⁸ The records which do remain from that era are primarily polemical pieces written for the purpose of condemning or defending Director General Willem Kieft, whose name has been given to this war.²⁹ Many descriptions of the Indians of New Netherland appeared in the mid-seventeenth century, but while these descriptions are useful, they tend to borrow from one another or borrow from earlier descriptions making it difficult to trace cultural change over the period of colonization.³⁰ Furthermore, these authors rarely made distinctions between the different native groups under their purview. While this partly reflects the similarity in culture between the various indigenous peoples of the Hudson River valley, it nevertheless leaves investigators uncertain about how significant the descriptions are for any one group in the region. Further, some of these authors talked to native people and recorded what they heard, but very little exists in the way of Native American oral sources. Of course any sources created by Europeans reflect not just what they saw, but their perceptions of what they saw and even only what their perspective allowed them to see.

Scanty and biased sources pose obvious challenges to the researcher of Dutch-Munsee relations. It does not mean that nothing can be determined concerning the Munsees, their culture, and the changes which took place in contact with the Dutch. It does mean, however, that one has to read the sources carefully, looking for what might be revealed by

Dutch observers who themselves may not have recognized or understood certain patterns of Munsee behavior. It means occasionally assuming certain effects of colonization upon the Munsees based upon the experience of other native people of northeastern North America, and it means accepting the limits of what can be said or observed with confidence. In particular, some changes in Munsee society can be traced more easily than others. The experience of the Munsees most often comes to the fore in Dutch records during times of war. This is important, however, since much is revealed in the diplomatic choices and actions of the Munsees. Along with Munsee actions in war and diplomacy, significant political and economic developments can be identified in Munsee society. Unfortunately, many other changes such as gender relations and the roles of men and women remain generally hidden from the scholar's gaze.³¹ It means also that it is very difficult, although not impossible, to capture the native perspective on the challenges they faced and the changes they experienced. These areas, then, have not been ignored in producing this volume, but a conscious effort has been made not to engage in undue speculation. Thus the book does not reveal all that was happening within Munsee society, but discusses what can most confidently be argued from the sources or inferred in correlation with the experience of other groups. Nevertheless, important conclusions can be drawn about effects of colonization on the Munsee people and the degree and significance of cultural change which took place on the Dutch-Munsee frontier.

* * *

While aspects of Munsee culture and society will become clear in the chapters that follow, a few words about their worldview and cultural practices are necessary at the outset.³² At the heart of the Munsees' cultural outlook at the time of contact, as for so many Native Americans, lay an emphasis on the social aspect of reality. Maintaining proper social balance and proper relations was a key feature of Munsee culture. This was demonstrated throughout their societal structures. In religion, for example, the Munsee people expressed themselves with strong animistic beliefs. What Europeans considered inanimate or insensate objects were, for the Indians, alive with power. The Munsees' world was inhabited by animals, plants, rocks, and other-than-human creatures, all with spirits like their own. Relationships with such beings were beneficial, but also dangerous. To protect oneself it was necessary to maintain a proper relationship through the giving of gifts and through other exchanges. Such gift giving and social exchange was also practiced in connection with marriage rites and political and diplomatic relations—all agreements were sealed through the exchange of goods, particularly "spiritually charged" items such as shell beads known to us today as wampum. The importance of maintaining good relations with others pervaded their society. Nowhere, perhaps, was this more important than within the clan. Whereas Europeans identified the responsibility for administering justice

with the state, the Munsees associated the maintenance of justice with the extended family or clan group. When one member of the extended family was wronged, injured, or killed by an outsider, it was the responsibility of the remaining family members to see that justice was carried out. And this justice was defined in terms of social balance and reciprocity. Those who offended the family of another were obligated or compelled to recompense them through the giving of gifts or the forfeiture of life.

In their various cultural practices, the Munsees, who numbered about twelve thousand at the time of contact with the Dutch in the early seventeenth century, followed a cultural pattern similar to other northeastern woodland people, particularly the Mahicans and Mohawks.³³ The subsistence of those living inland centered upon a horticulture of corn, beans, and squash, and was supplemented by seasonal fishing, hunting, and gathering, while those living along the coast favored food gathering from marine sources. They maintained permanent seasonal villages, gathering in larger groups over the summer to pursue agricultural endeavors, and dispersing into smaller hunting parties or groups during the winter. They claimed possession or sovereignty over particular hunting, fishing, and agricultural districts. Their villages consisted of several round or long houses, with members of the same extended family or clan living in one house. They used various implements and tools made of stone and animal by-products such as bones, shells, and horns. Their weaponry consisted of hand-fashioned, stone projectile points. Their material culture also included pottery, clay pipes, shell beads, ornaments of various natural substances including Indian copper, and effigies representing various creatures and human beings. By the time Europeans arrived, the Munsees were likely involved in one of the many networks of trade existing throughout the Northeast. In particular, they were involved in exchanges with the Susquehannocks, Iroquois, Mahicans, and probably others. The nature of the exchange and the economic and diplomatic relationship between these people is little known today, but evidence from the period of postcontact suggests that the Munsees held an inferior position to some of these other tribes.³⁴

At the time of contact with the Munsees, the Dutch reflected the broad trends and experiences typical of early modern Europe, including the emergence of nation-states and a sense of nationalism; the political, religious, and social responses to the new religious diversity created by the Reformation; and the transition from a medieval to a modern worldview.³⁵ This last is important. While Europeans of the seventeenth century can seem quite familiar to us in their modernity, we should not be surprised by the persistence of medieval ideals. When Europeans in the early modern era met indigenous people, they were often driven by more modern economic forces, but they also tended to interpret the identity of Native Americans in light of a worldview inspired by medieval mythology.

Dutch culture and society, in particular, had undergone dramatic changes by 1609. In the 1570s and '80s, the Dutch revolted from their feu-

dal lord, the Spanish crown. In the aftermath of the initial revolt and brutal attempts by the Spanish crown to terminate the affair, a new and popular nationalism developed among the Dutch. This patriotic movement merged with Calvinism, and soon the Dutch identity became almost indistinguishable from feelings of anti-Catholicism.³⁶ This event reflected all of the major developments of the early modern period identified above. While a state of war existed with Spain until 1648, the foundations of the Dutch state—a republic—were established already in the late sixteenth century with the Union of Utrecht (1579) and the Act of Abjuration (1581). Even more significant was the emergence in the 1590s of the “rich trades.” A variety of forces led at this time to Dutch overseas expansion and the opening of trade between the Netherlands and the East Indies which provided the Dutch with spices and other commodities highly valued in Europe. These rich trades brought vast wealth and prestige to the Dutch Republic. With the development of the rich trades and war with Spain came an influx of European immigrants and significant urban growth in the maritime areas.³⁷ In short, expansion—economic, political, and religious—typified the Dutch experience in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. The impulse to colonize New Netherland grew out of this context. European immigrants, Dutch and others, shared a worldview comprised of a mix of medieval and modern ideas. Europeans would rely on medieval cosmology to find categories for native people while they brought and imposed upon the Indians modern European societal structures in the realm of politics, economics, law, and religion.

* * *

The chapters that follow explore the evolving relations between these two groups and consider how they, and individuals within each group, interacted, focusing in particular on how the changing colonial landscape affected their cultural encounter and Munsee cultural development. The chapter titles indicate, in a basic way, the main developments in their relations. Chapter 1, “First Contact,” considers the brief, but significant points of contact between the Munsees and Europeans beginning with the voyage of Verrazzano in 1524 and concluding with Hudson’s exploration of the region in 1609. During the initial encounter, Munsees and Europeans met and perceived one another out of their traditional world views. Hudson’s voyage marked the end of one era and the beginning of another, for in 1610, the Munsee people found themselves visited by the first of a long series of Dutch traders. This significant change in the cultural encounter is explored in second chapter, “Trade.” While traditional cultural motives guided both groups through this stage of the encounter, each side learned important lessons about the other. After 1624, much of the contact between the Dutch and Munsees was marked by trade, but as demonstrated in chapter 3, “Trade and Settlement,” the arrival of settlers again modified the shape of the frontier, particularly in the claim of

Dutch sovereignty over the region and the presence of a colonial administration. Whereas both sides tended to meet as equals in earlier encounters, with the Munsees continuing to be masters of their land, Dutch settlement shifted that balance and laid the foundation for the loss of native political sovereignty. Chapter 4, "Settlement and Warfare," considers the change in relations primarily provoked by larger-scale European migration and changes in colonial administration, while the last chapter, "Warfare and Diplomacy," continues that exploration and examines in particular the evolution of Munsee responses to ongoing European settlement within their lands. With increased European settlement came increased Munsee resistance. This led to three Dutch-Munsee wars. While most Munsee bands chose resistance at one time or another, by the end of the third war, each band had chosen to accommodate Dutch rule rather than to militarily resist it.

This study formally ends in 1664, when the Dutch colony was captured by the English, replacing Dutch claims to sovereignty over the region with English ones, and in effect ending the Dutch-Indian frontier, but creating a new English-Indian frontier. By that date, the structures of Dutch society—particularly economic and political—had become firmly established in the region. While some Dutch individuals and colonial officials had accommodated the Indians over time, few did more than that. In fact, as many recent studies demonstrate, by 1664, the Dutch of New Netherland maintained a strong Dutch identity and affinity with the fatherland.³⁸ While individual Europeans may have acculturated native ways elsewhere in colonial America, it was not prevalent among the Dutch in the lower Hudson Valley region of New Netherland. Under the English, Dutch cultural identity and many aspects of their society persisted well into the eighteenth century. As the conclusion notes, during the English-Indian frontier, the Munsees experienced increased pressures from European society which continued into the eighteenth century. Nevertheless, while a few Indians may have fully or significantly acculturated, the evidence suggests that many Munsees maintained significant elements of their traditional native worldview. Regardless of the state of their cultural development, most Munsees eventually retreated from the region altogether, leaving little impact on the overall character of New York.

One may ask whether New Netherland, in terms of European-Native American relations, was unique among the European colonies. When one generalizes about the nature of European-Native American relations in the colonies, it is common to note the differences between the English, French, and Spanish examples. At least since the time of Francis Parkman, historians have held that the French related far better to the Indians than did the English.³⁹ "Spanish civilization crushed the Indian," wrote Parkman, "English civilization scorned and neglected him," and "French civilization embraced and cherished him."⁴⁰

Understanding the frontier in terms of stages, however, and applying that framework to Indian relations in New England and New France may

suggest more similarities than differences. There is no denying that differences in geographic settings, environment, inter-Indian relations, national and ethnic identity, diverse cultural practices, and other factors played a role in every frontier in colonial America and defined each as unique. But consider for a moment the basic character of the Dutch-Munsee frontier, which will be elaborated upon in the following chapters. As the Dutch colonial effort developed, the Munsees continued to operate within their indigenous cultural outlook, but were also forced to come to terms with the new societal structures of the Europeans. Their responses to these were many, ranging from violence and warfare to various degrees of acculturation and accommodation. In general, the impact of European colonization was least in times of exploration and trade and became greatest when the focus of European expansion shifted to settlement. While the stages of the New Netherland frontier can be divided into small segments, as the following chapters do, the basic pattern remains—first contact, trade, and settlement. Each was marked by a particular character.⁴¹ This pattern was not unique to New Netherland, but typical of European-Indian relations elsewhere. When the conditions of colonization paralleled one another, the same patterns of interaction were repeated in New England and New France. In particular, when European expansion and colonization focused primarily upon trade, relations between Europeans and Native Americans tended to be more peaceful and both sides more inclined towards accommodation. Violence and warfare, by contrast, tended to emerge in the face of European settlement and European attempts to extend their sovereignty over native people. If European-Native American relations appear to have differed significantly in New England and New France, this perhaps had more to do with the fact that the English colonies were more extensively marked by settlement, while colonial efforts in New France centered on trade. But relations shaped by first contact and trade parallel one another throughout colonial history wherever they occurred. And even the small-scale attempts at settlement in New France reflected patterns of European-Indian relations which also developed in New England and New Netherland as a result of settler immigration. While the present work does not offer a systematic comparison of these three colonial regions, it does indicate broad parallels in frontier development where appropriate.

In conclusion, this work traces Munsee cultural change and development throughout their frontier experience with the Dutch in New Netherland. The goal of this work is threefold. First, it seeks to contribute to our understanding of New Netherland by giving the Munsee people their proper place in the story of the Dutch colony and to consider their experience in the Dutch colony. Second, because relations with Native Americans constituted a significant theme in other European colonies, this study contributes to the work already accomplished by others to broaden our knowledge of European-Indian relations in the seventeenth-century Northeast.⁴² Finally, this study works with a particular frontier frame-

work which facilitates comparisons of European and indigenous relations elsewhere, and suggests ways European and Indian relations in New Netherland, New France, and New England may have paralleled one another.

Notes

1. Howard Lamar and Leonard Thompson, eds., *The Frontier in History: North America and Southern Africa Compared* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981), 7.
2. Daniel K. Richter, *The Ordeal of the Longhouse: The Peoples of the Iroquois League in the Era of European Colonization* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1992), 55-56; Bruce Trigger, "The Mohawk-Mahican War (1624-1628): The Establishment of a Pattern," *Canadian Historical Review* 52 (1971): 276-286.
3. As Daniel Richter put it, "these peoples of the Longhouse are among the most studied of all North American Indians; indeed, many would argue that they are *overstudied*." *Ordeal of the Longhouse*, 1. Besides Richter, the most important works of the last twenty years include José Antônio Brandão, "*Your Fyre Shall Burn No More*": *Iroquois Policy toward New France and Its Native Allies to 1701* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997); Denys Delâge, *Bitter Feast: Amerindians and Europeans in Northeastern North America, 1600-64*, trans. Jane Brierley (English ed., Vancouver: UBC Press, 1993); Matthew Dennis, *Cultivating a Landscape of Peace: Iroquois-European Encounters in Seventeenth-Century America* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993); Michael K. Foster, Jack Campisi, and Marianne Mithun, eds., *Extending the Rafters: Interdisciplinary Approaches to Iroquoian Studies* (Albany: State University of New York Press for the Center for the History of the American Indian of the Newberry Library, 1984); Francis Jennings, *The Ambiguous Iroquois Empire: The Covenant Chain Confederation of Indian Tribes with English Colonies from Its Beginnings to the Lancaster Treaty of 1744* (New York: W.W. Norton and Co., 1984); Richter and James H. Merrell, eds., *Beyond the Covenant Chain: The Iroquois and their Neighbors in Indian North America, 1600-1800* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1987).
4. For example, Allen Trelease, *Indian Affairs in Colonial New York: The Seventeenth Century* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1960).
5. The case of the Iroquois, for example, differed significantly since they occupied lands which mostly remained remote from European colonization for a significant period of time. Richter, *Ordeal of the Longhouse*, 2-3.
6. Robert S. Grumet, *Historic Contact: Indian People and Colonists in Today's Northeastern United States in the Sixteenth through Eighteenth Centuries*, with a Foreword by Francis Jennings and a Preface by Jerry Rogers (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1995), 198; Grumet, "The Minisink Settlements: Native American Identity and Society in the Munsee Heartland, 1650-1778," in *The People of Minisink: Papers from the 1989 Delaware Water Gap Symposium*, ed. David G. Orr and Douglas V. Campana (Philadelphia: National Park Service, Mid-Atlantic Region, 1991), 183-185.
7. There exists no consensus among experts concerning the proper application of the terms Munsee, Delaware, and Lenape. Concerning the Munsee, Ives Goddard writes, "as a linguistic term Munsee includes all groups of any period that spoke dialects of the language spoken by the Munsee group, even though not all such groups were or

are Munsees in the political sense." Munsee means "person from Minisink," but "this name replaced Minisink to designate the consolidated group of emigrant Munsee speakers of whom the Minisinks were the major component." "Delaware," in *Handbook of North American Indians*, ed. William C. Sturtevant, vol. 15, *Northeast*, ed. Bruce G. Trigger (Washington: Smithsonian Institution, 1978), 236. Marshall Becker defines the Munsees as "a Delawaran (linguistically) assemblage, the bands of which appear to have been oriented more toward the lower Hudson (North) River." "The Lenape Bands prior to 1740: The Identification of Boundaries and Processes of Change Leading to the Formation of the 'Delawares,'" in *The Lenape Indian: A Symposium*, ed. Herbert Kraft (South Orange, New Jersey: Archaeological Research Center, Seton Hall University, 1984), 20. Herbert Kraft notes that "the name Munsee first appeared during the historic period in the Pennsylvania colonial records of 1727.... In the eighteenth century, the name Munsee was used to include all those Indian bands who formerly lived above the Raritan River as far north as Kingston, New York, and above the Delaware Water Gap and into northeastern Pennsylvania." He uses the term "Proto-Munsee" to refer to the groups whose descendants became known as Munsees. *The Lenape: Archaeology, History, and Ethnography*, Collections of the New Jersey Historical Society, vol. 21 (Newark: New Jersey Historical Society, 1986), xvii-xviii; "Late Woodland Settlement Patterns in the Upper Delaware Valley" in *Late Woodland Cultures of the Middle Atlantic Region*, ed. Jay F. Custer (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1986), 102-106. In his doctoral dissertation, Robert Grumet refers to the Munsees and nearby groups, who differed linguistically, as "Upper Delawaran" people, rejecting the term Delawares, usually designating those bands to the south and west of this region and used more commonly from the mid-eighteenth century onward; rejecting the term Lenape, which designates language; and rejecting the term Munsee, which also came into use in the late eighteenth century. He notes, however, that many of the Upper Delawaran people in his study came to be known as either Delawares or Munsees as they migrated west in the 1700s. "We Are Not So Great Fools': Changes in Upper Delawaran Socio-Political Life, 1630-1758" (Ph.D. diss., Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, 1979), 5-6, 24. This study is mostly limited to those who spoke the Munsee dialect, and thus is a narrower grouping than Grumet's Upper Delawarans. It adopts Goddard's use of the term Munsee for convenience.

The term Lenape is more problematic. According to Kraft, the term Lenape comes from the Unami dialect and has several related meanings including "'men of the same nation'" or "'common,' 'ordinary,' or 'real' people.'" The Lenapes referred to the territory they inhabited as *Lenapehoking*—"Land of the Lenapes." They have been more commonly known as Delawares, but this term is a European invention which is a shortened version of the "Delaware River Indians." The English associated the Lenapes with the bay they named after Sir Thomas West, Lord De la Warr, in 1610. This name was used especially after the many different groups of Lenapes left the region. Kraft, *The Lenape*, x-xviii. Goddard states that the terms Delaware and Lenape (from the Unami dialect) have come into use since the eighteenth century to describe all the speakers of the Unami and Munsee dialects, but it should be made clear that these groups identified together as Delawares or Lenapes "never formed a single political unit, and the name Delaware, which was first applied only to the Indians of the middle Delaware Valley, was extended to cover all of these groups only after they had migrated away from their eastern homelands." "Delaware," 213, 235-236. Not everyone agrees on the inclusiveness of these two terms. In his volume for junior audiences, Robert Grumet subsumes all the Unami and Munsee speakers under the term Lenape, noting that the "Lenapes have always thought of themselves as members of a single ethnic group sharing a common sense of identity and heritage" although "they have been politically united as a single people only rarely in their history." *The Lenapes, Indians of North America* series, ed. Frank W. Porter III (New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 1989), 13. Kraft does the same, but prefers the name Delaware be reserved "for the Unami-speaking people of the late seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth

centuries, and their present-day descendants; and Munsee for the historic Munsee-speaking people" although he acknowledges that "many Munsee-speaking Indians in Canada and elsewhere also call themselves Delawares." *The Lenape*, xviii. In general, Marshall Becker distinguishes between the Munsees and the Lenapes as culturally distinct (based on several archeological findings by others). But Becker notes that the Canadian "Delaware," and possibly Delaware groups in Wisconsin "are principally derived from these peoples conjoined with Native American remnants from Long Island and southern New York State." Yet "some members of the Munsee appear to have become a vital component of the Delaware who moved west to the Susquehanna and beyond." These stand in contrast to the other Lenape (Unami) based Delawares. "Lenape Bands," 20-21 and "The Boundary between the Lenape and the Munsee: The Forks of Delaware as a Buffer Zone," *Man in the Northeast* 26 (Fall 1983): 1-2. Similarly, William Hunter notes that "the Munsees ... are to be distinguished from the Delawares proper." There were cultural and linguistic divisions between Delawares (Unamis) and Munsees. "The Moravians ... consistently distinguished between Delaware and Munsee or Minisink in their mission records." "Documented Subdivisions of the Delaware Indians," *Bulletin of the Archaeological Society of New Jersey* 35 (1978): 31. See also Becker, "A Summary of Lenape Socio-Political Organization and Settlement at the Time of European Contact: The Evidence for Collecting Bands," *Journal of Middle Atlantic Archaeology* 4 (1988): 79-83.

8. See Grumet, "We Are Not So Great Fools," 23-28.
9. Goddard, "Delaware," 213-215. Like most seventeenth-century Europeans, the Dutch were never uniform in the spelling of names. In order to insure uniform spelling, I have adopted the spelling used by Goddard and Kraft. The names listed here are all those Goddard identifies as Munsee-speakers. Most of these interacted with the Dutch to one degree or another. As Robert Grumet has pointed out, difficulties exist with accurately identifying Native American groups and their homelands. The names and locations on Map 2 in this volume reflect Goddard's conclusions. Grumet challenges these, particularly in the case of the Rechgawawanck. "On the Identity of the Rechgawawanck," *Bulletin and Journal of Archaeology for New York State* 83 (Spring 1982): 1-7.
10. David Steven Cohen, "How Dutch were the Dutch of New Netherland?" *New York History* 62, no. 1 (January 1981): 43-60.
11. Joyce D. Goodfriend, "Burghers and Blacks: The Evolution of a Slave Society at New Amsterdam," *New York History* 59 (1978): 125-144; Goodfriend, "Black Families in New Netherland," *Journal of the Afro-American Historical and Genealogical Society* 4 (1978): 95-108.
12. Willem Frijhoff suggests that "in New Netherland [Dutch culture] was capable to absorb, and to a certain extent transform, the different cultures of its European members." "New Views on the Dutch Period in New York," *de Halve Maen* 71, no. 2 (Summer 1998): 29.
13. Lamar and Thompson, eds., *Frontier in History*, 5, 7-8. For an insightful discussion on the evolution of the frontier thesis since its promotion by Frederick Jackson Turner, see Kerwin Lee Klein, "Reclaiming the 'F' Word, Or Being and Becoming Postwestern," *Pacific Historical Review* 65 (May 1996): 179-215; and Klein, *Frontiers of Historical Imagination: Narrating the European Conquest of Native America, 1890-1990* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997).
14. James Axtell, "The Ethnohistory of Early America: A Review Essay," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd ser., 35, no. 1 (January 1978): 110.
15. Alan Gallay, *The Formation of a Planter Elite: Jonathan Bryan and the Southern Colonial Frontier* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1989), xv-xvi; Gregory Nobles, *American Frontiers: Cultural Encounters and Continental Conquest* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1997), 24. In their recent essay, "From Borderlands to Borders: Empires, Nation-States, and the Peoples in Between in North American History," *American Historical Review* 104, no. 3 (June 1999): 814-841, Jeremy Adelman and Stephen Aron explore the mean-

- ing of the frontier in relation to the concept of borderlands, bringing greater clarity to the definitions of both. See also the useful critiques in the following issue by Evan Haeffeli, Christopher Ebert Schmidt-Nowara, and John R. Wunder and Pekka Hämäläinen, plus Adelman and Aron's response, "Borders and Borderlands," *American Historical Review* 104, no. 4 (October 1999): 1221-1239.
16. Colin G. Calloway, *New Worlds for All: Indians, Europeans, and the Remaking of Early America* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997), 1-7; Andrew B. Cayton and Fredrika J. Teute, eds., *Contact Points: American Frontiers from the Mohawk Valley to the Mississippi, 1750-1830* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press for the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1998), 2. Some of the other works from the last fifteen years which implicitly or explicitly work with an understanding of the frontier as a zone of intercultural contact and mixing include Kathleen M. Brown, *Good Wives, Nasty Wenches, and Anxious Patriarchs: Gender, Race, and Power in Colonial Virginia* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press for the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1996); Richard White, *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815*, Cambridge Studies in North American Indian History, ed. Frederick Hoxie and Neal Salisbury (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991).
 17. Elsewhere I have argued that frontier historians have not adequately done this. See Paul Otto, "Reassessing American Frontier Theory: Culture, Cultural Relativism, and the Middle Ground in Early America" in *Frontiers and Boundaries in United States History*, ed. Sylvia Hinton and C.A. van Minnen (Amsterdam: VU University Press, 2004), 27-38.
 18. C.T. McIntire, "Historical Study and the Historical Dimension of Our World," in *History and Historical Understanding*, ed. C.T. McIntire and Ronald A. Wells, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984), 34-37.
 19. This simplification is consistent with McIntire's other work: *The Ongoing Task of Christian Historiography* (Toronto: Institute for Christian Studies, 1974), 16-19; and "The Focus of Historical Study" (unpublished essay), 7-10. Similar ideas are shared by other scholars of the same school of thought. See, for example, Sander Griffioen, "The Relevance of Dooyeweerd's Theory of Social Institutions," in *Christian Philosophy at the Close of the Twentieth Century: Assessment and Perspective*, ed. Sander Griffioen and Bert M. Balk (Kampen: Kok, 1995), 140; Bob Goudzwaard, *Capitalism and Progress: A Diagnosis of Western Society*, trans. and ed., Josina van Nuis Zylstra (Toronto: Wedge and Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979), xix-xxi; and B.J. van der Walt, *Afrocentric or Eurocentric? Our Task in a Multicultural South Africa* (Potchefstroom: Potchefstroom University Press, 1997): 7-20.
 20. My position stands in contrast to others on this point. For example, defining the frontier simply in terms of cultural interaction leads Gregory Nobles to conclude that "in reality, there is no end to the [frontier] story." *American Frontiers*, 16.
 21. Lamar and Thompson, *Frontier*, 7-11, quote on 7; Nobles, *American Frontiers*, xii. See also Leonard Thompson, "The Southern African Frontier in Comparative Perspective," in *Essays on the Frontier in History*, ed. George Wolfskill and Stanley Palmer (Arlington: Texas A&M University, 1983), 101-134.
 22. In this volume, *acculturation* is understood to mean any kind of cultural change resulting from impositions by another society or voluntarily undertaken, and *accommodation* to mean temporary modifications made by a group or an individual in order to ease tensions within an intercultural setting. My use of the term *acculturation* follows that of Alden T. Vaughan and Daniel K. Richter, "Crossing the Cultural Divide: Indians and New Englanders, 1605-1763," *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society* 90, Part 1 (April 1980): 24 n. 5.
 23. Richard Elphick and V.C. Malherbe, "The Khoisan to 1828," in *The Shaping of South African Society, 1652-1840*, ed. Richard Elphick and Hermann Giliomee (Middletown, Conn: Wesleyan University Press, 1988), 7-9. This volume has adopted the current "Khoë" in place of the traditional and more familiar "Khoi."

24. One aspect or another of this approach differs from several works which have explored the interactions of Native Americans and Europeans in the region once occupied by the Munsees. For example, Frank J. Esposito, "Indian-White Relations in New Jersey, 1609-1802" (Ph.D. diss., Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, 1976); Grumet, "We Are Not So Great Fools"; Laurence M. Hauptman and Jack Campisi, eds., *Neighbors and Intruders: An Ethnohistorical Exploration of the Indians of Hudson's River*, National Museum of Man Mercury Series, Canadian Ethnology Service, No. 39 (Ottawa: National Museums of Canada, 1978); and Trelease, *Indian Affairs*.
25. Sander Griffioen offers some insight into the distinctions between various forms of diversity with implications for distinguishing between culture, society, and ethnicity. See "Is a Pluralist Ethos Possible?" *Philosophia Reformata* 59 (1994): 11-25, and also his book coauthored with Richard Mouw, *Pluralisms and Horizons: An Essay in Christian Public Philosophy* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993).
26. For an example of such microstudies, see some of the essays in *Contact Points*, ed. Cayton and Teute.
27. Axtell, "The Ethnohistory of Early America," 116.
28. Willem Frijhoff, *Wegen van Evert Willemsz.: Een Hollands weeskind op zoek naar zichzelf, 1607-1647* (Nijmegen: SUN, 1995), 794-801; Simon Groenveld, "New Light on a Drowned Princess: Information from London," *de Halve Maen* 74, no. 2 (Summer 2001): 23-28.
29. Those seventeenth-century sources in opposition to Kieft's administration include David Pietersz. de Vries, *Korte Historiaal ende Journaels Aenteykeninge van verscheyden voyagiens in de vier delen des werelts-ronde, als Europa, Africa, Asia ende America gedaen*, ed. H.T. Colenbrander, Linschoten Society edition, vol. 3, (Den Haag: Martinus Nijhoff, 1911), portions which relate to New Netherland are translated and included in the anthology *Narratives of New Netherland, 1609-1664* (hereafter NNN), ed. J. Franklin Jameson (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1909), 181-234; and the pamphlet, *Breedden-Raedt aende Vereenichde Nederlandsche Provintien. Gemaect ende gestelt uyt divers ware en waerachtige memorien* (Antwerp: Francoys van Duyne, 1649), translated and republished in Henry C. Murphy, trans., "Vertoogh van Nieu Nederland" and "Breedden Raedt aende Vereenichde Nederlandsche Provintien" (New York: 1854). The source most clearly supporting Kieft is the anonymous manuscript "Journael van Nieu-Nederlandt," published with Jan Willem Schulte Nordholt, "Nederlanders in Nieuw Nederland. De oorlog van Kieft met als bijlage het 'Journael van Nieu-Nederland,'" *Bijdragen en Mededelingen van het Historisch Genootschap* 80 (1966): 78-94; translated as "Journal of New Netherland" in NNN, 265-284.
30. Charles T. Gehring and Robert S. Grumet, "Observations of the Indians from Jasper Danckaerts's Journal, 1679-1680," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd ser., 44, no. 1 (January 1987): 105 n. 3.
31. But note Robert Grumet's brief look at women in Munsee society in "Sunksquaws, Shamans, and Tradeswomen: Middle Atlantic Coastal Algonkian Women during the 17th and 18th Centuries," in *Women and Colonization: Anthropological Perspectives*, ed. Mona Etienne and Eleanor Leacock (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1980), 52. See also Grumet's "That Their Issue Be Not Spurious: An Inquiry into Munsee Matriliney," *Bulletin of the Archaeological Society of New Jersey* 45 (1990): 19-24.
32. Information on Munsee culture and lifestyle was reported by several firsthand observers or those who received reports from firsthand observers. Some of these include Johannes de Laet, *Nieuwe wereld ofte Beschrijvinghe van West-Indien ...* (Leiden: Isaack Elzevier, 1625); De Vries, *Korte Historiaal*; Adriaen van der Donck, *Vertoogh van Nieu Nederlandt* (Den Haag: 1650); Nicolaes van Wassenaer, *Historisch verhael alder gedenk-waerdigste geschiedenissen die van den beginner des jaeres 1621 ... tot 1632 voorgeaallen sijn* (Amsterdam: J.Ez. Cloppenburch, 1622-1623; Jod. Hondius, 1624; Jan Jansz., 1624-1635). Translations of the portions of these works which relate to New Netherland can be found in NNN. More in-depth descriptions can be found in Van der Donck, *Beschrijvinge van Nieuw-Nederlant* (Amsterdam: Evert Nieuwenhof, 1655),

- available in translation as *A Description of the New Netherlands*, ed. Thomas F. O'Donnell (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1968), but see also Ada van Gastel, "Van der Donck's Description of the Indians: Additions and Corrections," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd ser., 47, no. 3 (October 1990), 411-421. Secondary sources on Munsee and Lenape culture include Goddard, "Delaware," Grumet, *Lenapes*; Grumet, *Historic Contact*; Kraft, *The Lenape*; C.A. Weslager, *The Delaware Indians: A History* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1972).
33. Robert Grumet, personal communication, 6 November, 1994; Grumet, *Historic Contact*, 211, 212; Marshall Becker, "The Lenape Bands," 20-21.
 34. Lynn Ceci, "Tracing Wampum's Origins: Shell Bead Evidence from Archaeological Sites in Western and Coastal New York," in *Proceedings of the 1986 Shell Bead Conference. Selected Papers*, ed. Charles F. Hayes and Lynn Ceci, 72-74; Grumet, *Historic Contact*, 197-199, 202-203, 211-218; Jennings, *Ambiguous Iroquois Empire*, 30-31; William A. Starna, "Seventeenth-Century Dutch-Indian Trade: A Perspective from Iroquoia," *de Halve Maen* 59, no. 3 (March 1986): 5; Ceci, "Maize Cultivation in Coastal New York: The Archaeological, Agronomical, and Documentary Evidence," *North American Anthropologist* 1, no. 1 (1979-1980): 45-74; Patricia S. Bridges, "Prehistoric Diet and Health in a Coastal New York Skeletal Sample," *Northeast Anthropology* 48 (Fall 1994): 13-23.
 35. For general information on the culture and history of the Netherlands in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, see Jonathan Israel, *The Dutch Republic: Its Rise, Greatness, and Fall, 1477-1806* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995); Geoffrey Parker, *The Dutch Revolt* (rev. ed., London: Penguin Books, 1985); A.Th. van Deursen, *Plain Lives in a Golden Age: Popular culture, religion and society in seventeenth-century Holland*, trans. Maarten Ultee (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991); Simon Schama, *The Embarrassment of Riches: An Interpretation of Dutch Culture in the Golden Age* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988).
 36. S. Groenvelde and G.J. Schutte, *Nederlands verleden in vogelvlucht. Delta 2: De nieuwe tijd, 1500-1813* (Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff, 1992), 120; Van Cleef Bachman, *Peltries or Plantations: The Economic Policies of the Dutch West India Company in New Netherland, 1623-1639*, Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, 87th ser., no. 2 (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1969), 25-26; Oliver Rink, *Holland on the Hudson: An Economic and Social History of Dutch New York* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press and Cooperstown: New York State Historical Association, 1986), 50-68.
 37. Israel, *Dutch Republic*, 318, 328-330, and *passim*.
 38. David Steven Cohen, *The Dutch-American Farm*, The American Social Experience Series, ed. James Kirby Martin (New York: New York University Press, 1992); Firth Haring Fabend, *A Dutch Family in the Middle Colonies* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1991); Fabend, *Zion on the Hudson: Dutch New York and New Jersey in the Age of Revivals* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2000); Joyce D. Goodfriend, *Before the Melting Pot: Society and Culture in Colonial New York City, 1664-1730* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992); Jaap Jacobs, *Een zegenrijk gewest: Nieuw-Nederland in de zeventiende eeuw* (Amsterdam: Prometheus and Bert Bakker, 1999); Jacobs, *New Netherland: A Dutch Colony in Seventeenth-Century America*, The Atlantic World, Europe, Africa, and the Americas, 1500-1830, ed. Wim Klooster and Benjamin Schmidt (Leiden: Brill, 2005); and David Narrett, *Inheritance and Family Life in Colonial New York City* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press and Cooperstown: New York State Historical Association, 1992).
 39. See, for example, Cornelius J. Jaenen, *Friend and Foe: Aspects of French-Amerindian Cultural Contact in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited, 1976), 7.
 40. Francis Parkman, *The Jesuits in North America* (reprint, Boston: Little, Brown, 1963; originally published 1867), 131.

41. This distinction in stages of contact is similar to that expressed by Neal Salisbury in *Manitou and Providence: Indians, Europeans, and the Making of New England, 1500-1643* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), 12. See also White, *The Middle Ground*.
42. These authors' works include but are not limited to James Axtell, *The Invasion Within: The Contest of Cultures in Colonial North America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986); Alfred Cave, *The Pequot War*, *Native Americans of the Northeast: Culture, History, and the Contemporary*, ed. Colin G. Calloway and Barry O'Connell (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1996); William Cronon, *Changes in the Land: Indians, Colonists, and the Ecology of New England* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1983); Delâge, *Bitter Feast*; Dennis, *Cultivating a Landscape of Peace*; Jaenen, *Friend and Foe*; Francis Jennings, *The Invasion of America: Indians, Colonialism, and the Cant of Conquest* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1975); Richter, *Ordeal of the Longhouse*; Salisbury, *Manitou and Providence*; Bruce G. Trigger, *The Children of Aataentsic: A History of the Huron People to 1660* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1976); Trigger, *Natives and New-comers: Canada's "Heroic" Age Reconsidered* (Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1985).