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A barrack in North Holland from the first half of the Seventeenth Century. The original by G. Raghmann is in the Bremen Kunsthalle. This and the two other European sources were furnished the author by Dr. B. Nonte, Volkskundliches Seminar der Universität Münster, Germany.
A barrack is a farm building consisting of four posts (with holes for pegging) which support a roof that can be raised or lowered according to the contents. Open on all four sides, it served as a shelter for hay, grain or straw.

In the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries barracks were commonplace in the rural landscape, not only in Pennsylvania but in adjoining New Jersey and New York as well. Today, in all of Pennsylvania, but one such structure is known to survive—in almost complete ruins—on a Bucks County farm near Keller's Church.

In the southern tier of the Pennsylvania Dutch Country the barrack is called a “shut-shier” in dialect, a term which is documented as early as 1756. (See cut on page 3.)

Scholars abroad, K. Rhamm* principal among them, inform us that the barrack was known as far back as the Middle Ages all over Middle Europe—Germany, the Netherlands, France and Italy, but not in the British Isles. It is understandable, therefore, why one should occasionally encounter the term “Dutch Barn” (see 1793 entry) for the barrack, for apparently it was the early Dutch and German settlers who transferred this architectural feature to our shores.

I shall now list the American source material on the barrack chronologically.

Peter Kalm’s Travels in North America, edited by Adolph B. Benson (New York, 1937), Volume I, pp. 264–265, May 24, 1749: “... many people, especially in the environs of Philadelphia, had haystacks with roofs which could be moved up and down. Near the surface of the ground were some poles laid, on which the hay was put, that the air might

* K. Rhamm, Urzeitliche Bauernhöfe in Germanisch-Slawischem Waldgebiet, Braunschweig, 1908, p. 250.
pass freely through it. I have mentioned before that the cattle had no stables in winter or summer and were obliged to graze in the open air during the whole year. However, in Philadelphia, and in a few other places, I saw that these people who made use of the latter kind of haystacks, viz. that with movable roofs, commonly had built them so that the hay was put a fathom or two above the ground, on a floor of boards, under which the cattle could stand in winter when the weather was very bad. Under this floor were partitions of boards on all the sides which, however, stood far enough from each other to afford the air a free passage.

Page 332, June 13, 1749: "The land on both sides of the river was chiefly low, and more carefully cultivated as we came nearer Albany. Here we could see everywhere the type of haystacks with movable roofs."

1756

The Journal and Papers of David Shultze, Volume I, 1726-1760, translated and edited by Andrew S. Berky (Pensburg, 1952), p. 180, July 19-23, 1756: "Hauled in all the rye and wheat—1000 (sheaves) of wheat in the stock, 900 (sheaves) or rye in the barn." The original reads "Shot Shener" which Mr. Berky should have translated "in the barrack" and not "in the barn."

1767

Extracts from the Diary of Jacob Hiltzheimer, of Philadelphia, 1765-1798, edited by Jacob Cox Parsons (Philadelphia, 1893), p. 13, Jan. 6, 1767: "Thomas Shoemaker and I measured the hay barrack, below the house, where the water left a mark, and found it had been five feet, four inches."

1787

A letter by Mrs. Mary Capner, written Nov. 13, 1787, from Hunterdon County, New Jersey, to relatives in England, quoted in Rural Hunterdon, An Agricultural History, Hubert G. Schmidt (New Brunswick, 1945), p. 95: "Barracks are a building I have not described to you, tho I noticed them at the first coming into the country. Tommy has made one for his Bro. [It has] four poles fixed in the ground at the distance of fifteen feet in a square. The poles are squared fifteen feet or more at top and five feet at bottom unsquared. This is all above ground. In the square part of the poles there are holes bored thro at the distance of twelve inches big enough for a strong iron pin to be put thro to support [sic] four wall plates which are tenanted [sic] at the ends, then some light spars are put upon the wall plates and thatch upon them. When it was only five feet from the ground, the room can be raised at pleasure 21 feet or any distance from the ground between that and five feet. These are to put hay or any kind of grain under and the roof is always ready to shelter it from hasty rains which is common hear [sic] in summer. Those that have only two cows have the bottom part boarded at the sides and a floor laid over and the hay at top and the cow stable under."
An entry, dated July 19-23, 1756, from the diary of David Shultze with the earliest documentation for “Shot Shear,” the Pennsylvania Dutch word for barrack.

1703

Patrick Campbell, Travels in the interior inhabited parts of North America in the years 1791 and 1792 (Edinburgh, 1793), p. 151: [in the Niagara area of New York] “When I came opposite to Captain Fraser’s house, which was a little way below the road, my servant said that it was the place where we had been directed to; but on my looking about, and remarking the good house, but a still larger barn of two stories, several office houses, barns, or Dutch barns, the sufficiency and regularity of the rails, and extent of the meadows, considerable flocks of Turkeys, Geese, Ducks, and Fowls, I said it could be no Highlander that owned that place,—that the barns or Dutch barns were foreign to any Scotchman whatever,—that I had not hitherto seen any of them that had such a thing,—and that he must be a German who lived in that place.”

1798

Two years ago, while engaged in collating the barn data in the 1798 direct tax records in the National Archives in Washington, D. C., I encountered the term barrack for the first time. Standard agricultural histories, which I consulted for help, including Stevenson Whitecomb Fletcher’s 1950 Pennsylvania Agriculture and Country Life 1630-1830, failed even to mention the barrack. This article, then, is the fruit of a two-year quest for information concerning this medieval type of architecture in our Colonial and post-Colonial mid-America.

The 1798 direct tax records for Merion Township, Montgomery County, list 178 farmsteads with barns and 12 farmsteads with barns (no size is given): Jacob Balert, two barracks; Henry Cline, barrack; Elizabeth Conrad, barrack; Davis Mordice, two barracks; Henry Helfembott, frame barrack; Samuel Levering, barrack; Andrew Myers, barrack stable; Peter May, barrack stable; no name, barrack; John Roberts, barrack; and Aaron Smith, barrack. The Plymouth Township records list George Hitner, barrack.

Chester County records list under Vincent Township: Elizabeth Keely, two grain barracks. Lancaster County under Lancaster Township lists: Andrew Graff, one “barrack frame” 18 x 16, and John Shank, one “barrack frame,” 30 x 18.

1807

Vancouver Agric. Devon, 1813, p. 129: “This contrivance is called a hay-barrack in Pennsylvania, where they are equally used for the protection of hay as well as of corn.”

1818

John Palmer, Journal of Travels in the United States (London, 1818), p. 14: “The barracks have a moveable roof, supported on posts, in which holes are bored and the roof raised and lowered at pleasure.”

1832

David Lloyd, Economy of Agriculture: Being a Series of Compendious Essays on Different Branches of Farming, Germantown, 1832, pp. 20-21: “When a large quantity of hay is to be put together in a mow, it should be made drier than when it is to be put in barracks or stacks.”

1848

J. R. Bartlett, Dictionary of Americanisms (New York, 1848), p. 173: “Hay barrack (Dutch, hooberg, a hay-rick), a straw-thatched roof supported by four posts, capable of being raised or lowered at pleasure, under which hay is kept. A term peculiar to New York State.”
This is a Rufus A. Grider copy of the earliest known painting of Bethlehem, Pennsylvania. The Grider copy bears this note: "Bethlehem, Pa, in 1753. Copied from an Original Sketch in the possession of Matthew S. Henry, Esq., by Rufus A. Grider, Bethlehem, Nov. 11, 1854." Note the barric in the foreground, center, between log house and barn.

1854

*Harper's Magazine*, November, 1854, p. 849 (locale not given): "We creep slily around a 'barrack,' as it is called, of standing hay, and the pegs at a corner-post we climbed up to the top of the hay-mow, under the straw-thatched roof, and lay down."

1956

About two years ago I enlisted the help of the Reverend William J. Rupp, now of Souderton, Pennsylvania, in pursuing the subject of the barric in his weekly dialect column in the Pennsburg *Town and Country*. Mr. Rupp, subsequently, devoted four columns replete with much valuable information on the barric. They are reprinted here in their original garb.

**October 5, 1956**

Now wulla m'r fertacla fon da shutt-sheier, wie m'r fershprocha hen die lebliht woch. Tum airshda wulla m'r sawga wos sie nat is.

Ainer hut sawga wulla es wear en budden-sheier, en sheier wuH alles so uff en budden nous geht,—dr̈eš-den, shťalling, un alles uff en grund nous. En onnerer hut sawga wulla es wear en sheier wie shear aimichi onneri yusht os sie en gons kartzer foershuss hett,—en foershuss draw owwer gons wenich fonna nous gebout.

Noch ainer hut sawga wulla es wear nix os wie en shupp-sheier,—yusht en grosser shťall odder shupp aryets drous im feld fer hoi, shtrow odder frucht nei bis m'r so sacha rei hola kon un's in die recht sheier do, odder bis es tsoit is fer so ebbes feedera.
Now, ich glaub als noch so halver os ebbol mol shutt-sheier ge'ewt huit um hut shupp-sheier gemaint, un os des was mir shwetza wulks dafon mol sella waeg sei nawma grieht huit. Dale fon uns Deitseh kenna alsamohl ordlich ferdrate shwetza un dale fon unsara werta kunnas alsamohl ordlich iswertzwarich roits.

Ich kon aw gons letz sei in dem ding, fon waya en shutt-sheier is weit fon was mir als en shupp-sheier klaesa hen. Ferleieht huit mol ainer beim nawma “Shutti” so ebbes es affer airtsht moih gemicht un sie hen’s fon darta ob en “Shutt-sheier” klaesa, odder shutt-sheier wie mir’s now shpella.

Der Fred Slifer fon Phoebe Home in Allentown huit uns es airtsht fortzelt fon paar shutt-sheiera os er als g’sehna in feeler shear drivva om Haycock, hinnich Quakertown un Flatland drivva. Wie er yinger wor is er un sei papp als dart hinnamous gongga ihra g’sheida noch, um darta huit er die dinger es airtsht un es airtshts moih g’sehna. Sei papp huit ihm g’saunt wos sie wearda.

Noh is der Howard Sebbery fon Schwenksville kumma uns sehna un er huit uns aw fertzelt fon paar shutt-sheiera os als wora in da noecher-hof fon Geryville, nat weit fon Krausdale. Er huit gemaint eins dafof weir als uff da Drei-Kounty Bowwerei Gewest drivva aryets g’shwichich Geryville un Krausdale drin. Er huit sie als g’sehna wie er yung wur in sella ummergeid, un es letshit os er gewist huit dafof shon yohra tzurick is os die sheier om tsumma folla wor. Er s’wagt now weir alles fert.

En shutt-sheier is nix os wie feer poshda im grund mitt’na dach owwa druffi. So’n sheier odder shupp wor so ebbes wie tzaa, tzwolf odder fuftzaa foos eckieh. Ferleieht wora sie kon tzetl mainer os tzwelf foos eckieh. Won sie graezer gewest wearda wears dach druff zu gross un zu shwear gewest.

Die sheier wor so gemacht os m’ir es dach uff un ob sheava huit kenna, hutt’s muf sheava kenna, odder runner lussa. Yader poshda is dorrich an eek fon dach gonga. Die poshda wora in der grund gezwawoa un wora so bunt en halb foos eckieh. Es wora tpoppa-lecher dorrich die poshda gemacht die tzwaay waya, so os m’ir tzwai waya tpoppa dorrich shreka hut kenna fer’s dach haeva. Sella waeg wor’s hendiecher fer’s dach muf do odder runner lussa, un’s shewear ding is da leit not uns da hend gerasa un nummer g’soals.

Es wor en leicht shindla dach uff dem ding. Der buddem dafof wor der grund selwert, odder paar block odder riggel uff der grund geaegt. En shupp-sheier huit aw riggel uff en grund k’hotta fer en buddem.

Die sheier huit kon wond k’hotta, yedht die eckposhda. Won’s tzetl wor fer die glee sheier block mit hoi, shthrow, frucht odder welshkarn-lawb don hen freer monnsleit es dach muf g’sheva so weit os sie gkennt hen. Die tpoppa in da eckposhda hen’s droww k’hotta. Noh is die frucht odder so der gleiches nei k’hnut werra.

Wie der shutick fertich wor, odder shear so hoch os die poshda, odder shear muf on’s dach, noh is es dach runner gelush werra uff’s hoi, shtrow, frucht odder lawb. Onsa

---

*Courtesy of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania.*

*A plate from Patrick Campbell’s Travels in the interior inhabited parts of North America in the years 1791 and 1792. Edinburgh, 1793. showing three “barracks or Dutch Barns.”*
rum war der shtruch uf, die eek-poshda hen alles tzonna k'hoya, un's dach owwa driver hut ocht gewwa uf's iwwerich. Es wor besser wie en onner shtruch droum im feld,—er is nat imm-wenich nos werra.

Wun's tei zor fer sacha uns da shutt-sheier nemma, hen die menners es dach bissel muf g'shova, hen rons genanna, wos sie hame fohra hen wulla, un hen noh's dach widder runner gelusst uf wos noch darta wor. Sella waeg war immer en dach uf en shtruck, wor er hoch odder wor er mider.

Ich sutt aw sawga, es wor en loch in yadern eek fon dach, un darrich selli lecher sin die fee eek-poshda gonga, odder darta drin is es dach muf odder runner gonga.

Gons darrich war die shutt-sheier en hendich ding, un wor fieb besser os wie der uff'na hoi, shtrow, lowb odder frucht-shtruck os droum im feld g'shtonna hut darrich alla wedder, os oft teiata darrich mass werra is won er nat recht gemacht wor.

Sel is so bout wos m'r so weit wissa fon da shutt-sheier. Is noch ebbe mainer? Now os ihr so fieb wiest, kommt eich noch mainer ei? Wo kent ihr uns noch fortzela?

Un wuh in da welt is noch so en ding? Is noch ainich arryets ebbe iwwerich os mir ohna gae kenta un en picker nemma? Shreibt uns wos ihr noch wiest.

October 26, 1950

Ich will now noch weiter shreiva fon da shutt-sheier bisnis. Die wos nat wissa, wes ich main, kenna tzurick gouda zu unserm brief drei wocha tzurick. In sellem brief hen m'r fertzaelt wos m'r so weit gewist hen fon dem waes. Die teiata hen m'r noch mainer ausg'fuma.

Der Al Shumacher fon Pennsylvania Deitscha "Folklore Center" droum in Bethel, der kerl os es aller airtsht gewunnert hust wach da shutt-sheier, hut uns bissel mainer g'sawt fon dem ding, un wie er uff die shloor kumma is fon so ebbe.

Der Al sawgt uns ehr's ainicht k'haert fon so ebbe fon Fred Stauffer drumma in Oley so on da drei yohr tzurick. On sella teiata wor der Al uff da maiming der Fred hett en bueden sheier gennant.

Noh wie der Al on's shreiva gongs is fer sel she buch fon da Pennsylvania sheiera rous griega, hut er mit'ma alta shreiner drumma in Herrford g'shwezt, un der kei hut ihm g'sawt en shutt-sheier wear en sheier os en anyer kartzer foreshuss hett.

Sell is der waeg wie der Al es noh g'shrivva hut in sein buch, un doch wer er as noch so halwer uff da maiming es kent ebbe shunnh sit,—ken bueden-sheier un aw ken sheier mit'ma gons kartza foreshuss.

Der Al hut uns noh g'frogt wachdem ding, un mir hen eich g'frogt. Der Fred Sliker un der Howard Seiberl hen uns noh ausgelaggt uff der rechda waeg wos en shutt-sheier is, un sell os wos m'r gewwa hen in unserm brief drei wocha tzurick.

Die teiata hut der Al uns g'sawt er hett en brief g'shamma in all seine boecker, g'shrivva in 1945, beim Dr. E. F. Bonner fon Salfordville. In dem brief hut der Bonner g'sawt es hett shutt-sheier in Barricks un Lengesbder Contey, es hett sie droum in da felder es mehcht, wosdah uff uff da feur seida, un hetta en dach os m'r muf de kent odder runner bues wie's en boss dade. Er hut g'sawt sie words fa bu, sthrow odder frucht nei do.

Wos der Bonner g'sawt hut is wos m'r aw k'haert hen, un wos m'r g'shrivva hen. So wora m'r all uff da rechda shdoor.

Der Fred Sliker hut uns die teiata g'sawt der Clarence Huber fon Trumbaurersville hett aw als shutt-sheier g'shuma in seine nochenheits yohra tzurick, grasw os wie der Fr德

A detail from a Pennsylvania painting, "Country Fair," by John A. Woodside dated 1824, showing a barrack. This painting is owned by Harry T. Peters, Jr., of New York City. A reproduction can be found in Centennial Exhibition Pennsylvania Painters, University Park, Pennsylvania, 1955, plate 20.
Cut of a farm scene showing a barrack in the foreground, right. Reproduced from the title page of Hubert G. Schmidt's Rural Hunterdon, New Brunswick, 1945. The source of the illustration is not given in the volume.

Dale fon denna gebeier wora grawd himma odder naeva on da grossa sheier, odder gons naegsdht dabe ufi egni sheier-hole. Ommora wora in shwomum, ufi em shwomum-hiwheel, im nelond, droux in felod, odder aryets naeva om busch. Dale hen sie os em waeg g'shiedt, hen sie gons in der busch, un hen in busch-waeg gemehnt fer omna kumma.

'Mir missa des doh obschnida un noch weiter ferziela die naegsdht woch.

November 2, 1956

Der Al Shunacher fom Pennsyania Deitsch "Folklore Center" os now droux sheir on Bethel is, hut uns fer weil tzuriek g'trogwt waech em Englisha navuma, "hay barrack." Er hut g'sawt er hett seller navuma fiel g'sehma da alta tox-lshida os sie hetta druma in Washington fom yohr 1798.

'Mir waes os des ebbes is os tan do hut mit da bowwerei un os es ebbes fon'ma gebei sei sull os ufi da alta bowwerica wor long tzuriek. Ich denk es wor da Englisha ihnra waeg fer ebbes haesa os mir Deitsche un hoi-shupp odder so ebbes haesa dadu.

Wie ich des g'sehma hob is es mir eikumma ich hett mol aryets long tzuriek der Deutsch navuma, hoi barriek, k:lueert. Ferieicht bin ich gone in die welt nei letz. Em sei gedonka haltn em alsamoohl fernarre. Ich hob shun rum'rogwt owner niemond will ebbes waes fon'ma "hoi-barrack." Es kon gute sei os es so ebbes sei haeta nat gewwa hut.

Doch wunnet's mich wie mir so ebbes in die gedonka kumma is, em hoi barriek. Ainer hut g'sawt er dade denka ich dade em hoi-shuck mannt. Yar wol, ich waes yusht net un ich will nit maner dafof sawga.

Ancher, der Al Shunacher manti d'Englisha ihnra "hay barrack" wear gewest was mir shupp-sheier, shrow-shupp odder so der gleiches haesa. Er hut aw gemaint sell wearda ferlecht die shupp-sheiera gewest.

Won ebbes uns beseeber omslaya kon was so ebbes is, oddder wor, wearda mi't froh es tzu haera. So aw mit da shupp-sheier bisnis.

Noch eins,—alles kummt hame om end, so sawga sie als. Bei mir is gewiss dale hame kumma! Noch all dem shreeva un winner waech shutt-shheier oder shupp-shheier, die mit em glaena, leichda duch os m'r m'uff sheava kon odder runner lasse wie m'r will, is alles shae hame kumma tzu da alta haemet un bowweree wu hich ufgewoasa bin!

Ich hob ois z'fumma os so en shutt-shheier als uff da alta, bowweree g'shtonna hut ebbe wie fuftzich yohr tzurick. Ich waes now wu hie g'shtonna hut, in wellem feld. Ebbe gaca fimf-un-fertzich yohr tzurick is sie week gerissa werre.

Es wor en hoi-shupp odder shupp-shheier, haes sie wos duh witt. Sie wor ebbe wie fertzaz foos echkch, wor nix os wie feer eck-poshda un dach. Die poshda wora so ebbe wie en halb foos echkch, un wora full tzoppa-leecher fon budden nufl bis on's end. Es dach owwa druff wor gebort, wor ken shindla dach.

Un's besht fon all, ich hob's iwwerbleibs fon aim eck-poshda, mit tzoppa leecher un alles, g'fumma dahame uff da bowweree im alta hinkel-shhall! Ac shwell in sellem alta-shall is en poshda fon alta hoi-shupp! Dart is als noch tzu sehna, so weit alles os m'r noch tzu sehna grieckt hen fon wos dale en shutt-shheier haesa wurh!

Alles kunnt hame, odder nemnt em tzurick hame! Un sell is nat all. Ich hob oug'fumma os so shupp-shheiera uff da ommer bowwereia wora nat weit fon unsera haemet veek. Dale wora gons gross un long. Ommera wora blae un wora grawd, so wie die shutt-shheiera os m'r fertzaelt hen dafon. Now sin sie all fert un die alta bowwer dart rum kenna em yushit so bout sawga wu hie als g'shtonna hen en halb-bunnert yohr tzurick.

So haert m'r os die dinger um der waeg worn in Lecha un Barrieks County yohra tzurick, un os sie nat yushit in Bucks, Montgomery un Lengesdier wora wie m'r es airesht genaint hen.

Oh, won m'r yushit noch ains aryets finna kent un en piekler nemna dafon! Odder won yushit eebber aryets en bld fon so ebbe noch hett! Gookt mol, denkt mol, ferleicht is noch aryets so ebbe.

Won aryets ains wear os m'r obnemna kent, ging ich
An etching of barracks by H. Farrer, reproduced from the January 1883 issue of the Century Magazine, page 491. The author owes this find to Dr. Don Yoder, who also informs that the aged artist Daniel Garber of Lamberville, Pa., has done four etchings showing barracks, likely of New Jersey provenience.

shnell uff der waeg for en farreb-pickler nemma.

Mit dem huisa m'rir don die gons busiss,—bis ich widder ebbes laefer olde schen, olde bis ebbre mir noch mainer shiekot oder shrteet. Seit so gute un buste haera fon eich won ihr eisht ebbes wisst. Un gross donk fer alles!

November 9, 1956

Unser letzibreif wor noch nat recht drucks, bis en brief kamma is fon Oliver Bieler fon East Greenville. Des is woes der Ollie g'shrivva hut.

Ich bin als on deina g'shiebdla lasen in unsera tzeitung, un duh hushlt shum peer molh g'shrivva fon shutt-sheiera. Wuh seller nawma harrkummet kon ich nat suwa, owzer sell is woes mir des ding klaess hen uff unserm blots halb waegs g'shivva East Greenville un Palm in Montgomery County on da Baroma Grieb.


Es huet uff grossa shiae g'sutza, so bout tzwaee foos hoch fon baddenn on da hochsa seid, un nat so hoch fon baddenn on da niddere seid. Es wor feer-cekikh, ferleicht ebbes on da sehztze foos eckikh,—owzer des denk ich yuscht, ich hoh's nat gamessa!

Es wora drei g'saegda bleck uff die grossa shtae gelagt da ainda waeg un tzwaee da onnern waeg. Die bleck wora g'folst un gatzoppt. Die bleck wora tzeimich shuttirick un wora ebbes wie och tzull eckikh. Der bleck in da mift wor yuscht fer die riggel druff haya fer der baddem fon da shutt-sheiera macha, so os es sacha in da sheier nat uff en grund wor, un os luft unna darrich gekent hut un es es umgetziffer nat so shillem wor.

On da feer eeka wora poshda neig getzoppert fer die hocha eeka macha. Die poshda wora so bout un halb foos eckikh un wora so bout tzowentsch foos hoch. Unna wora die eck-poshda gute fastt gemacht mit booga drin die tzwea waya. Owwa wora sie tzonna klaas mit feer eisena shtonga, os alles tzonna gebamma hen.

Es wor en feer-seidie shpitziach dach owwa druif, so nei gemacht offen dufft gemacht os yader poshda om eek darrich's dach gonga is. Es dach wor nat fastt so os m'ir es muff sheava hut kenna offen rumer lussa. In da poshda wora leecher nei gebolt, ferleicht en tzall gross en un foos fon nommer uff da tzwea seida fon yaderm poshda. Doh wora shticker fon eisena shtonga nei g'shleekkt os tzoppfa fer des dach hueva won m'ir'es muff offen rumer gaalst hut.

Wen ich nat letz bin vor des dach fon bord gemacht. Wie g'sawi, es wor shpitziach in da mitt.

Die shutt-sheier wor gons rum uff. M'r hut uff da hocha seid uff die shiefer-brick fohra kenna fer frueht, hot, oder welshkern-lawb nei ohalawa. Uff da unnera oder niddere seid hut m'ir onna fohra kenna fer ufflawda oder sache roos nemma un week fohra.

Now is gorf mix darta un es is ken pickler tzu nemma! Alles is furt un week! Ferleicht konneh duh en pickler in deim kupp macha os duh nolh davon shrivva konneht so wie ich des dings doh achselegt hob.

Busch, von duh mol doh rumer kunnemhit noch East Greenville kon ich dich on der alt blots nemma wah des geber mol wor un wah mir als g'shoft hen.

So bei fer dessa molh fon Ollie Bieler.

So macha m'ir don fert bis m'ir fertich sin un bis m'ir alles nummer g'shriwva un gedruckt hen os onstzofina is fon denna alta shutt-sheiera. 
The Courtship and Wedding Practices of The Old Order Amish

Benches and chairs are set up in the main room of the house for the church-meeting. Later, the seats are cleared away and tables set up.
It is rather early in the morning when the guests start their buggy ride to bride's house.

By VINCENT R. TORTORA

The enormous vitality with which the old-order Amish Folk retain their semi-anachronistic way of life amid the stresses of the modern American society is quite astounding. No other major in-group in America has so effectively resisted the homogenizing effects of the present technological and mass-media era. Even the hill folk of Kentucky, according to educator Jesse Stuart writing in the Saturday Review of Dec. 28, 1957, have gone "modern."

Of no small consequence in the preservation of solidarity and esprit de corps among the Amish is their remarkable faculty for relative self-sufficiency. Indeed, the Amish need not reach beyond their immediate group to satisfy the larger part of their physical needs and all their social, spiritual, and emotional needs.

The resounding conviviality and wholesome camaraderie attending an Amish wedding is an excellent case in point. It is here that the multi-faceted Amish personality is expressed and stimulated by nothing more than membership in their own microcosm, happily fulfilled.

While the groom and, sometimes, his brother, invite the Amish guests personally, the bride's mother and father may invite "English" guests by means of a personal visit or a casual post-card. However, invitations extended to non-Amish friends are extremely rare. Usually, only the family doctor, the school teacher, the feed supplier and the like are invited.

I managed to wheedle a grudging invitation to the wedding of Dave Zook's daughter only through frequent and pointed references to his wife's excellent reputation as a cook and to my eagerness to sample some of her fare . . . "Just drop on in if you like," he said icily.

Rachel Zook's wedding to Levi Fisher was to be held on a Tuesday morning during November. Tradition dictates, as it does in so many modern Amish practices, that, with the work of the harvest completed and the larder filled to overbrimming, the wedding season should begin. The alternative day would have been Thursday. Other days are inappropriate insofar as Monday is a day of preparation after the Sabbath, Wednesday is the day of preparation for Thursday weddings, Friday is unlucky and Saturday is the day of preparation for the Sabbath.
At about 8:00 A.M. I drove my small French Renault into the Zook’s farm-yard, already cluttered almost to the point of overflow with the grey, box-like buggies of the family men and the black, rakishly-open buggies of the young bachelors. Ephraim Rehl, close friend of the groom, came up to the car and mischievously advised me that even though he was chief hostler he could not manage to put up in the stable all the “horses” under my hood. All morning, Ephraim and his crew had been unhitching horses from the buggies of guests and putting them up in the stable. A type of numbered horse-check which they gave to each guest helped identify horses when it came time to leave.

Mr. Zook, father of the bride-to-be, came out to shake my hand and take me by the arm. As we walked into the house, he explained: “The young fellows are all out to do mischief at weddings. If you were to walk in alone they’d think you wasn’t invited and they’d blacken your face for sure.”

The ground floor of the Zook house had been cleared of most of its furniture to make room for a score or so benches and a number of chairs. The religious ceremony was due to begin at 9:00 A.M. In corners of the main room and in other rooms, both upstairs and down, the wedding guests, grouped off according to sex and age, were engaging in conversation. Most of the married women were either in the shed or the cellar executing final refinements on the food. The bride and groom were commingling freely with guests their age. The shrill giggles of the bride’s friends alternated with the raucous guffaws of the groom’s friends in a type of nuptial antiphon.

The bride, much as her unmarried girl-friends who were gathered around her, was dressed in a solid color, rather formless, tuck made by Mrs. Zook. An ample white organdy apron extended from waist to lower hem and two thirds of the way around her body. Tinned to the top of the apron was a triangular Halstuch (neckerchief) extending tightly across her breast, over her shoulders and down to the top of the apron in the back. Perched atop her bun of ample hair was an organdy cap fastened to the hair with two narrow ribbons tied in a bow at the base of her throat. Her shoes were high-top and, most likely, would not be worn again until old age. Symbolic of the constancy of wedding vows was the fact that she would never again wear her bridal apron and Halstuch until laid to eternal rest.

The groom was dressed in what was probably his first store-bought outfit, consisting of heavy black trousers, a brief vest and a collarless jacket. His unmarried friends were dressed similarly, except that their clothing was made by a member of the family or by a local seamstress. Accenting the clean white shirts of all the eligible boys was a meticulously adjusted ribbon bow tie.

A few minutes before 9 o’clock, a reverent hush pervaded the entire house as the wedding guests began filling the benches and chairs in the meeting room. I was about to take a seat close to the front when an imposing elderly patriarch leaned over and asked me to find a seat in an adjacent room where the younger children were seated. “We don’t like non-Amish to be in the main room during the service,” he explained.

From a seat in the next room I could still, by sharply craning my neck, see and hear most of the action.

At 9 o’clock sharp, the wedding party consisting of three boys and three girls came down the aisle and took places in the front row. In the same row were the Bishop (Volle Dienster), Deacon (Dienster zum Buch), Sub-Deacon (Armen Dienster), fathers of the bride and groom and the song-leader.
The girls in the wedding party, wore black organdy caps which they had put on just before walking down the aisle. The other unmarried girls in the congregation, just before the service began, replaced their own white caps with the black ones that bespeak their eligibility.

Not a girl in the entire room, whether she was in the bridal party or in the congregation, wore cosmetics or jewelry or carried flowers.

As soon as the bride and her waiters and the groom and his attendants (one of whom I had previously seen acting as a hostler) had taken their seats, the song-leader stood up and began to intone the traditional first wedding hymn entitled: "Wohlauf, Wohlauf, Du Gottes G'mein" (All hail, all hail, Thou Church of God).

With this, the Bishop and Deacons solemnly arose and proceeded, with the wedding party following immediately behind, to the door of an especially prepared upstairs room. The attendants and waiters stayed outside while the couple and the preachers, seating themselves in a circle of previously arranged chairs, discussed the multifold responsibilities and obligations of Christian marriage.

At the completion of the first hymn, the song-leader again stood up and this time intoned the first words of the second traditional hymn for weddings and all religious services, "Der Lob Song" (The Hymn of Praise). With full-throated piety, the congregation followed in a one voice (soprano) chant closely resembling German Gregorian chant of the 17th century, they clearly eununciated the words:

O Gott Vater wir Loben dich / und Deine gute Preisen / das du dich o Herr gnadiglich. Oh God, our Father, we praise you and glorify your goodness that you, o merciful Lord.

AN UNS NEU HAST BEWIESEN / UND HAST UNS HERR ZUSAMMEN G'FUHRT / UND ZU ERMAHNEN DURCH have demonstrated anew to us. And you, oh Lord, have led us together and you admonish DEIN WORT / GIB UNS GENAD ZU DIESEM, us through your word. Give us guidance in this.

The third hymn, sung until the consultation in the upstairs room ended, was entitled, "So Will Ich Aber Helen Ahn" (So Will I Continue to be Steadfast). As soon as the wedding party and the Bishop and Deacons had resumed their seats, the hymn was terminated. At this point, one of the deacons delivered the initial sermon in the sing-song intonation characterizing all sermons. This sermon consisted of references to the obligations of marriage and of scriptural readings such as Matt. XIX; 1-13.

Then, after several minutes of kneeling in silent prayer, the congregation sat again to listen to the Bishop deliver the wedding sermon in Amish High German. This was the same sermon the Bishop had given at weddings ever since his nomination and consisted of further and sometimes, repetitions, references to the responsibilities of marriage and of scriptural readings from I Cor. 7, Eph. 5, 21 and from the Apocryphal Book of Tobit on the marriage of Tobias and Sarah.

At the conclusion of the sermon, the Bishop, looking first to the young couple and then to the congregation, asked softly in Pennsylvania Dutch dialect if there was any impediment to the marriage known to the assembled. When there was no reply, he motioned for the bride and groom to come forward and stand before him. The attendants and waiters remained seated, as did the father of the bride.

Hoslers put the horses in the barn and leave buggies haphazardly arrayed in field.
Accordingly, the couple exchanged vows without such externals as someone to give the bride away and a wedding ring.

The actual exchange of vows marked the culmination of preparations that had begun almost at birth in the Zook and Fisher families, as will all Amish families who follow the *Ordnung* (Church discipline).

From their first birthday on, young Amish children are given, among other things, gifts especially intended to furnish a future home. Boys and girls, alike, receive china and glassware. Moreover, boys receive farm equipment, carpentry tools and so forth. Girls receive table and bed linens patiently embroidered by the women relatives and friends, sewing equipment, cooking utensils and the like.

When the children reach school age, their parents make every effort to send them to one-room schools where they are less likely to meet and become friendly with non-Amish. The fact that one-room schools still exist in Amish areas eloquently attests to the perseverance of Amish parents in protesting large modern consolidated schools. They feel that such schools tend to have a diluting effect on the faith of their children.

Usually, as soon as the young man reaches his 16th birthday, his father gives him a racy black open buggy, appropriately called a courting buggy, and a horse of his own. In this buggy, the young Amish man will run his numerous errands and go to “singing” (Church discipline) on special occasions for their future home.

At the “singing,” the young people, grouped off in the barn according to sex, sing traditional Amish hymns for several hours.

The more alert young Amish man spends much of the evening trying to line up one of the girls to ride home in his buggy. He brags profusely about how fast his horse can run, how his buggy out-shines all the others, how sharply he can take a corner, etc.

Should a novice succeed for the first time in taking a girl home, his friends will do everything possible to confine him. On some occasions they have been known to follow the couple at a discreet distance and, when the young man ties up his buggy in order to walk the young lady to her house, make
off stealthily with his horse or, even, a wagon wheel. The custom, locally, goes by the name "scouting."

Should a rapport be established between the young man and woman during the singings, and the rides home, he will make it a point to ask her, as they walk along the lane to her house, if he might not come visiting one of the evenings of the week.

If accepted, he will wait for his parents to go to bed and, then, make his way stealthily out of the house. At the girl's house he ties his buggy to a fence post at the far end of the lane and proceeds to a point directly below her window. She, of course, is awaiting him and needs only to be notified of his presence below by the pebbles or bits of corn he throws or the flashlight beam he plays against her window. Promptly, she comes quietly down the steps and opens the kitchen door.

Hence, in the warmth of the kitchen, while the family ostensibly sleeps, the courtship takes its course.
In view of these practices, it becomes obvious that such features ascribed by legend to Amish courtship like the blue gate and bunzling have no basis in fact.

The young couple continues its courtship in the blissful assumption that no one else in the world knows, or should know, about it. If questioned by parents or friends about designs toward the person with whom they have frequently been seen leaving the "singings," both, young man and young lady, will vehemently deny any interest at all. Such white lies are traditional in Amish families—the parents having done the same with their parents—and only serve to put everyone on guard.

Unbeknown to the couple, the fathers, thus alerted, get together and begin discussing tentatively such mundaneities as granting the dowry, the purchase of a farm, construction of new buildings, stocking with animals, ordering a family buggy and the like.

When the couple, by mutual consent, decides to marry, the young man makes a visit to one of the deacons of the church. He confides in him and exhorts him to go to the father of the bride to ask permission for the marriage.

Forthwith, the deacon, confiding his mission in the secrecy the Amish love to have attending their wedding plans, goes to the girl's father in the capacity of intermediary (Schrockh-Mann) and officially advises him of what he has long suspected.

From this point on, the families take over the preparations for the wedding. As much as possible, however, the plans are kept secretive until the banns are published at a church meeting at least two weeks before the wedding.

On the day that the banns are to be published and the whole congregation apprised of a fact that they, too, have long suspected, the bride-to-be does not come to meeting. The groom, traditionally, sits near the door so that, as soon as the announcement is made, he may run out to his buggy tied-up near the road and speed to the home of his betrothed. As he rides off, a few of his closest friends may run out of the meeting and call teasingly after him.

For the first time that Sunday, the young man visits his woman in the light of day, under the noses of the entire family.

The few weeks between the announcement and the wedding are crammed with the febrile excitement of cooking foods, preparing clothes, extending invitations, cleaning the house and the like.

After the Bishop, standing before the meeting room full of friends and relatives of the couple, had performed the ceremony, the newly-united pair again took their seats. This time they listened to testimonies on the essence of Christian marriage delivered by the deacons, preachers and other esteemed men in the congregation.

To close the wedding ceremony, the song-leader chanted the first lines of the hymn, "Gelobt Sei Gott im Hochsten Thron" (God in His Highest Throne be Praised), and the other members of the congregation took it up. Tradition holds that singing at one's own wedding may bring bad fortune; hence, Levi and Rachel Fisher merely smiled as they led the wedding procession slowly out of the house and into the farmyard.

There was no reception line; but members of the congregation, led by the Bishop, the Deacons and the parents, swarmed around the couple extending congratulatory wishes. The young girls took this opportunity to change back to their white caps. Rachel, too, changed to a white cap which she would wear from then on at meetings.

In the meantime, about thirty women and young girls bustled about inside the house clearing away the benches and setting up tables in almost every room. Then, they formed
a type of bucket brigade to bring the profusion of food up from the cellar.

Mrs. Zook advised the Bishop when dinner was ready and he called in each group to take the place he assigned. The bride and groom, their party and most of their young friends sat in the main room at tables arranged in the form of a large square, with one corner left open to provide access for the food-servers. From the "bride's corner" that Levi and Rachel occupied, they were able to look over the room filled with young unmarried guests, the boys on one side of the tables and the girls on the other. The Bishop and Deacons were seated at the main table. So, also, were the hostlers.

The occupants of the other rooms were, for the most part, married. They were assigned places according to age and sex.

The table of the newly-weds was handsomely decorated with wedding cakes and other imaginative desserts prepared by girl-friends of the bride.

As soon as the carver, who was seated next to the bride and groom, performed his express function of serving those seated at the main table, everyone in the house fell to the sumptuous feasts with relish. Coming past me at my table
in the kitchen was a variegated variety of serving plates and bowls containing copious portions of about four types of soup, eight types of meat, fourteen types of vegetables, thirty types of desserts and dozens of miscellaneous. So acute, indeed, was the need for servers and bus-boys as close to 180 people ingested delicious food with unrestrained enthusiasm that several of the young men volunteered to help.

The Amish eat in surprising quantity and haste, chattering freely and constantly. The young guests, especially, teased and joked with the newly-weds almost without pause. I had scarcely finished a few representative helpings of the main course when the first after dinner hymn started, led by a young man not too far from the main table. It was entitled, "Wacht Auf Ruh! Uns Der Stomme" (Awake! The Voice is Calling to Us). Of course, Levi and Rachel did not sing. They were kept busy passing out pieces of the variety of wedding cakes on the table. The first three after dinner hymns were "slow tunes," or, Gregorian Chants. The next five hymns, beginning with "Ich Will Lieben" (I Will Love), were, as is traditional, "fast tunes." The text of the fast tunes derives from scriptural passages and the tunes, from modern American gospel songs.

Once the eight traditional songs were out of the way, the tables were briskly cleared of dirty dishes and most of the young people went outside. Some of the older people, too, went out to the porch or front lawn. The rest stayed at the tables to nibble at the seemingly unending supply of desserts and to continue singing. In fact, throughout the entire day the guests kept returning to the tables to gulp down a few mouthfuls of food from constantly replenished platters.

A group of young fellows, accompanied by the groom, went to the barn to play corner-ball, basketball, blumsack or soccer. The bride and her group, strolling along the road and across the fields, seemed to giggle with every step. Some of the married men went to play croquet and some of the women, horses-hoes. Others were content just to watch the exertions. A small group of older men made directly for the tobacco shed where, it was alleged, a keg of brew had been hidden among the stalks of unstrapped tobacco. All the rooms of the house were filled with small groups exchanging stories, playing games, posing conundrums or singing.

Just as night was falling, the young unmarried men forming the groom's coterie started in from the barn. Suddenly, a group of Levi's closest friends sneaked up behind him and, by prearrangement, threw him, spread-eagle, over a fence and into the waiting arms of a group of young married men. Thus was effected, symbolically, the transition from the care-free bachelor life to the care-ridden life of a married man.

On another part of the farm Rachel's close single friends were toasting her also, but, in this case, it was over a broom handle. Thus did she pass from the mobile to the married state.

At the evening meal, the married guests took the same seat occupied at dinner. The young people, however, were required to desegregate. Now, boys and girls were happily integrated.

After a repast equally as overwhelming as that of a few hours before, the customary toasts began. With a glass of unsweetened lemonade the Bishop, the groom's father and
father-in-law and a number of guests close to the family stood up regally to recite a serious or facetious toast. Many were the satirical barbs cast at the blushing couple.

At a given moment, dressed in all manner of dowdy disguises, the young men who had helped serve the food and clear the tables put on their traditional act. They paraded in front of the bride's table and through a series of delightfully exaggerated gestures and syllables made it known that they expected tips for their work. Going along in the act, the bride and groom yawned noisily and feigned indifference. Finally, with a rumbling sigh of resignation, the groom reached into his pocket for a coin he had prepared for the occasion and sent it rattling into the ladle one of the young men was using as an alms cup. This was the signal for everyone in the room to do likewise.

The servers usually use the money to buy some souvenir of the wedding.

Finally, another dozen or so hymns were sung, punctuated by a profusion of good-natured banter and repartee.

The better part of the rest of the evening was spent in the barn; the young folks engaging in folk games and dances and the older folks watching, eating, chatting and singing.

At about 10:30 one of the women from the kitchen came into the barn to advise the whole company that it was again time to eat.

This time we sat down to cold food left over from previous meals. The young people were in a jovial mood, having just been dancing actively in the barn. For the first time during the entire affair, it was the girls who got up to tell anecdotes or to caricature the bride and groom or some of the other young guests. The laughter was hearty and continuous. Indeed I have never seen such camaraderie generated at a gathering of young people in all my years of party going.

It was well after midnight before all the guests had handed their horse-checks to the sleepy hostlers and cluttered off in the autumn night. The last person to leave was Levi Fisher, Rachel's husband. He rode off in his parent's buggy.

But, he was to come back again the next morning and every other day that week to visit his new wife.

On the Sunday after the wedding, Levi took his wife, now dressed in a darker dress and a black apron in contrast to the lighter colors of dress and apron during her single days, to the meeting. After the meeting they went to the Fisher home and stayed a few days.

It was from the home of the husband's parents that the newly-married couple embarked on a buggy visit to almost everyone who had come to the wedding. They had to use Levi's open buggy because the closed family buggy, ordered by the parents, would be a year or so in coming due to the large backlog of orders at the local carriage shop.

Mr. and Mrs. Levi Fisher methodically made their way through the Amish community, stopping at one farm for lunch and at another for supper and lodging. Everyone went all out to fete and feast them. At each stop the gift-giving pattern was the same. Just as the couple, seated in the buggy, was about to drive out the lane, one of the young children raced out of the house with the wedding gift.

The collection of wedding gifts, all of them for use in the house, tool-shed or barn, piled up in the back of the buggy during the rest of the tour.

After a month or so of touring, the couple returned to the home of the groom's father. From there, they moved into their new house, bought or built and almost completely furnished by the two fathers and the neighbors and relatives.

By the time Spring arrives, the Fishers will be ready to start their planting. If they are fortunate, they should be welcoming the first new member of the new family during the next wedding season.

And, each new member of the Fisher family, as with every other Amish family, will be prepared from earliest childhood for that day when he or she will marry in the fashion I have been attempting to describe.

Thus is closed the delightfully simple and immutable circle of life among the old-order Amish.

*Older guest, his horse-check in hand, goes to hostlers for his horse and buggy.*
Fig. 1—View from Nisky Hill toward South Bethlehem, 1852.

Fig. 2—The same scene as in figure 1 twenty-two years later.
On February 7, 1900, Rufus A. Grider, died in Canajoharie, New York. In the Archives of the Moravian Church, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, there is folio after folio of pencil, pen and water-color sketches that establishes Grider as a Pennsylvania artist-historian of note. Three hundred pictures, with few exceptions, Pennsylvania communities between 1850 and 1877, are preserved at this one location. The artist preserved scenes prior to his time by copying earlier amateur artists such as Nicholas Garrison and Samuel Reinke.

The significance of his work is best illustrated in a folder enclosing two pictures depicting the view from Nisky Hill in Bethlehem toward Bethlehem South, July 30, 1852 (figure 1), and another (figure 2) described by the artist himself, "The same scene from same place as the former in May 1874, or 22 years after the first was taken." We see the difference to be the overlay of what was to become the source of our country's prestige-industry. The introduction of the iron industry to the north bank of the Lehigh River was resisted, but it spread swiftly along the south bank. 1846-1876 was the period Joseph Levering called "Three Decades of Progress" in his book A History of Bethlehem Pennsylvania. One could better describe the period as one of change rather than one of progress for one could not reasonably imply that the landscape Grider portrayed was an inferior existence to that which followed. When he began to paint in the area of Bethlehem the community had become a borough, having been earlier a "church-village."

He then narrated the transition from borough to city. The change was brought to pass in this local instance by the industries of iron and zinc together with the railroad. The industries were the Bethlehem Iron Company and the Lehigh Zinc Company.

Zine, though discovered many years earlier, became the object of earnest production in 1853. A picture from this formative time was completed September 28, 1856. Successful manufacturing did not begin until 1859. Water in the mines was a problem at Friedensville. A picture of this area was made by Grider in 1861. To cope with the water problem the largest steam engine and pump in the country were put into operation in 1872. However, operations finally had to be suspended, but not before Grider painted the "House where the great Pump was worked." Recently operations have been opened and a great controversy once more exists—centered around water. Once more "spectacular" is associated with this work. History has repeated itself.

Ground was first broken for the first building of the Bethlehem Iron Company on July 16, 1863. Buildings were completed in '65, '67, and '68. In time the Steel became the overpowering and predominant scene on the south bank of the Lehigh. It was important, therefore, that Grider did point so much of that south bank, prior to and during the building process. Soon after the first building was started there was a severe flood. The encompassing waters (figure 3) are seen at the Rolling Mill and Furnace. Apart from

Fig. 3—Bethlehem Rolling Mill and Furnace in the flood of the 1860's.

Rufus A. Grider

By JOHN F. MORMAN
these paintings of the flood there is a scarcity of work by
Grider in the 60's though there are a great number in the
50's and 70's.

Inasmuch as the historian and artist are best personified
and combined in this series special notice is taken of the
work reporting the "Fresnet of June 3, 1862" (figure 4).
The original sketches are in the Archives. The finished
pieces are also there but in a separate handmade booklet.
This booklet contains eleven views with extensive and in-
teresting notes. The most interesting is that taken from
the tower of the church.

Rufus Grider was a business man—starting as a clerk
when still a boy in his home town of Latitz, Pennsylvania,
and as a young man in his new home of Bethlehem, then as
the owner of a general store in Emmaus and later in Bethle-
hem. Yet, the changes created by business at the expense
of the good land was not happy to our amateur artist, musician
and historian. The appearance of industry was not offensive
to his eye, for he selected such subjects as the "Coal Com-
pany's Railroad at Penn Haven," "Railroad Depot at Port
Clinton," "Zinc Mine at Friedensville," and "Iron Works
on the Lehigh." Many other scenes were painted with in-
dustry in some part of the composition. It was only un-
fortunate that the most picturesque areas were most practi-
cal for the development of these plants.

An example of this was on the southern bank of the Lehigh
River, west of the old bridge. There was located at this
area a spring midst beautiful mountain paths. "The Spring"
(figure 5) was the object of at least a dozen paintings of
Grider. To a work of July 10, 1853, he made the comment
that the scene was one existing "ere the railroad destroyed
the beauties." Levering calls this a "revolutionary change.
The reference is to the Lehigh Valley Railroad Company.

It was the coming of the railroad that took another of
Grider’s favorite subjects, "The Crown Inn." The Inn was
one of many that flourished in the area because beauties of
the Valley attracted many city dwellers. It was enviably
situated near Bethlehem, yet midst pastoral sceneries, the
object for recreation by natives and visitors. In its earlier
years it was not unusual to see Indians lounging in the yard
or in boats in front of the Inn. Such a scene is preserved
in a historical folder prepared by Grider in which he in-
cluded copies and contemporary scenes of the Inn, 1750 to
1854. William Reibel claimed the 1750 copy the earliest
known view of Bethlehem. Other scenes of this subject,
being of larger dimensions, include better craftsmanship
and greater detail. At the bottom of one scene, as was his cus-
tom, our painter made the comment that the Crown Tavern
was the "first public house kept at Bethlehem, Pa. . . .
Washington lodged here in 17 when the fresnet in the Lehigh
prevented his crossing over to town. . . . Com. Paul Jones,
also."

The first business Grider owned was in Emmaus. Here
he opened a general store, doing quite well for several years.
Some of his most "complete" water color scenes, and his
most attractive snow scenes were made of Emmaus. Titles
are "Philadelphia Cash Store at Emmaus," "A Winter View
near Emmaus," and three other views with identifying nota-
tions.

One of these latter scenes (figure 6) has an unusual
sign at the Inn. Together with the "rockers" in the painting
"View of Main St., Bethlehem in 1840" (a copy) he has
noted this form of Early American Art.

While in Emmaus Grider purchased a tract of land in
Salisbury Township known as "Horlacher’s vineyard, peach
orchard, and strawberry patch." He did not personally
administer the farm but it was placed in charge of his
younger brother Orville. The writer of his obituary in The
Bethlehem Globe Times, Feb. 9, 1900, speaks of the produce
from this land as "famous" on the Bethlehem market. Per-
haps this new interest led him to paint an old German print
"Gudenthal and Christiansbrunn." A later editor com-
ments on this 1855 copy: "When this view was taken this
was considered the Model Farm of Eastern Penna.—it was
here where the application of Lime on land was first tried
and when successful used elsewhere—the idea came from
Germany and was introduced by Rev. J. G. Cunow."

Near the orchard was a favorite recreation area called
"Bower’s Rock." In 1853 he painted a half dozen views.
Some to this day recall the happy hours in this spot, but few
others visit the beautiful view.

Selling his business in Emmaus, Rufus Grider returned to
Bethlehem. He bought several stores and ultimately pur-

Fig. 4—Fresnet of June 5, 1862.
Courtesy of Moravian Archives, Bethlehem.
Not to be reproduced without special permission.
chased the Sun Inn. The Sun Inn has been the subject of many historical accounts. Among his personal papers there is found an extensive collection of early clippings on the hostelry. Making a copy, Grider painted the Inn as it existed from 1758 to 1825 and then as it was changed to a three-story building from 1825 to 1852. At a time when he was not the owner he was in charge of decorating the building for a banquet in honor of Judge Asa Packer, Mauch Chunk. Of the decorations the following comment was made: "The banquet room was made beautiful, attractive, and historical by the magic touches of Mr. Grider's brush in arranging the decorations and sketches in the life of Judge Packer from the tow path to the building of the Lehigh Valley Railroad and the towering up of Lehigh University."

Grider contributed to the testimonial for a great man. His own life, too, was filled with illustrative material that speaks of his own greatness. For a time he was the Director of the Philharmonic Society of Bethlehem. He was a fine tenor. He played the flute, and was an oboist. He was the first in Bethlehem to use illuminating gas. He introduced asphalt sidewalks, though the project was unsuccessful. Late in life he moved to Camojahoe, New York where he became the superintendent and instructor in drawing. He had a collection of historical powder horns which were used by famous patriots during the Revolution. Through it all he was primarily a historian. He collected historical accounts, contributed his own research, illustrated for books of history, accumulated miniature papers on specific subjects, which he illustrated with his own work. When he painted it was always the historian that predominated—often allowing titles to be written over his art work; seldom giving short titles, but short treatises. He was fascinated by the changing picture of history. He sketched quickly, on one painting noting that he sketched the scenery in seven minutes. He always included the date of his work. Most of the time the month was listed, and almost as often he put down the exact day. Several times he put the hour. Often he would do many sketches from nature, take notes, and then later at leisure paint the picture—some sketches being completed as many as 20 years later. He was found with

pad in hand Easter morning, in the mid of winter, day after Christmas far from home, sitting on a church tower, or on a rock deep in the woods. He was interested in anything that fell upon his eyes. Even though his figure and portrait work must have given him great difficulty, he never ceased to flood his pastoral scenes with people at ease. People were there. He had to record it.

His art work is filled with comments both on events contemporary to his era and previous to it. Of interest to Bethlehemites are his extensive remarks on the naming of Nisky Hill—the northern parallel to the Steel Company along the Lehigh River. The picture is "S W View from Nisky Hill Cemetery taken in April 1882." Another painting made two months later describes the method for catching shad in the River. Grider painted many pictures of the Indians at this task—having an eye witness on hand. He even named the witness on one painting. Attention had

Fig. 6—A winter view in early Emmaus.

Fig. 5—A spring on the southern bank of the Lehigh in the 1850's.
already been called to his attention concerning the use of lime in farming. In June, 1872, he painted a very clear view of the "Old Stone House on Copey Creek." The building was known as "Deisher Fort" (figure 7) situated on the Deisher Farm in Whitehall Township. Said to have been built in 1757, it was a place of refuge for the settlers in Colonial times, groups assembling in the "Fort" at night. The size of the building, the wood of the window frames, and the owner at the time of the sketch are all examples of the type of material that appears on these sketches.

The works made by Einstein tell who lived in many of the houses. He copied a map of Bethlehem according to a survey of January 12, 1757. He includes a clear system of titles on the map. He enters the controversy over the appearance of the first house of Bethlehem by painting one differing from that which was the accepted of his day—having the description of an eye witness.

Painting a picture of Dr. A. L. Hubener's house, Long Valley, Monroe County, he does so because on this spot was the Indian Mission, Veckonrant. Brethren Mack and Gruber were the Moravian missionaries. The station was destroyed by "Wild Indians in 1756." He showed considerable interest in the Walking Purchase, showing present appearance of the "East End of Nisky Hill, a scene along that walk." He copied a painting by Reichel of the farm of Solomon Jennings, a walker for Pennsylvania, showing a close view of the burial ground on the farm and the wall surrounding the land. He also made a map of some area released by the Indians in the "Purchase." Gruber painted the stable studio where Gilbert Stuart painted the portrait of Washington in 1793, Germantown. He also painted from the original banner the flag made for Pulaski.

Though Gruber was born at Lititz and received his training in art at the school run by the noted educator, John Berk, the Archives contains few illustrations of that community by Gruber's hand. When he was 38 he did sketch the "Sister's House at Ephrata in Lancaster County." He copied a picture of Lititz in the year 1862. The only other relationship his works show is several copies he made in the year 1836 and 1837 of sporting events in England. The works themselves do not have the beauty of color and freedom with which his later pictures are filled. Inasmuch as other works of Gruber do exist than those in the Archives and from which this article worked, we have reason to believe interesting discoveries will yet be made when readers begin to look for this man's signature. Without fail Gruber signed every sketch and painting.

Often the artist painted trees that had special affection to the community—noting at times their demise. In a scene showing the Islands on the Lehigh he calls attention to a water birch and large oak. In painting the second house of Bethlehem he reminds us that he did not include the tulip trees that grew along the street. After the flood he took a portrait of one of the damaged trees on the Island. He notes that the two weeping willows at the Old Bridge over the Monocacy were cut down in 1855. Another water color had the inscription, "What remains of the Old Chestnut Tree at the Rolling Mill Office, September 10, 1874." Another chestnut near the pond south of Second Street was also dying. There was a collection of eight unusual trees found in the Bethlehem area—sketched in the 50's but completed in the 70's.

When he came to Bethlehem Gruber depended a great deal upon the city as his subject. Much of this article concerns his part in preserving the Bethlehem scene in a period when changes came in rapid order. But he did travel as much as transportation of that age would allow and as his responsibility to a business would permit. His companion during some of these journeys into neighboring counties was Gustave Grunewald. Grunewald taught drawing and painting in the Young Ladies' Seminary from 1836 to 1866. He was a far more accomplished artist, but certainly not exceed the fervor of Gruber. In one trip known as the series of the "Pine Swamp," Gruber depicted his companion busy at his own work of sketching. At another time Gruber takes a view of Bethlehem with Grunewald's home in the foreground, calling attention to that fact.

The list is long of areas visited by this historian-artist other than Bethlehem. He painted much associated with Moravian work in Nazareth. At Catawba he showed the Iron Works (figure 8). The little community of Freemansburg sat for him in 1852. Wind Gap from Ely's Rosecom-
mon Hotel was completed in 1853. A beautiful vista appears from Mt. Pocono. The Wilkes-Barre Turnpike was the road from which he painted the wilderness. At White Haven rafts of lumber are seen at the mouth of the Tobyhanna. The main buildings of Stoddardville, Luzerne County, make an inspiring scene in the summer of 1853. On this same trip he was attracted by the activity centering around the coal industry, his “Bird’s eye view of the Inclined Plain” being breath-taking. The Jordan Creek at Allentown was a scene closer to Bethlehem. This 1852 view copied from a Grunewald shows the Old Chain Bridge. Manch Chunk was the subject of much concentration in the year 1855. In Oley, Berks County, in 1855 he painted a dwelling, formerly the Moravian Church and parsonage. [See the Winter 1957-58 issue, page 6]. The Delaware Water Gap was often viewed from various approaches. An interesting country retreat is seen in a view of Effort, Monroe County, residences of C. C. Tombler and Patrick Daily, July 13, 1853. ‘Black Creek at Weatherly was another view from Carbon County. He thought it important to put down the hour when he painted Brodhed’s, Kittatinny House. The new road, old road, the railroad, the shanties of the workmen, the Delaware River and the Delaware Water Gap all appear within the same format. Marshall’s Fall was painted the day before. The railroad continues to interest him for it is the foreground of the scene in Port Clinton, Schuylkill County. He does a series on Conrad Weiser’s Farm situated in Heidelberg Township, Berks County, in the year 1873. Thus, Rufus Grider traveled extensively for a man in his position as owner of a general store and a hotel.

As Bethlehem works toward a program of re-development Grider will be consulted many times. His work is so extensive that the scenes he painted give the impression of being three dimensional from all sides and from all angles. One would first see a panoramic view of Bethlehem South on which appropriate comments point up the highlights. Searching through his work one would find views from these highlights, many from one area. A dramatic illustration of this point is seen in the two pictures (figures 9a and 9b) of the termination of the Hazleton Coal Company’s Railroad at Penn Haven. The work centering around the Spring and Mountain Path on the South Bank of the Lehigh River in Bethlehem is so varied that a perfect restoration from these paintings alone would easily be effected.

When one reads accounts of an era one often experiences the spirit and pulse of the time. A photographer does much to capture that spirit. But in the day when Grider lived photography had much to learn in reaching the inner life. When one compares photographs of the life Grider brought under his brush one experiences this truth. For restoration of details the photographer is supreme, but for the more difficult task of how that scene fit into the “life” of that time, the artist is unsurpassed.
"To feed were best at home;  
From thence the sauce to meat is ceremony."
—Shakespeare

The Pennsylvania Dutchlander long away from home is likely to be subject to nostalgic hunger pangs at Folk Festival time or, for that matter, whenever the subject of Dutch cooking comes up. The toothsome shoofly pie, the delectable chicken-corn soup, the hot dandelion salad, the schnitz-and-knepp—these and a dozen others take on a halo as nearly as tangible as the odors which once permeated the kitchens where they were prepared. For the person who is to experience Dutch cooking for the first time, the glow of anticipation is equally pronounced. There just isn’t anything to equal old-time Pennsylvania Dutch cooking; everybody says so, and it must be so.

Now and then, however—not often, but now and then—realization falls short of anticipation, not through the fault of memory or because of unduly optimistic propaganda, but because, all unconsciously, time has had a trump card to play. One simply can not extract a block of time out of the past and attempt to graft it onto the present, most particularly where food is concerned. People eat according to
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Steel dough scrapers (one marked P.D.—for Peter Derr—1854) and a steel and brass coggling wheel for crimping the edges of pastry, fasnachts, noodles, and the like.

Brass skimmer with simple tulip design and wrought iron handle, for fireplace cookery.
A Collector's Problem

their needs, according to their social pattern, according to the era in which they live. A generation accustomed to a breakfast of juice, toast, and black coffee could hardly be expected properly to appreciate an early morning meal of fried potatoes, sausage, pancakes, and several kinds of pie; a person who takes a green salad as a matter of course at luncheon or dinner and who is as likely as not to waive dessert may find schmaltz and kneph too unctuous, pot pie too starchy, and a dozen other viands too rich and calorie-full for more than an occasional experiment. On occasion and at their best, such foods are “wonderful good”; as regular fare, they would serve the needs of today's eaters not at all, save for those engaged in daily heavy physical labor, the purpose for which they were originally intended.

A comparable situation exists with regard to the implements used in cooking and for eating; times and circumstances produced them—and times and circumstances have changed. The collector of antiques ordinarily expects to do one of two things with his purchases—put them on display as objects of beauty or art, or put them into at least limited service. For furniture, fraktur, spatterware, pottery, and a dozen other items there is no great problem; one substitutes the older piece for a modern one—the wooden settle for a chaise longue, perhaps, fraktur for conventional prints, a woven coverlet for a spread or blanket, and so on. With the knives and forks and spoons of a bygone day, though,

Long-handled implements used in fireplace cookery. L. to r.: steel, copper, pewter-composition, and brass. Handles of the ladles are wrought iron, the one on the brass implement dated 1805 and initialed MM.

An exceptionally good steel cooking fork with three ornamental brass plates—the top marked IT, the middle with a heart, and the lower one with the date 1827.

The handle of this small steel spoon (twelve inches) is expertly inlaid with tiny decorations of copper and brass.
there is a major problem: They will fit into a decorative scheme only if the collector is willing and able to provide a background fitting for them. Lacking a proper setting, many objects highly desirable in themselves either look out of place in a total collection or receive less attention than they deserve. The average housewife would find herself hard pressed to utilize a cast-iron cherry-pitter, for instance, and her husband would probably not relish the thought of receiving a personal vest-pocket metal toothpick as a birthday gift; yet in their day a cherry-pitter was as indispensable as a personal toothpick was de rigeur, and both have considerable status as collectibles. If the prospective purchaser of such gadgets has a satisfactory answer to the question “Can I put this thing to use in my personal scheme of living?” he should, of course, go right ahead and buy it.

Fireplace cookery called for accoutrements suited to pots of generous size, with capacities measurable in gallons rather than in quarts or pints. Since the cook had to work in immediate proximity to the flame, the various ladles, dippers, skimmers, turners, and forks of necessity had long handles. Most of these implements were hand wrought and of metal throughout; wooden handles or shanks might have been easier or lighter to manipulate, but would hardly have been practical. When not in use, the implements were hung from the mantel or near the fireplace. In such a setting today they have a charm compounded of the picturesque and the romantic—but the charm is none the less dependent upon the setting.

Dimensions of pieces like these vary according to the vessels with which they were used. A ladle with a pint capacity and a twenty-inch handle was probably used only at butchering or apple butter-making time; a shallow skimmer with a twelve-inch handle would serve to lift vegetables and chunks of meat from a pot at an ordinary family meal, as well as to remove excess fat a little later, when the broth had cooled. The usual cooking fork was considerably larger than today’s carving fork, with prongs more widely set and a handle from twelve to twenty inches or even more in length.

Handle-ends of many of these tools tappered off in a neat curve so that they could be hung on a peg or nail. In addition, some of them have heart or other cut-outs for an ornamental touch. In prime specimens, a name or a date is not infrequently cut into the metal. While the earliest utensils and implements were of iron, it was not long before brass and copper came to be used, and their warm tones lent an esthetic appeal without loss of the utilitarian aspect. The height of craftsmanship in long-handled implements was reached when brass or copper, or both, were used as ornamental insets, inlay, or bands on large forks or spoons. Such pieces were one-of-a-kind, and obviously called for extraordinary skill.

Among other early pieces the collector might wish to secure is the “drohiter kuche” funnel—a funnel-like instrument with a long, hollow handle attached. The cook closed the narrow bottom opening of the funnel with one finger while she filled the top section with batter; then, moving to a kettle of hot fat, she removed the finger and dribbled the batter concentrically or according to fancy into the hot fat. The cakes, dusted with sugar, are comparable to doughnuts. Such funnels are still used and remain unchanged in form.

Another item, not particularly beautiful but historically significant and a lively conversation piece, is the little hoe-like implement once used in bread-making. Dough boxes or trays of wood were used to hold considerable quantities of dough during the stages of kneading and rising. When the dough was removed and shaped into loaves, some adhered to the sides and bottom of the box—and was scraped away with the little steel “hoe.” Some of these hoes are dated and initialed, and a few have even been ornamented with chased designs. One purporting to have been used at the Ephrata Cloisters has the symmetrical touch of two small fishes as its decoration.

It was not until the Eighteenth Century was well advanced that cutlery for individual diners became common; in fact, travelers in earliest times did well to carry their own knives and forks with them in order to be sure of getting their portion from the common pot. This reliance on the knife as the principal eating tool seems to have continued, in and out of Pennsylvania, long after the necessity itself ceased to exist.

The earliest knives and forks the collector of Dutchiana can find will be the staghorn variety, often called “Welsh Mountain” cutlery, though no one seems to know why. These implements are of conventional length, with blades and tines of imported Sheffield steel. Knife blades almost always bore the name of the English cutter, but repeated scoring finally obliterated many such markings. In Victorian times the initials “VR” (for “Victoria Regina”) usually stood at the top of the stamped impression. Wilson, Worth & Moss and W. Greaves & Sons supplied much of the Pennsylvania market. Greaves’ knives are usually impressed “Cast Steel.” Handles are of deernhorn, and while there is reason to suppose that some of these were made locally, it is not unlikely that many were imported “complete.” The forks have two long, sharp tines; the knives have wide blades capable of taking a very sharp edge. Staghorn spoons are missing entirely; the knife was expected to serve as knife and spoon. The function of the two-tined fork, incidentally, was to serve as an anchor rather than as a means of conveying food to the mouth.

Early Dutch Country butcher knives were among the most efficient—and perhaps the most fearsome—ever made. Of finest steel, they were mounted in heavy wooden handles, riveted for the ages, and then ground to the point at which they would cut a fine hair held suspended between thumb and forefinger. Often, broken steel blades were converted into butcher knives. A set of butcher knives at a country auction often commands a price which seems fantastic unless one reflects that it would be impossible anywhere today to buy new ones comparable in quality.

There were spoons, of course. Wooden spoons, spoons, ladles, and mashers were used in cooking. In earliest times they were whittled; later, many of them were lathe-turned. It is possible that some of the ornately carved or incised wooden spoons of tablespoon size one sees now and then came from the Dutch Country—possible but not likely; there was no tradition of spoon-carving among the Pennsylva­nia Dutch as there was among the Scandinavians. Pewter tablespoons and teaspoons exist in some quantity and are presumably the earliest indigenous type in metal the collector can secure. As pewter goes, they are comparatively late, coming after the “good” Eighteenth Century years for pewter. They seem to have been made to about 1850. They can never have been very satisfactory, since they are very soft, and their lack of smoothness makes them less than wholly acceptable to fastidious users.

For the collector, one of the most productive periods lies in the Victorian era, after the two-tined forks had become outmoded and before silver was common. This was the
Table knives and forks spanning the Nineteenth Century. L. to r.: staghorn, staghorn, bone, bone, wood, wood, rubberoid.

An old-time Dutch Country place setting: cloth, homespun; napkin, linen; spoonholder, pressed glass in peacock feather design; teaspoons, plate and sterling; plate, cup, and saucer, white ironstone; knife and fork, bone handle.

Horn spoon or scoop found near Kresgeville, Pa., with handle in the shape of a cow’s or steer’s head.

A Nineteenth Century spoon: pewter, coin silver, sterling, plated silver.
Dovetailed pine knife-and-fork box with sliding lids, painted yellow, red, green, and black.

Walnut knife-and-fork box with inlays in a variety of woods—cherry, holly, maple, chestnut, and ebony.

The heyday of the bone handle—which sometimes actually was bone and sometimes rubberoid or a forerunner of what we should now call plastic. Some were of wood, but, for whatever reason, are referred to as bone—possibly because the metal parts are identical with those of bone-handled implements. Knife blades are somewhat less broad than those of the stag-horn type, and the forks are three-tined. The major attractiveness of these implements lies in the ornamentation of their shanks, which were commonly of two pieces, pinned tightly together with steel or brass or with a composition metal which looks like but is not pewter. Sometimes the pins constitute the design, sometimes the ferrule is extended into the bone in the form of narrow bands—or trees, flowers, or other simple devices. The bone itself may be almost white, but oftener exists in tones of cream or ivory. Wooden handles are brown or black.

Certain problems will beset the collector who wishes to utilize bone-handled cutlery in place settings today. Knives and forks have to be thoroughly scoured after each use to keep them from discoloring, and in damp weather they will rust even when not in use. Yesterday's housewife would have had a scouring plank and a cake of hard grey scouring soap handy for the cleaning operation—but the soap has all but disappeared from the market and the planks (actually open-end boxes mounted on a smooth board) either have joined it or have been refinished and converted into magazine racks or ivy-planters or something similar. Too, bone handles will go soft in very hot water, or in any water if immersed for too long a time. Bone-handled spoons, like stag-horn spoons, seem not to have been made at all.

It is stumbling upon a rarity which gives the collector one of his greatest delights. In this field, probably the greatest rarity is the horn spoon or scoop. Such pieces were carved from cattle or steer horns which had been immersed in warm water until they became pliable enough to cut. The ultimate shape of the spoon would depend upon the curvature of the horn. The tip of the horn became the tip of the spoon-handle. Hearsay has it that horn spoons were decorated, scrimshaw-fashion, as powder horns were, but no such decorated spoon has actually been reported. Not many have survived—perhaps only those that have been kept in very dry places.

The final step in the evolution of Pennsylvania Dutch cutlery was reached when silver plate became easily available. That is not to say that coin silver, bright-cut, and sterling were unknown in the Dutch Country, for in some families
such pieces have been handed down for generations. By and large, however, silver of considerable intrinsic value was rarely to be found in most farm homes, and is hardly to be thought of as characteristically Dutch. Nor can any particular pattern or design in silver plate be pointed out as enjoying particular favor in the Dutch Country. Occasionally, at country auctions, brass spoons come to light. These are usually extremely ornate, and may have been a decorative offshoot of the Eastlake period in furniture if the designs are a proper indication.

In a well-ordered household, there seems always to have been a correct place in which to keep the family supply of cutlery. In earliest times it was at the fireplace—on simple pegs or nails or on metal plates which contained a number of hooks. By the time the stag horn days had been reached, the old-time massive kitchen cupboards had also come into being, and one or more shelves were slotted at the front so that knives, forks, or spoons could be suspended there. Some of these cupboards had knife drawers built in at either side, or just below the glazed overhang, as well.

Ornamental hanging racks for spoons, Eighteenth Century pieces, are among the rarities of the Dutch Country, but do exist. They are usually planned to accommodate a dozen spoons in three tiers of four spoons each, and are of simple but rugged construction. They should not be confused with elaborately carved and painted Scandinavian racks made for the same purpose. The problem is a difficult one for the novice, since the decorative motifs are strikingly similar to those found in Pennsylvania iron, fraktur, and other objects.

Cherry—and walnut and maple—dropleaf tables came into common use at about the same time bone-handled cutlery did, and the end drawers of these tables were usually reserved for the storage of knives and forks. Not spoons, however! Spoons were generally kept on the table top in a spoonholder, oftenest one of the pressed glass receptacles then in vogue. When bone side spoonholders were lacking, a lidless sugar bowl—in Victorian times always of generous size—was often pressed into service. We are told that one reason for the existence today of so many old sugar bowl-spoonholders without tops is that the sugar bowl was the favorite hiding place for money, and the frequent removal of the lid often resulted in breakage.

The current fashion of placing forks at the left of the dinner plate, and knife and teaspoons to the right, would probably have taxed the patience of the Pennsylvania Dutch housewife, who preferred knife and fork at the right and spoons in the spoonholder. A spoon withdrawn from the holder was usually allowed to stand in the coffee cup, not infrequently even when the diner was drinking. The sugar spoon customarily remained in the sugar bowl from meal to meal. Emphasis was on the food, not on the setting. Centerpieces found no favor; the napkin shown in an illustration on these pages would have been regarded as an out-and-out affectation in most homes.

The early- or mid-Nineteenth Century was marked by the appearance of cutlery boxes, some of them beautifully conceived and executed. In structure they were relatively simple, with separate compartments for knives and forks. Some boxes were of open construction; those which were closed were made with hinged lids or with lids which slid into grooves. The decorations were dictated by individual fancy rather than by a general pattern. One specimen is expertly inlaid in a variety of designs apparently borrowed from cookey cutters; another is brightly painted in geometric patterns of yellow, red, green, and black. Very early is one with a heart cut-out for carrying and a smoke decoration made by darkening the original point in regular splottes with a lighted candle. A coat of varnish was sometimes applied to preserve smoke-decorated objects.

Nowadays, of course, most Dutch Country kitchens have gone modern, and stainless steel and silver have taken the place of old-time cooking and eating tools. Even so, in many a kitchen drawer may be found an old knife with a better cutting edge than can be bought today, or a slender thinned fork better able to test the "doneness" of a boiled potato than the thicker modern implements!
Many of the Quaker meeting-houses still standing in Southeastern Pennsylvania were erected in the early 18th Century. They present a visible evidence that the religion and way of life of the Society of Friends prevailed in the early days of William Penn's Holy Experiment. The Quakers in Pennsylvania as well as those in other colonies developed during the 17th and 18th Centuries a clearly defined cultural pattern, the general character of which is illustrated in their meeting-houses.

The earliest Quaker meetings were held in Quaker homes. The first of these in Pennsylvania was held in the home of Robert Wade in Upland, now Chester, in 1675. Quaker settlements in the new colony began in ten areas about 1682. Others followed soon after. These ten areas are identified by the location of the farms of those Friends who started meetings in a particular home. To take a single example—Chester Meeting, then held in the home of Thomas Vernon, agreed that a meeting should be settled at John Bowater's in 1686, another at Bartholomew Coppeck's in 1686 and a third at Thomas Minshull's in 1698. These became Middle-town Meeting for Friends between the Chester and Ridley Creeks, Providence Meeting for Friends between the Ridley and the Crum, and Springfield Meeting for Friends between Crum Creek and Darby Creek. The first meeting-houses settlers lived in a small log cabin, and held meetings in the home of a member of the Society of Friends. The cabin was on the outskirts of the Quaker settlement, and was soon replaced by a larger meeting-house. The earliest meeting-houses in Pennsylvania were erected about 1683.

Photos and dates of the erection of meeting-houses are from the Edward A. Jenkins Collection, Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pennsylvania.
for these meetings were built in 1702, 1700, and 1703. The old records show that Middletown Meeting was set up in 1686 "for ye ease of such yt live westerly, in ye woods."

Sometimes a meeting held in a home was moved because of some violation of the discipline. We find under date of 9th Month 1st 1703: "Chester M. Mtg. being called, the friends appointed to attend this meeting signify that the friends of Goshen have acquainted them that they have agreed to a settling of the meeting there to be kept at David Jones' at Whiteland in the Great Valley." But under date of 1st Month 27, 1704: "Ellis David and Cadwallader Ellis informed this meeting that David Jones belonging to Goshen mtg. some time since did unhappily connive and give way to his servant to work in his team some of his neighbors' creatures without their consent." For this infringement the meeting was moved from the house of David Jones.

The first meeting-houses were made of logs. Only two of these survive, one at Catawissa and the other at Roaring Creek, both a few miles south of Bloomsburg. Log meeting-houses were often replaced by stone structures which were enlarged and changed as the meeting grew.

The oldest meeting-house now standing in Pennsylvania is probably that at Merion, a part of which was built by Welsh Quakers in 1695. Among the meeting-houses still standing which were built, at least in part, before the American Revolution are those at Chester, Chichester, Darby, Concord, Radnor, Birmingham, Bristol, Buckingham, Cad, Exeter, Fallsington, Frankford, Goshen, Alington, Marshalltown, Middletown, New Garden, Newtown Square, Old Haverford, Old Kennett, and Old Sadsbury. In Maryland there is an even older meeting-house, that at Easton, which was built in 1684.

The architectural style of these early buildings, and also many erected during the 19th Century, followed a definite pattern. The building was rectangular, about twice as long as it was broad. There was no ornamentation inside or out. Simple straight lines were used. There were two doors on the long side, one for men and the other for women. Inside were rows of unpainted benches facing away from the door and two or three rows of raised benches facing these, where the elders and those who most frequently spoke in meeting.

Exeter Meeting, built 1759, one mile S.E. of Stonersville, Berks County, Pennsylvania.
Birmingham Meeting, built 1763, one mile N.E. of Chadd's Ford, Chester County, Pennsylvania.

Buckingham Meeting, built 1768-69, one mile N.E. of Holicong, Bucks County, Pennsylvania.
sat. The inside was divided into two equal parts by a series of shutters which were lowered or raised to separate the men from the women during the meeting for business. That the benches were, unlike those in a church, parallel to the long side of the building, is a minor result of the democracy prevailing in a Friends Meeting which is without human leadership, depending only on the guidance of the spirit.

Simplicity, when based on the Quaker idea that there should be no superfluity, rather than on a Puritamical asceticism, often produced results of genuine aesthetic value. Many old Quaker meeting-houses have been described by artists and architects as beautiful because of the right proportion of their dimensions and the strictly functional character of every part. The meeting-house at Birmingham, 4 miles southeast of West Chester, is an example.

Many of the meeting-houses built during the 19th Century were contaminated by the influence of Victorian styles. In the 20th Century successful efforts have been made to return to the earlier simplicity, but with the useful addition of kitchens and class rooms which had no place in the earlier meeting-houses.

During the seventy-eight years (1682-1750) in which the Quakers were in control of the government of Pennsylvania the meeting-houses served a variety of important functions. They were the spiritual, intellectual, economic, educational, judicial and social centers of their neighborhood. The meeting house library contained books of a high intellectual quality. The members of the meeting formed a community in which economic interdependence was practiced. Any Friend in need of material assistance was helped by the meeting. If his barn burned down, the meeting helped him to build a new one.

The meeting maintained a school or helped a neighboring meeting to maintain one. Before the end of the 18th Century there were at least 60 Friends schools in Pennsylvania.

If two Friends had a quarrel or disagreed over a boundary line or even showed a dislike for each other the difference was settled in the business meeting. Friends who refused to come to agreement were ultimately disowned. The penalty for all offenses was a written apology offered in person to the meeting. To take an example, dated 1751: "Friends, whereas I contended with my neighbor William Shipley for what I apprehended to be my right by endeavoring to turn a certain stream of water into its natural course, till it arose to a personal difference, in which dispute I gave way to a warmth of temper so far as to put my friend into the pond, for which action of mine, being contrary to the good order of Friends, I am sorry and desire through Divine assistance to live in unity with him for the future. Joshua Way."

Any violation of the rule for strict simplicity in "dress, speech, and behavior" and the furniture of houses was brought before the meeting. The minutes of these monthly sessions for business in the early days contain the record of a people who, having lost their possessions in the old world through fines and imprisonment, were determined with great enthusiasm to set up a commonwealth founded on the teachings of the New Testament and offering complete religious liberty to all.
The Bannister-back Chair
(An American Development)

By JOHN CUMMINGS

When Charles II came to the throne of England, there was a revulsion against the heavier Jacobean styles, as well as against the plain severity of the furniture of the Cromwellian Commonwealth era. The chairs of this period are particularly noteworthy, as well as being pertinent to this study; and are variously termed "Flemish," "Canedback," "Restoration," or combinations of these terms. Their period covers the last third of the XVII Century. Some of these chairs were brought over to the Colonies and, also, made here, although they were probably not too common in the new land. We do know that William Penn's Inventory1 shows cane chairs in several rooms and Governor Gordon, who arrived in Pennsylvania in 1725, listed four among his possessions, also2 that the inventory of Plummer in Philadelphia, taken at his death in 1707, shows "seven carved maple chairs" unfinished in his shop (he was a joiner).3 The chair of Figure 1 belonged to a friend and associate of Penn (the name of the original owner and/or the "genealogy" of this chair was known to the late Joseph Downs, but the writer does not remember these details, nor are notes made earlier now available). It is an American example, made of maple and painted black. It can be dated a few years prior to 1690. While the carving of crest and front stretcher is quite satisfactory, the sides of the cane panel of the back are simply moulded rather than carved. The turnery of the back posts is of the best—yet it is obviously the simplified colonial version.

As Edwin Hipkiss, the knowledgeable curator of the Boston Museum, sagely remarked, "Everything we have is derived or has evolved from something else earlier." Let us apply this concept to our thesis. If we substitute three vertical members for the cane in the back panel, and a wooden panel for the cane in the seat, we have precisely such a chair as that of Figure 2. Four of these were long in the collection of Mrs. Katherine Prentis Murphy, who gave a pair (one of which is illustrated through the courtesy of Mrs. J. Watson Webb) to the Prentis House in the Shelburne Museum, Shelburne, Vermont. Such a chair would have been made, very probably in the last years of the XVII Century. Stylistically its under structure seems a bit later than that shown in Figure 1 with substitution of turned member at front.

That the substitution of vertical wooden members, in lieu of the cane in the back, did occur in England on rare occasions, is not to be denied. MacQuoid & Edwards, in their monumental work "The Dictionary of English Furniture," cite a couple of such examples, but stress that they are

---

2. Ibid., p. 91.
the chair in Figure 3, which the late Joseph Downs described as the full development of the bannister type. (It was once in the Downs collection, and prior to that time was in the Lockwood collection.)

It is tall, well and fully carved; and its turnery is very fine. One should note the exquisitely done crest and that the lower cross member is carved; while the height is not less than that of the Carolean chairs, placing it in the early years of the XVIII Century.

It is still debated and unresolved whether simplification of a style indicates the rural craftsman, or a later date when the style begins to decline—perhaps, it is sometimes both. We see evidences of such declension in Figure 4. This may depict a country worker’s attempt as evidenced by the retention of height but elimination of carving, and while the turnery is good, it is not the finest.

We close the first quarter of the XVIII Century with Figure 5 showing “block and vase” turning, simply turned back, and a Dutch (?) carved top rail on a chair of considerably diminished height and lighter structure. A number of these chairs have been found—most of them in Eastern Massachusetts.

The second quarter of the Century shows crests sawn into ornamental profiles instead of carving, simpler turnings, less height, and slightly lighter members. This is the period when the style is beginning to decline. Two chairs from the Connecticut valley, dating perhaps 1730 to 1740, are indicative. One is interesting because numerous examples have been found in the vicinity of Deerfield, Massachusetts, but not elsewhere. The other chair shows quite well the jig saw work on the crests. Figure 6.

During this interum we find the replacement of turned bannisters with flat moulded bannisters. While this diminished the time consumed, the cost, and involved labor; such was certainly not always what was sought. However, when in addition the crest has been replaced by the simple yoke top, then the final exit is very near. A chair with such a yoke top and flat bannisters is shown in Figure 7, which is probably mid XVIII Century or even later. While it is a very nice chair, it is indeed a far cry and a considerable declension from those of a half century earlier, and marks the end of the series. This chair has much more character, better design and finer turning than one usually finds and probably originated in southern Connecticut. New York chairs especially on Long Island have as a feature curious front feet like the diminutive replica of the bull foot on a Kas, also they frequently retain the single bulbous turned front rung of the earlier period.

Thus far we have concerned ourselves with the straight or side chair for examples to show the changes. However, “armed chairs” underwent a parallel set of changes, with a few “extras” just for good measure.

There is a well nigh unique chair in the Henry Ford Collection (Antiques, LXXII, 2 Feb. 1958, p. 151). Curious indeed is the manner in which the crest is carved also its understructure is not in the usual manner. It is described

8. Wallace Nutting, Furniture Treasury (Framingham, 1928), II, #2483.
9. Lockwood, op. cit., p. 44.

Fig. 2.—Early bannister, showing features of the transition from the caneback. End of XVII Century. In Prentis House, Shelburne Museum (ex. coll. of Mrs. Katherine Prentis Murphy).
as, "New England bannister back arm chair, curly maple, painted black (Antiques XXX, 5, Nov, 1936, p. 207) circa 1800." This reference pictures the identical (?) arm chair (William Wilson Wood III of Pequa, Ohio) but date assigned is circa 1720 and wood as walnut. It is thought to be "honest" and New England—but yet is very puzzling.

No serious student today will entertain the concept that the bannister back is an evolution from the Carver-Brewster sort, but some of the earlier makers of bannister backs were influenced in their productions by the early, heavy thrown chairs, as evidenced in Figure 8. A large, heavy, well designed and executed chair—the general turnery and especially the finials show a kinship to the heavy Pilgrim chairs of earlier days. The bold curvature of the arms is indicative of earliness, as well as merit. It was reputedly found in Rhode Island, but may have been made in Connecticut, or Massachusetts. It is one of the most individual and desirable early examples to be found.

In Connecticut (it is believed) a type developed which features a most elaborate crest, termed "heart and crown." In this case, flat moulded bannisters do not bespeak shortcuts or skimping. These fine chairs (Figure 9) show careful, finished craftsmanship and they were probably presentation pieces. The chair depicted in Figure 10, from the Joseph Downs collection, shows height, fine turnery, and ample use of material—all combined in an ensemble of good design and excellent workmanship.

In early XVIII Century Pennsylvania developed a type of large, imposing bannister back arm chair of another sort. They are quite different from any others discussed. These seem not to derive from the Carolan cane chairs, nor do they show any close similarity to the sort produced in New England. These are more the work of the joiner, than the turner, also their derivation seems to be from the German settlers of Pennsylvania instead of the English. Further differences appear in that these chairs are usually of walnut and do not seem to have been painted.

Two very fine examples are displayed in the Philadelphia Museum of Art. One of these is here illustrated (Figure 10) through the courtesy of that institution and its Director, Mr. Henri Marceau.

On examining the picture (Figure 10) one notes the use of paneled seat, the absence of finials, the boldness of the arms, and the excellence of any turnery employed. These
Fig. 6—Simple rural chairs. Connecticut Valley, second quarter XVIII Century. Left example is sort found in vicinity of Deerfield, Massachusetts. Shorter; lighter; less attention to turnery and with same profile as embellishment of crest.

rare chairs are pleasing and attractive, but their boldness and vitality carries more of a German and of a peasant feeling. They may have been made from the early years through the 3rd quarter of the XVIII Century in Pennsylvania.

It seems generally believed various styles of furniture were also made on a smaller scale for children. Whether this be true or not, or whether some of these diminutive articles were journeyman's models cannot be answered here.

A child's (?) bannister back armchair, or perhaps a workman's sample is shown in Figure 11. The evidences of rough usage indicate that at some time during its career, children did use it. An identical example was in the J. Stogdell Stokes collection. A beautiful "heart and crown" high chair, in the Joseph Downs collection was indubitably made for a young child's use. Esther Singleton illustrates a New York high chair of the late type.

A fairly reliable guide to the probable date is to be found in the dimensions. Early specimens have about the same height of back (48 inches) and height of seat (18 to 18½ inches) as the cane backs, although they are slightly wider at the front of the seat (19 to 20 inches). Possible dates for these might be 1690 to 1720, and they will usually exhibit a curved crest with an abundance of fine, bold turning (as shown in Figures 2 and 3).

During the first quarter of the XVIII Century a transition begins, examples of which are shown in Figures 4 and 5. The height of the back decreases to 44 or 45 inches, the height of the seat is lower (17½ to 17¾ inches); the various members are somewhat lighter; and simplification has begun.

The change reaches its completion in the second quarter of the century. The simple rural chairs of Figure 6 show a height of 40 to 41 inches with the seat but 17 inches high and shallower from front to back. All members of the chair have been lightened; which does not permit bold turning, nor is too much attention spent upon the turnery, and carving is no longer to be observed.

At or near mid-century the crest is replaced by a yoke top; finals shrink or completely disappear; flat moulded bannisters are substituted for turnings; and the end of the style is drawing near. Some of these examples (Fig. 7) are

Fig. 7—Unusually good turnings, but yoke top and flat bannisters indicate mid XVIII Century. Sort often found in New York and southern Connecticut. Collection of Mr. K. O. Hill.

wider across the back (15 inches) and have a greater depth of seat (15 inches) than average for the style.

No example has been pictured in connection with this discussion which shows Spanish feet. Such were not infrequently used and when they occur it will usually be on the earlier chairs. Their presence, or absence, is not of too great importance, although a desirable detail.

The turnery, the height and the overall design and workmanship of the chair should be the important features to be considered.

We may properly believe that these chairs were nearly always painted—the early examples black; but somewhat later iron oxide red, brown and a deep green are noted. Perhaps this was because our ancestors had an aversion to the simple, light colored native woods!

The material used is usually largely maple—quite understandable since they were a product of the turner and this wood is ideal for working in the lathe. The seat rails are almost invariably hickory, split and shaped with a draw shave, as is characteristic of so many American chairs. Rungs and bannisters may sometimes be of hickory, less commonly of oak and occasionally of ash. I have seen cherry and butternut used for the flat cross members that engage the ends of turned bannisters. Pennsylvania chairs are walnut and unpainted.

Soft wood seems not to have been used except for the flat moulded bannisters; for the crest in ‘heart and crown’ chairs (Figure 9) and for the yoke which replaces the crest on the relatively late chairs (Figure 7, also Figure 11). We may note in passing that the last type was apparently more common in southern Connecticut and New York.

As with the contemporary slat back chairs12 or the somewhat later Windsors, the technique of using partly seasoned woods for some of the components, was sometimes employed. When these parts dried out in final seasoning the shrinkage assured a firm, viselike hold at each well fitted joint. But the system was not always used nor did it work out completely in practice and even the use of wooden pins could not completely assure permanence and an overall solution to the problem. The design of the chair was such that it was not able to remain firm and tight when subjected
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Henry Hammond Taylor, Knowing, Collecting and Restoring Early American Furniture (Philadelphia, 1930), pp. 74-75.
to continuous hard wear and rough usage.

Two methods have been suggested as the modus operandi by which split-turned bannisters may have been produced. One way was to saw an appropriate turning lengthwise through its exact center; the other was to have two sticks glued together, perhaps with paper or other separation between, which could be soaked apart after being turned. But one cannot today establish which of these was used; or if neither technique was employed.

The bannister back chair was the chair of the well-to-do, or those in moderately comfortable circumstances. Quite definitely, they were not the crude work of some country carpenter or "handyman," and certainly they were not the chairs of pioneer huts.

Like many another fashion, it developed—then subsided after a half century of favour, showing a serious decline in the last few years. As the XVIII Century progressed, the turner slowly gave place to the chair maker and, later still, the cabinet maker. The taste of the middle and upper classes shifted to Queen Anne; then the Georgian styles in walnut or mahogany, for their greater elegance. On the other hand, the slat back chair, which was more comfortable, sturdier, and easier to make; also somewhat later the Windsor, gave competition for the homes of those who had a less well filled purse.

The bannister was forced thus to leave the field. Its chaste, even austere, beauty did not compensate for some degree of fragility, a certain lack of comfort and time consuming fabrication by a really skilled craftsman. It is doubtful if any were made after the beginning of the Revolutionary War. They constitute a very nice chapter in the book of chairs and are something worth while, which we can properly claim as our own.
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By EDNA EBY HELLER

The lude and hearty Dutch of eastern Pennsylvania could very well be tabbed "the pie-eating people." The number of pies consumed by the average farm family is astounding. Every housewife is a pie baker and a good one. Mothers see to it that each of their daughters knows how to make a cherry pie long before she marries Billy Boy. To neglect such training would be sheer folly among such people where pie is often eaten three times a day by the farmer but only seven times a week by the city dweller.

Pies have been baked in this region since 1750. Some folks claim that the first pies were made in Pennsylvania but authorities recognize that the original idea was planted here by the English. However, when the Dutch were introduced to this idea of tucking pieces of fruit between rounds of pastry, they were so fascinated that they began to put anything and everything into a pie. As a result, the Dutch counties constitute the piebelt of America today. Although pies form an important part of the cookery in each section of the Pennsylvania Dutch country, certain parts seem to have their own special ones. In Berks County, Lemon Strip Pie is the most popular choice. But among the Amish of Lancaster County, Vanilla Pie is as common as the Apple Pie is to fruit growers of York County. Then in Lebanon county, more Boiled Pot Pie is made than in any other section. Recipes of each of these are given on these pages.

**Berks County's Lemon Strip Pie**
(makes two pies)

**Lemon Filling:**
- 1 cup sugar
- 3 tbsp flour
- 1 lemon, rind and juice
- 2 eggs, beaten

In a saucepan, combine sugar, flour, lemon rind and juice. Add the beaten eggs and molasses, mixing well. Slowly stir in the water. Let come to a boil, stirring continually. Remove from heat and add butter. Set aside to cool.

**Sweet Dough:**
- ½ cup sugar
- ½ cup flour
- 1 egg, beaten

Cream together the sugar and flour. Add the beaten egg. Sift together the flour and baking powder and add with milk. Roll out to size of pie pan and cut in inch strips. Pour cooled filling into two unbaked pie shells. Top with strips of dough. Bake in a 350 degree oven for 30 minutes.

**Lancaster County's Amish Vanilla Pie**
(makes two pies)

**Filling:**
- 1 cup brown sugar
- 1 cup dark molasses
- 2 tbsp flour

Combine ingredients in a saucepan and cook until thickened. Let cool while you make crumbs.

**Crumbs:**
- 2 cups flour
- 1 cup brown sugar
- 1 egg, beaten
- ½ cup shortening

Combine flour, sugar, soda, baking powder, and shortening to make crumbs. Pour half of cooked filling into each unbaked crust and top with crumbs. Bake at 375 degrees for 40 to 45 minutes.

**York County's Apple Cumb Pie**

Pastry for one 9 inch shell
- 1 cup sugar
- 6 tart apples
- 1 diced apple

Pare and core apples and cut into eighths. Mix ½ cup sugar and cinnamon together and sprinkle over apples. Put into unbaked pastry shell. Combine remaining sugar and flour and butter, rubbing together to make crumbs. Cover sugared apples with crumbs. Bake at 425 for 10 minutes and then reduce temperature to 350. Bake thirty-five minutes longer.

**Lebanon County's Boiled Pot Pie**

- 3 cups sifted flour
- 1 cup sugar
- ½ tsp salt
- ¼ tsp baking powder
- 1 cup water

Mix the above ingredients as for pastry. Roll out on floured board half portion at a time to ¼ inch thickness. Cut into two inch squares and drop into meat broth in which meat and vegetables are cooking either real beef, pork, chicken or squirrel. Sprinkle copiously with black pepper. Cover kettle and boil for twenty minutes.

Pieces of pastry that are boiled instead of baked are the base of a main dish known as pot pie, a popular dinner dish among the Pennsylvania Dutch. Usually this dough, which is sometimes noodle dough, is boiled with meat and potatoes in meat broth, but can also be found cooked alone in the broth. Many women cook pot pie squares in either beef, venal, pork, or poultry stock, while others have never ventured to serve them in any other than the customary way their mothers and grandmothers cooked them with either poultry or game. There is another use of these boiled dough squares. In Adams County and in Carbon County they are cooked in a sugar syrup with peaches or apples and served warm for dessert. Enough said for the pie in the pot.

Among the Dutch there are many other main dish pies, both meat and vegetable. The meat pies are sometimes also called pot pies even though they are baked. So actually
there are baked pot pies and boiled pot pies among meat pies, but the potato, corn, onion, and oyster pies are always baked. There is also a meat pie that is made at butchering time which is fast becoming only a nostalgic memory. Beef or pork is put between crusts of bread dough, set to rise, baked, and then frozen in the cold attic. Many a man will drool when he talks about these delicious pies that his mother would bring from the attic and steam in the big wash boiler. Served with canned meat gravy they seemed to hit the spot. But as butchering and quantity cooking are no longer commonly done on homesteads, these pies will most likely be an item of the past.

There are other differences between the pie baking of this generation and that of the past. Few children today see mothers bake sixteen pies at once as their grandmothers were prone to do. The perforated tin pie cupboards which held all the pies of the weekly baking are useful now only to the antique collector. Today we are so choosy that we eat pie only when it has been baked the same day. However there are exceptions and here is one: a Lancaster county girl writes that she still bakes five or six Shoo-fly pies twice a week.

What is a Shoo-fly pie? Of a certainty it is a molasses flavored cake in a pie shell. For a more detailed description, you will have to taste twenty shoo-fly pies and decide for yourself. The differences in this pie are surprising. No two taste alike! Some are gooey and some are choky. They may have a lot of spice or none at all. Some cooks always use brown sugar and others never heard of using brown. As for molasses, each cook has her own favorite brand and is willing to drive miles to get that particular kind. It is true that basic differences center around the flavor of molasses or the proportion of liquid used. If, by chance, you need a recipe for the Shoo-fly Pie, here is a recipe for the pie which took the prize one year at the Shoo- fly Baking Contest at the Pennsylvania Dutch Folk Festival at Kutztown.
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**Shoo-fly Pie**

**Bottom part:**
- ½ tsp. soda
- ½ cup boiling water
- ⅓ cup molasses
- ½ cup flour

**Top part:**
- ½ tsp. soda
- ¼ cup flour
- ¼ cup sugar
- ¼ cup butter

Dissolve soda in boiling water, add molasses and stir well. Set aside. Combine flour, sugar, and rub in butter to make crumbs. Pour ⅔ of molasses mixture into unbaked pastry shell. Fill alternately with crumbs and liquid. Bake in 425 degree oven for 10 minutes. Reduce to 350 degrees and bake for 30 minutes more.

In all of the Pennsylvania Dutch pie cookery there is much variety. Among the dessert pies and in addition to the usual two crust pies there are custards, crumbs, pies, and fried miniature pies. When anyone mentions lemon pie you can justifiably ask what kind. Here, there are Lemon Meringue Pies but they are in the minority. With greater acclaim the Dutchmen choose either Lemon Sponge Pie or Lemon Strip Pie. Then too, there is a two crust pie that contains lemon slices and another that contains a lemon pudding made with dried bread crumbs. Is there any other way that lemons could be put into a pie?

All of the pie story will not be told until the little Milk Pie gets mentioned. All Dutchmen speak of this one as the pie that is made from the little bits of left-over pastry. It is filled with a sort of creamy filling which is simply made with brown or white sugar, flour, cream, and a flavoring of cinnamon. Some cooks do use molasses as a substitute for part of the sugar, but, basically, they all make the same uncooked filling by guess without measuring. Simple as it is, it is a favorite to old and young as a sort of snack pie.

Even though most of the Dutch recognize this pie by the name of Milk Pie, it has ever so many names. One finds agreement everywhere that Milk Pie is made with the left-over pastry and sometimes leftover cream or milk, but, each family seems to have its pet name for this pie. These are the names that have been given to this lovely tart: cream tart, schlopu kuchen, candy pie, butterscotch pie, moschti pie, barn-hartzig, flappy, milk flite, love pie, Mennonite pie, milch-schabbles, milch flab, raven kawder, schlebbys, milch flas, milch schablies, briska, kawder kuchen, rauen kuchen, poorners pie, promise pie, fress is graud, ferbaboldi sus, schlecker pie, slap jack, kawder kustard, betsu kuchen, spruzt kuchen and pussie pie. So many names for such a little pie!

**Milk Pie**

(8 inch size)

- 1 unbaked pastry shell
- 4 tbsp. flour
- 1 tsp. cream or milk
- Dash of cinnamon

Combine flour and sugar in the bottom of the pastry shell. Pour over it the milk or cream. Sprinkle with cinnamon. Bake in 375 degree oven for 35 minutes.

The number of kinds of pies that the Pennsylvania Dutch housewives bake is amazing. Their number is sixty. The question arises as to the cause of this stupendous production in home kitchens. Ingredients have never been a problem. Secondly, we like heavy food and are not one bit calorie conscious! And, being a very thrifty people, many of these pies were discovered in an attempt to “use up” leftovers.

Thriftiness also prompted the summer drying of snitz and the cooking of elderberries and molasses to store in crocks for winter pies. With the additional home canned fruits there are plenty for both two crust pies and sour cream tarts. If you do not want a fruit pie, have a piece of Walnut, Montgomery, McKinley, Funny Cake Pie, Cheese Custard Pie, Tyler Custard, Union Pie, Quakertown, or Molasses Coconut.
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*Pie safe from the Mrs. Harlan Wilson Collection.*
One noteworthy and far-reaching change to have come over Pennsylvania folk life has been the alteration of the family’s activities within the home, particularly those families living on farms. While engaged in a larger study of northern Indiana County and southern Jefferson County, I began to perceive, or so I thought, some of the characteristics of the family farm life that had once existed in the period 1870-1912. These practices took place in homes very much like the one shown in the photograph. This photo can be dated approximately 1905-1906 and was found in the negative files of the late Jean White, of Puxxutawney, Pennsylvania, who kindly gave me permission to look through his materials. The farm was in southern Jefferson County. Close scrutiny will reveal many features, such as varying types of fencing, buildings, etc., which were characteristic of farmsteads and farming of the period.

During the evenings, after the outside work had been done for the day, families spent a few hours idly or at some small tasks. While doing so, they enjoyed certain pastimes. Apparently one of the most prevalent was the telling of riddles. The following riddles were given to me by informants as
Indeed, these examples only; there were many which could not be recalled. Indeed, these are no doubt familiar to many readers and will serve to bring to mind others.

What goes up and down,
And never touches sky or ground?
Answer: A pump handle.

Patch upon patch, and a hole in the middle,
Guess me this riddle, and I'll give you a gold fiddle.
Answer: A chimney.

Up a chimney down, down a chimney down,
But won't go up a chimney up,
Nor down a chimney up.
Answer: An umbrella.

White in white; white saw white in white;
White sent white to put white out of white.
What is it?
Answer: A white woman in a white house saw a white cow in a buckwheat field and sent a white dog to chase the cow from the field.

Through a rock, through a reel,
Through an old spinning wheel,
Through a box full of pepper,
Through an old mill hopper,
Through a shunt-shank's bone,
This riddle never known.
Answer: A worm.

Black of mire, much at hire,
Many horses have I tire,
Tirel horse, tirel man,
Guess this riddle if you can.
Answer: Coal.

God made Adam out of dust,
But thought it best to make me first,
So I was made before the man,
To answer God's most holy plan.
My body He did make complete,
But without arms, legs [or] feet.
My ways and actions did control,
And fashioned me without a soul.
A living being I became,
And Adam gave me first his name.
Then from his presence I withdrew,
All more of Adam ever knew.
My God in me did something see,
And put a living soul in me,
But took from me that soul again.
So where from me that soul was fled,
I was the same as when first made.
So now without arms, legs, feet, or soul,
I travel now from pole to pole.
Thousands of people, both young and old,
Shall at my death great light behold.
To heaven I shall never go,
Nor to the grave, nor hell below.
Answer: The whale.

Riddles, according to the informants, were very popular; one woman remarked that her brothers were "eternally riddling one another."

Other family pastimes were playing cards, dominoes, crokinole, and checkers. Enchere and casino were two of the card games. Both crokinole and checkers were used outside as well as inside the home; once a newspaper correspondent complained that the people of the small, country village would do nothing but play checkers, while another correspondent announced with all seriousness that Professor J. E. Weaver was the champion crokinole player of that particular community. In another locality, everybody from an eight-year-old boy, to a square, to a fruit tree salesman were listed as champion checkers players.

In one family from corn husking time on beens were spread out on the table after supper, and the evening was spent in separating the good from the bad. Besides telling riddles and chatting, the pickers ate popcorn, roasted apples, or roasted onions. The apples were put in the "grate" and were covered with live coals. Chestnuts, hickory nuts, and walnuts were gathered in the fall to be eaten during other similar winter sessions. The chestnuts were boiled before being eaten.

It so happened that the same family which picked over the beans was a religious one ("The devil is in every pack of playing cards."). It did not indulge in many games, but often sang hymns or other songs to the accompaniment of the parlor organ, played by the daughter, and the violin played by the boy. Although this family was probably not typical, something close to it was well enough known in the area.

Drinking alcoholic beverages and smoking, while not exactly pastimes, were traits of life in many homes. Wine was apparently the strongest of the drinks made on the farm, and although whiskey was sold commercially, neither was used widely. On the other hand, pipe smoking and chewing tobacco were common. Women as well as men smoked pipes made of clay. The tobacco was either plug, which was shaved with a knife and then crumbled in the hand, or a coarsely-cut brand. A pithy reed growing in swamps or along women was used for pipestem, a plant with the obvious name of "pipestem." Riding pillows with his grandmother to gather this plant remains a vivid memory of one of my informants to this day. The practice of women smoking died out circa 1880-1890, judging from the informants' description of those who smoked during their youth. To be more exact, the generation rising to womanhood about that time did not take up the habit. Snuff, evidently, was never as universally used as were smoking and chewing tobacco, although it was far from unknown.

Home Holiday Celebrations

Christmas, New Year's, Easter, and Thanksgiving were the home-centered holidays. Of these, Christmas and Easter received the most attention. Decorated trees for Christmas were not used by most families until about 1900. Stockings were hung by some children for the gifts they received, usually fruit, candy, a small toy or two, and peanuts. Santa Claus did not bring the presents to all families; in fact, in some cases he did not come at all, the presents being given to the children by the parents without any pretense. Needless to say, in families such as this, the stockings were not hung on Christmas Eve. In the German parts of the area, some of the children also received a visit from the Belmeccle man, who was dressed in red or in red and black. Carrying with him a small whip and a little gift such as candy, he would question the children as to their behavior during the last year. If they had been good, they got some candy, and if they had been bad, they got a whack with the whip. This
Belznickle man was frowned upon by two non-German informants because, or so they claimed, the children were too often scared speechless. Of course, the “Dutch” spoken to on the subject thought that the practice was great sport. In other sections, Santa Claus seems to have been more prominent. The only other major characteristic associated with Christmas was the big meal served that day. Turkey or goose was considered fine for feasting.

A minor home holiday was New Year’s, although it did have special activities in a few places. One woman interviewed recalled that “Saint Belznickle” came on New Year’s instead of Christmas Eve. In this case, he did not confront the children, for the gifts that he brought were put in the stockings of the children. In another family a plate was put out to receive the gifts for the children, the donor not being identified.

Easter, on the other hand, was celebrated more than was New Year’s in the home. Again, the young members of the family took the greatest advantage of the day. Eggs were dyed for them with onion husks or beets; only once did I hear anybody say that the eggs were hidden. Aside from the dyeing, people also ate large quantities of eggs. Some said that the eggs were boiled, while others claimed that they were cooked according to individual preference. The practice was noted in the newspapers’ community columns, some correspondents wanting to know who ate the most eggs on Easter, while one complained that some folk were using the day only as an excuse for gorging themselves. According to one serious correspondent, the game of banging hard-boiled eggs together was supposed to signify the breaking of the tomb.

Thanksgiving, as a home holiday, attracted some attention,
but apparently ranked well below the others in popularity or in celebration. In almost every instance in which the day was mentioned, devotion to the turkey dinners was stressed. A few people went to church. Some reserved the day for butchering.

All the above holidays had their public aspect in addition to the home celebration. The public celebration was usually far more elaborate than that in the home. However unpretentious were the home festivities, the importance of them was always emphasized by the informants. The country home of the period from 1880-1910 may have been quiet, but it did have its keenly treasured moments.

Centered in the family, but not strictly a home affair, was the family reunion. A family, in this case, included all the descendants of some particular early settler. Therefore the reunion really occupied an intermediate position between the home proper and the community- or public-centered social life.

The family reunion was by no means a small affair. Of those for which attendance figures were reported in the newspapers, the number ran from 21 to 2500 people. The ordinary reunion seems to have attracted people numbering from 75 to about 250. The gatherings were held in one of four places: the home of the oldest family member; at the homestead; in a "grove" which was close to the oldest member or homestead; or at a church, either one considered to be within the family area (a region of no little size), or the home church of the family in the extended sense of the word. The accompanying photograph, also from the Jean White files, shows such a reunion held at a home about 1900-1901. Most of the reunions took place within the months of July and August. Those that took place in November and December were held at Thanksgiving and Christmas and were the smallest numerically. Only a few were held at any other time of the year.

The programs of the reunions were often elaborate and usually followed a pattern. A big dinner, music, speeches, organization and election of officers were the usual events. Martial bands, cornet bands, and "military" bands played, one of the martial bands consisting of a bass drummer, tenor drummer, and a fifer. Some bands were imported from towns or villages generally not considered to be within the family area. Instrumental music, in the way of solos and duets, were also offered for the pleasure of those in attendance. Violin and saxophone music were mentioned in this respect. The organ was used, but it seems to have been only as an accompanying instrument for singing or other instruments. Usually the songs were not identified. However, a few were named or otherwise specified as to type, the "sacred" songs outnumbering the secular ones. "Rock of Ages," "Jesus, Lover of My Soul," "God Be with You Till We Meet Again," "Shall We Meet Beyond the River," and the long-meter doxology were the religious songs mentioned, while "America" was the only secular song named as such. A choir, a quartet, and a trio were singing groups which performed at the various reunions.

Another mark of the family reunion was speech-making, including addresses of welcome, answers, and general remarks. Sometimes as many as five or six talks would be delivered.

Other items of entertainment added to reunion programs were recitations, games such as quoits and horsehoe pitching, foot racing (including races for specific ages such as seven, eleven, and sixteen-year-olds), and baseball games. Not all the ball games were impromptu ones; organized teams from various rural areas were brought in to play scheduled games. Groundhog hunting and berry picking were among the unplanned pleasures, while a festival was held after at least one of the affairs.

In addition to the above, one trait of the reunion was constant. Dinners were always held and were invariably reported in any account of the event. Several of the dinners were listed as "baked" meals or picnics.

Church ties were valued at the family reunion. Scripture reading, prayers, and ministers were often associated with the meetings, the last-named often being called upon for a few remarks.

These are only a few of the pastimes and practices of the Jefferson-Indiana County farm families through the period 1870-1912. There is good reason to believe, however, that before the days of widespread usage of autos and such entertainment facilities as radios and television sets, family recreations in the home and as a unit did fit into a pattern as outlined here.
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Buckskin or Sackcloth?

A Glance at the Clothing Once Worn by the Schwenkfelders in Pennsylvania

By ANDREW S. BERKY

On the twenty-second day of September, 1734, the English brigantine Saint Andrew casted into the harbor of Philadelphia. The anchor was cast, the cannons were fired and "many people came on board the ship distributing apples and fresh beer" to the sea-weary passengers. Of the 300 immigrants on board, one hundred and eighty-two were members of a religious group known as Schwenkfelders. They were entering the last stage of a migration that had begun eight years earlier in the Germanic principality of Silesia. They left a lot of things behind—friends, relatives, homesteads, an unfeeling government, hostile church groups and a way of life.

They were about to enter a new world and before too many years had passed, they were part and parcel of the vibrant culture that developed in Pennsylvania. With this unique heritage it would only be fair to assume that they contributed in fair measure to the development of this new culture and by the same token they were also vastly affected by the new environment. Culture is largely a mental attitude, but there are physical manifestations of attitudes toward life that aid and abet understanding. Hence, this brief examination of the Schwenkfelder attitude toward garb. Were they plain or fancy? Did they develop their own unique modes or did they imitate the patterns established by the other larger groups in southeastern Pennsylvania? Was there any unique mystical significance in the way they dressed?

At the outset, one has to recognize a few basic things about the individuals themselves. They were not frivolous. They were not migrating to Pennsylvania to seek economic opportunity and they were not an extension of an organized church body. They were dead serious in their desire for freedom. They had been hounded, chastised and imprisoned because they had refused to conform. They had voluntarily sacrificed their homes, their trades and virtually all of their "earthly possessions." Above all, they were completely dedicated to leading exemplary Christian lives along the avenues suggested by the lay spiritual reformer whose name they bore.

With all of these, and many more, external and internal forces at work, how did they react? Certainly, they were terribly self-conscious in this new world. So much so that certain individuals in the group proposed that they drop the name "Schwenkfelder" entirely. This was a bit too strong, but they did conclude that as a group they would dress as unassumingly as possible.

Hence, there are several basic reasons why they entered Pennsylvania on the plain side. First, the clothes they customarily wore in their Silesian homeland were far from being fashionable. These people belonged to a rural econ-
The three Schwenkfelder matrons were "taken off" about 1900 and this was not standard garb then. They got the clothes out of a chest to indicate the kind of thing worn some fifty or sixty years earlier, so the dresses would date back to 1830–1840.

Weiss, a thoroughly conscientious gentleman and a weaver by trade, went on to prescribe such detail as gray stockings for the elderly and fur-lined cloth gloves as acceptable for winter travel. All in all, his program was pretty rigorous and while there is no earthly way of knowing how many of the exiles dressed according to his dictats, we do know that his broader program for conduct in Pennsylvania was met with a great deal of opposition from many of the families. This small clan contained free-thinkers as well as ultra-conservatives and Weiss' brief tenure of leadership was a discouraging one in many respects. At the time of his death in 1740, instead of the tight-knit, well-disciplined group he envisioned, the Schwenkfelders were spread out over a stretch of fifty miles extending from Germantown to Meungie, and the divisive forces appeared overwhelming.

Hence, in the middle part of the eighteenth century, the geographical dispersion of this tiny band alone ruled out the possibility of the development of a distinctive garb. There were, of course, other major preoccupations, not the least of them being to convert wooded hillsides into arable land.

By 1775, a new element of leadership had arisen and the haphazard gatherings for worship had developed into a pattern, a school system had been established, there was an catechism and a hymn book. The schoolhouses became meeting houses and the informal talks between house-fathers jelled into a conference.

This was now, by and large, a new generation, one that had been intimate with the Quakers, the Mennonites, and the Dunkards. They had also lived among Lutherans and German Reformed Congregations, but there was too little similarity. They had no church hierarchy, no liturgy, no baptizers and no communion cups. Hence, by inclination, they gravitated ever more toward the "plain."

The first official attitude toward garb appears in the conference minutes of 1786. The delegates agreed on three main points.

First: All new modes, fabrics and styles that seem to serve no other purpose than to clothe oneself in an extravagant manner simply to draw attention and to cultivate pride shall be discountenanced.

Second: Members are permitted to use such styles in their clothing as are generally worn by the good people of the community where they reside. Any unjust criticism of those who see fit to adopt what all of the common people are using shall not be permitted.

Third: The use of home-made clothing, what members can raise and prepare for themselves, shall be encouraged.

Whatever other conclusions can be drawn from this official attitude, they should not serve to detract from the fact that this position made good sense. The elders advised caution, tolerated diversity and encouraged thrift. Could more be expected of any father in any age?
Certainly, there were those who wanted the security of established patterns. They wore very plain clothes and there isn’t much reason to assume that their dress underwent any basic changes in the New World. But there were also those who traveled to Easton and Germanstown and Philadelphia and liked what they saw, a flounce here and a bit of color there. They needed the security of knowing that they were participating in the world they inhabited. The fortunate result was compromise, for church groups have been split asunder for lesser things than the cut of a coat.

However, in one sense, compromises merely delay decisions and if the basic forces do not decay or deviate, they will return to be reckoned with another day. Thus, in 1852, the issue was again placed on the conference bargaining table. On the one hand they were exposed to groups who were becoming deadly serious about hooks and eyes versus buttons, and black bonnets versus light blue. On the other hand, stovepipe hats were infiltrating the countryside and the fulling mills were turning out beautifully dyed clothes.

The issue was reckoned to be of enough importance to become part of a set of by-laws adopted in conjunction with a constitution.

In order that with the mode of dress there may be no abuse practiced, it must be (1) comfortable, protecting both the body and the health. (2) It must be adapted to prevent evil desires, that these members are thereby covered whose sight might stir up impure desires. (3) It may be suitable to one’s condition, that is, one may wear such clothing as other Christian and reasonable people of our condition, which best indicate and promote purity and humility. (4) A Christian may according to the circumstances of the times arrange his clothing, that he may for example go forth on a festival day different than upon a time of mourning. (5) He may also adapt himself to the custom of the time and place when such custom does not contain in itself anything that is sinful and does not conflict with propriety of conduct and decency, and whilst he does not place any holiness in that he wears the old style of clothing, he nevertheless should guard against, at the same time, imitating all the new styles and much less will he make it his business to introduce new styles.

The key phrase of course, is this—whilst he does not place any holiness in that he wears the old style of clothing . . .

Here was a statement suggesting that vanity could also walk around underneath a very plain garb, that plainness could become an end rather than a means, a symbol indicating that the wearer considered himself more pious than the next.

In brief, the ultra conservatives lost the game. This by no means signifies the end of plain dress in Schwenkfelder circles. The customs of a lifetime were too deeply imbedded to be dropped at the adoption of a by-law. The conservatives, shall we say, have the habit of frequenting church services with more regularity than the liberals.

By mid-nineteenth century, a good many of the Schwenkfelder women had come to wear the black bonnets which were in general vogue among the Mennonites and Quakers. Beneath the bonnet, they continued to wear the white lace caps which they had worn in Silesia. The outer bonnet was removed in the vestibule of the meeting house for a time, but this wearsome ritual was soon abandoned and the black bonnets, now appearing in shades of gray and dark blue, marched right on into the sanctuary. After all, the man who drove the carriage to the meeting house was sporting a tall silk hat that made him look just a little bit like President Lincoln. Why couldn’t she dress a bit like Jenny Lind? There were a few casualties. One lady felt that a bonnet in a pew was an abomination and she never again appeared in the meeting house. By and large, however, the whole issue was handled peacefully and gracefully and also, perhaps, with an uncommon amount of wisdom.

Thus, by the close of the Civil War, the Schwenkfelders were more fancy than plain and any vestiges of what might have become a distinctive garb with religious significance were in the hands of a few elder citizens.

In retrospect the Schwenkfelders seem to have followed Pope’s famous counsel:

“In words, as fashions, the same rule will hold; Alpine fantastic, if too new or old; Be not the first by whom the new are tried, Nor yet the last to lay the old aside.”
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Books Wanted


Color Slides

Amish and Mennonites, Beautiful Colorslides. Twenty titles available. 3 for $1.00, complete set $6.00 postpaid. Free catalog. STEL-MAR, Box 21D, Mount Joy, Pa.

OLD ORDER AMISH in all phases of their picturesque life on bright color slides by professional photographers living among them. Catalog sample slide (30c). Photo Arts, 962 Salisbury, Lancaster, Pa.

Genealogical Queries


SNAVELY: I am attempting to list the various immigrants to Pennsylvania in the eighteenth century by the surname Snavely and to list the first generations of their descendents. Invite correspondence with anyone who can help. Frederick S. Weiser, P. O. Box 121, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania.

WARLICK—Daniel Warlick, wife Maria Barbara Schindel of Pennsylvania went to North Carolina, about 1750. Want names of parents, birth, death, where they lived, with ancestry to the emigrant and time of entry. Lucie Warlick Word, 125 Rummel Road N. E., Atlanta 5, Georgia.

Genealogical Research

Buy and sell genealogies. Also do genealogical research. Specialties—Mennonites, Amish and German families. Delbert Grah, Ph.D., Bluffton, Ohio.

I will do research in Adams County families on an hourly basis or in exchange for research I desire to have done in other areas. Contact Frederick S. Weiser, Gettysburg College, Gettysburg, Pa.

Novel Wanted

The Pennsylvania Dutch Folklore Center, Bethel, Pennsylvania, wants to acquire the novel The Hex Murder by Forrester Hazard, Lippincott, 1936.

Pamphlets for Sale

The Dutch Cookbook by Edna Eby Holler. $1.00.
The Pennsylvania Barn, edited by Alfred L. Shoemaker. $2.00.
Hex, Nat by Alfred L. Shoemaker. $1.00.
My Off is All by Alfred L. Shoemaker. $1.00.
Conestoga Wagon Lore by H. C. Frey. $1.00.
Traditional Rhymes and Jingles by Alfred L. Shoemaker. $1.00.
Facsimile reprint of Edward H. Rauch's 1883 Rip Van Winkle. $1.00. (This is in dialect.)
3 Myths about the Pennsylvania Dutch Country by Alfred L. Shoemaker. $1.25.
Check List of Pennsylvania Dutch Printed Taufscheins by Alfred L. Shoemaker. $1.00. (Well illustrated.)
Facsimile reprint of Edward H. Rauch's 1868 De Kampai Breafa. $1.00. (This is in dialect.)
Schnitzelbank Chart. $1.00.

Ninth Annual Pennsylvania Dutch Folk Festival

JULY 2-3-4-5-6, 1958

Fairgrounds, Kutztown, Pennsylvania

Route 222, between Allentown and Reading

Sponsored by The Pennsylvania Dutch Folklore Center