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FARM RESIDENCE  155 ACRES.
OF
JOSIAH GINGRICH,
WALKER TP.  JUNIATA CO.

FARM LAYOUTS AND BUILDING PLANS
DR. LEE CHARLES HOPPLE, Bloomsburg, Pennsylvania, is a member of the Department of Geography at Bloomsburg State College. His contribution to this issue is a section from his doctoral dissertation, *Spatial Development and Internal Spatial Organization of the Southeastern Pennsylvania Plain Dutch Community*, Ph.D. dissertation in Geography, The Pennsylvania State University, 1971. Dr. Hopple is a native of Pottsville and a graduate of Kutztown State College and the Pennsylvania State University, where his dissertation was done under the direction of Professors George F. Deasy and E. Willard Miller. It represents the first large-scale scientific study of the use of space among the plain sects of Southeastern Pennsylvania.

GABRIEL HARTMANN of Heidelberg, Germany, in 1926 published an article entitled “Amerikafahrer von Dossenheim im 18. Jahrhundert,” in the periodical *Mannheimer Geschichtsblätter*, XXVII (1926). Colorfully written and based on his researches in the church registers of Dossenheim near Heidelberg, the article gives a graphic picture of the conditions which led to the migration of eighty-four persons from this one small village on the Bergstrasse in the period 1749-1764. We are pleased to add this contribution to our growing series of articles documenting the 18th Century emigration across the Atlantic.

RUFUS A. GRIDER, a native of Lititz, Pennsylvania, died at Canajoharie, New York, in 1900. A Moravian, he for a time owned the “Philadelphia Cash Store” at Emmaus and later managed the historic Sun Inn at Bethlehem. His business affairs did not hinder his indulgence in his major interest, which was sketching. Beginning in 1836 he traveled widely, sketching urban as well as rural landscapes. The Grider Collection in the Moravian Archives includes over three hundred sketches, mostly of Pennsylvania scenes. We are indebted to the Archives for permission to reproduce the four winter scenes from Emmaus, dated 1847, in our “Winter Album”. For Grider and his work, see John F. Morman, “Rufus A. Grider,” *Pennsylvania Folklife*, IX:2 (Spring 1958), 22-27.

DR. FRIEDRICH KREBS, Speyer, West Germany, is archivist at the Palatine State Archives in Speyer. For several decades he has searched the German archives for documentation on 18th Century emigrants to the New World. We are happy to make available to our readers in this issue three short articles by Dr. Krebs which have appeared in German genealogical periodicals on emigrants of the 18th Century from (1) Odenheim on the Glan, (2) Frankenthal, and (3) The District of Wegelnburg in the former Duchy of Zweibrücken.
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Gingrich farmstead, from Illustrated Atlas of Juniata County, Pennsylvania (Philadelphia, 1877). Note that this farm, like many in Eastern Pennsylvania, has two houses. The one on the right was the so-called "Grandfather's House," built for the parents when a married son, often the youngest, took over the farm.
Since the publication of our Amish reading list ("What to Read on the Amish," Pennsylvania Folklife, XVIII: 4, Summer 1969, 14-19) we have been asked by many of our correspondents to publish a similar list on the Pennsylvania Dutch (Pennsylvania Germans) in general. We do so now, noting for our readers that this is a selected list, largely for beginners in the field, which covers a selected range of topics in Pennsylvania Dutch culture: History, Language and Literature, Genealogy, Religion, Medicine, The Arts, Architecture, Music, Costume, Cookery and Foodways, and The Pennsylvania Dutchman in Fiction. Also, in delimiting the list, we have decided to include, with a few exceptions, only English-language and 20th Century materials, and among these, principally materials which are still in print or available in larger reference libraries in the area.

The largest and most basic bibliography on the Pennsylvania Germans is the massive work by the German scholar Emil Meynen, *Bibliography on German-Swiss Settlements in Colonial America, Especially on the Pennsylvania Germans and Their Descendants, 1683-1933* (Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1937).

**GENERAL HISTORICAL WORKS**

The general works on the Pennsylvania Germans can be divided into the historic and the contemporary. Of the historic treatments, two deserve special attention, (1) Dr. Benjamin Rush, *An Account of the Manners of the German Inhabitants of Pennsylvania* (1789), edited by Theodore E. Schmauk with notes by I. D. Rupp (Lancaster, Pennsylvania, 1910), Pennsylvania German Society, Volume XIX; and (2) Phebe Earle Gibbons, "Pennsylvania Dutch," and other Essays (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co., 1872, enlarged edition 1882). Phebe Gibbons was a Philadelphia Quakeress who "lived neighbors" to the "Dutch" in Lancaster County for several decades before the Civil War. The book gives an intimate and lively portrait of the customs and attitudes of the Amish, Mennonites, Dunkards, Moravians and Schwenkfelders by a sensitive wife and mother, who even learned Pennsylvania Dutch to converse with her housewife friends. The book is still pleasant reading and provides us with the truest portrait of the Pennsylvania Dutch people achieved in the 19th Century.

Of the 20th Century treatments, Oscar Kuhns, *The German and Swiss Settlements of Colonial Pennsylvania*
Best of the pamphlet introductions to Pennsylvania German history and culture is Russell W. Gilbert's *A Picture of the Pennsylvania Germans*, published by the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission. Popular introductions include books by Phebe Gibbons (center) and Ann Hark (right).


The most important 20th Century symposium on the culture is Ralph Wood, editor, *The Pennsylvania Germans* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1942), which includes the following papers: I. "Penn-
sylvania, Colonial Melting Pot" (Arthur D. Graeff); II. "The Pennsylvania German Farmer" (Walter M. Kollmorgen); III. "The Sects, Apostles of Peace" (G. Paul Musselman); IV. "Lutheran and Reformed, Pennsylvania German Style" (Ralph Wood); V. "The Pennsylvania Germans and the School" (Clyde S. Stone); VI. "Journalism Among the Pennsylvania Germans" (Ralph Wood); VII. "Pennsylvania German Literature" (Harry Hess Reichard); VIII. "The Pennsylvania Germans as Soldiers" (Arthur D. Graeff); IX. "The Pennsylvania Germans as Seen by the Historian" (Richard H. Shryock); and an Appendix: "The Pennsylvania German Dialect" (A. F. Buffington).

Detailed monographs on many phases of Pennsylvania German history and culture and analysis of many Pennsylvania German cultural items can be found in the long series of publications of (1) The Pennsylvania German Society, beginning with Volume I in 1891 and ending with Volume LXIII in 1966, and (2) The Pennsylvania German Folklore Society, Volumes I-XXVIII (1936-1967), now merged in (3). The (new) Pennsylvania German Society, which has published five yearbooks since 1968. Many university and local libraries in the area have these indispensable sets. When the two earlier societies merged, a seventy-fifth anniversary volume of the Pennsylvania German Society was issued, Homer T. Rosenberger, The Pennsylvania Germans, 1891-1965 (Lancaster, Pennsylvania, 1966), Pennsylvania German Society, Volume LXIII, which discusses both the history of the Pennsylvania Germans as an ethnic group and the research that has been done on them since 1891. The book includes a useful if uneven "Year-by-Year Representative Bibliography," listing books, articles, and monographs on Pennsylvania German subjects from 1891 through 1965 (pp. 388-422).

In addition to these three basic sets of serials, there are several sets of periodicals which contain materials of great value, both on the history, culture, and genealogy of the Pennsylvania Germans. These are (1) The Pennsylvania German, beginning in 1900 and ending on the unfortunately German-nationalistic note (in 1918) as The Penn Germania; (2) The Perkiomen Region, Past and Present, Volumes I-III, 1894-1901, edited by Henry S. Dotterer, and its later namesake, The Perkiomen Region, Volumes I-VIII (1922-1930), edited by Thomas R. Bredle; (3) The Goschenhoppen Region, published by Goschenhoppen Historians, Inc., 1965 ff.; (4) The Keystone Folklore Quarterly, published by the Pennsylvania Folklore Society, 1956 ff.; (5) 'S Pennsylvannisch Deitsch Eck, a weekly column of Pennsylvania German studies and collectanea edited by Preston A. Barba and published weekly in the Allentown Morning Call from 1935 to 1969, and available in bound form in many Pennsylvania libraries; and (6) Pennsylvania Folklife, published by the Pennsylvania Folklife Society and begun in 1949 under the title The Pennsylvania Dutchman, now published quarterly and in its twenty-first volume. In addition to these periodicals, the two general Pennsylvania historical periodicals are necessary: (1) The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography, begun in 1877 as the official organ of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania; and (2) Pennsylvania History, begun in 1934 as the organ of the Pennsylvania Historical Association.

Local history is also a prime source for the Pennsylvania Germans. Here there are the county and local histories and periodicals. Pennsylvania has a strong chain of county historical societies. Of the Dutch counties, periodicals are issued for Bucks, Montgomery, Lehigh, Berks, Schuylkill, Northumberland, Lancaster, and Lebanon Counties. The county histories of these areas also contain chapters on the history and customs of the Pennsylvania Germans in the area, as for example, Alfred Mathews and Austin N. Hungerford, History of the Counties of Lehigh and Carbon, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (Philadelphia: Everts & Richards, 1884), which contains A. R. Horne, "The Pennsylvania Germans. Their History, Character, Customs, Language, Literature, and Religion" (pp. 23-42).

Town histories are of value for the researcher as well. Many of these are well researched and provide valuable dated materials on Pennsylvania German culture. One particularly good example is Professor W. W. Deatrick's The Centennial History of Kutztown, Pennsylvania (Kutztown, 1915). Of the more recent town histories, Preston A. Barba's They Came to Emmaus (Emmaus, 1959) is at the front rank. Of "valley" histories, Philip C. Croll's Annals of the Oley Valley (Reading, 1927) is an outstanding example, with well researched materials on the settlement history, religious divisions, and genealogy of that Berks County area. Equally readable, if somewhat more journalistic, is the same author's Ancient and Historic Landmarks of the Lebanon Valley (Philadelphia, 1895), which deserves reprinting.

When the Pennsylvania Germans were "discovered" in the 20th Century by journalists and essayists and
roving photographers in search of quaint Americana, a different genre of treatment was created than the "history". Here we have had a veritable stream of books from the pen of the University of Pennsylvania professor and essayist, Cornelius Weygandt (The Red Hills, The Blue Hills, The Dutch Country) and Ann Hark (Hex Marks the Spot, Blue Hills and Shoofly Pie). Wallace Nutting led the vanguard of the photographic essay in his Pennsylvania Beautiful (Framingham, Massachusetts: Old America Company, 1924). These books helped to entice the tourist into Eastern Pennsylvania. Weygandt in particular spurred the interest in Pennsylvania Dutch antiques and antiquing. Some of them (Nutting in particular) helped to confuse the public on the "meaning" of the "hex signs" found on Pennsylvania barns. But all of them are readable and some of them are necessary for an understanding of Pennsylvania German culture in the 20th Century.

In the most recent times, photo albums accenting the serenity of Pennsylvania Dutch (mostly "plain") culture have been issued by various photographer teams. One of the most pleasant of these is Fields of Peace: A Pennsylvania German Album (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1970), with text by Millen Brand and superb photographs by George A. Tice.

**Language and Literature**

Each culture of course has its own language. Pennsylvania Dutchmen have had to deal with three languages, (1) the Pennsylvania German (Pennsylvania Dutch) dialect, which was the language of the fireside and everyday communication; (2) High German, the original language of school and church and newspaper and formal communication; and (3) English, which gradually has taken the place of High German in the culture, with the exception of a few "Old Order" plain sects.


For those who wish to learn Pennsylvania German or analyze it, the available grammars are (1) J. William Frey, *Pennsylvania Dutch Grammar* (Clinton, S.C.: The Jacobs Press, 1942), and (2) Albert F. Buffington and Preston A. Barba, *A Pennsylvania German Grammar* (Allentown: Schlechter's, 1954), also printed as Volume XXVIII of the Pennsylvania German Folklore Society. The Barba-Buffington work provides the best systematization of dialect orthography. The two systems formerly used were those based on English sound values, and those based on German. Actually every dialect writer had his own system, and the Buffington-Barba attempt to standardize spelling has been widely accepted for scholarly work on the dialect.

Dialect dictionaries have been many and on various cultural levels. Among the earlier ones, with curiosity value, are James C. Lins, *A Common sense Pennsylvania German Dictionary* (Reading, 1887), and A. R. Horne, *A Pennsylvania German Manual* (Kutztown, 1875, and later editions). Thus far the standard dictionary is Marcus Bachman Lambert, *A Dictionary of the Non-English Words of the Pennsylvania-German Dialect* (Norristown, 1924), The Pennsylvania German Society, Volume XXX. The most recent scholarly dictionary is the *Abridged Pennsylvania German Dictionary—Kleines Pennsilvaniadeutsches Wörterbuch* (Kaiserslautern, West Germany, 1970), edited by Professor C. Richard Beam as No. 8 in the Series *Pflüger in der weiten Welt* sponsored by the Heimatstelle Pfalz, Kaiserslautern. It lists over 5000 distinctive words in the dialect vocabulary, with definitions in English, and notes by Dr. Heinrich Kelz on phonology and orthography. Professor Beam, of Millersville State College, Director of the College's German extension at the University of Marburg, West Germany, is engaged at present on a full-scale Pennsylvania German dialect dictionary project.


Pennsylvania German has remained, as the German scholar Heinz Kloss has put it, a "halfway language," i.e., one which never really made it to the level of normal written communication. Essentially it has remained a spoken dialect. For this reason in the 20th Century the average Dutch speaker prefers dialect plays and radio programs, i.e., spoken Dutch, to the laborious and difficult process of reading the few dialect newspaper columns in the upstate weekly press. For Dr. Kloss' discussion of the arrested development of the Pennsylvania dialect, see *Die Entwicklung neuer germanischer Kultursprachen von 1800 bis 1950* (Munich: Pohl & Co., 1952), pp. 119-126.

There was, of course, a minimal dialect literature produced, much of it either of the sentimental doggerel poetry variety or the humorous "Letter to the Editor" genre. Actually there have been only several dozen books published in the dialect, mostly poetry collections and newspaper letters. For as complete a list of the individual dialect imprints as we are likely to get, see Alfred L. Shoemaker, "A Checklist of Dialect Literature," *The Pennsylvania Dutchman*, IV:1 (May 1952), 6-7, 10.

For those who wish to read samples of the dialect, my three favorite anthologies of dialect writings are (1) Heinz Kloss, *Ich schwitz in der Mutter sprach* (I Speak in the Mother Tongue) (Bad Dürkheim, 1936); Wiesbadener Volksbücher No. 266; (2) Heinz Kloss, ed., *Leuwendiche Schimme aus Pennsilvenia* (Living Voices from Pennsylvania) (Stuttgart and New York: B. Westermann, 1938); and (3) William S. Troxell, *Aus Pennsylfawnia: An Anthology of Translations into the Pennsylvania German Dialect* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1938).

On the history of the dialect literature, see Earl F. Robacker, *Pennsylvania German Literature* (Philadelphia, 1942), cited in full above, which gives perspective and discusses individual writers, and Harry Hess Reichard, *Pennsylvania German Dialect Writings and Their Writers* (Lancaster, 1918), Pennsylvania German Society, Volume XXVI; and Harry Hess Reichard, *Pennsylvania German Verse* (Norristown, 1940), Pennsylvania German Society, Volume XLI. For the newspaper columnists and the beginnings of dialect production in the 19th Century, the best analysis thus far is Heinz Kloss, "Die pennsilvaniadeutsche Literatur," in *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Akademie*, 1931 No. 4 (Munich: Deutsche Akademie), 230-272, which will be reissued in English in the United States sometime in the next year.

For the dialect theatre in Pennsylvania, the "home talent" play put on by churches and grange groups, and the radio "drama," see Albert F. Buffington, ed., *The Reichard Collection of Early Pennsylvania German Dialogues and Plays* (Lancaster, 1962), Pennsylvania German Society, Volume LXI.

On the High German literary production in Pennsylvania, which was extensive, see the still useful bibliography of German imprints, Oswald Seidensticker, *The First Century of German Printing in America*, 1728-1830 (Philadelphia: Schaefer & Koradi, 1893). This volume was greatly enlarged by Professor Wilbur H. Oda (1892-1953), and at present Dr. Karl J. Arndt of Clark University, Worcester, Massachusetts, is preparing a final version for the press. For High German works produced in Pennsylvania, see Robacker, *op. cit.*; also John Joseph Stoudt, *Pennsylvania German Poetry*, 1685-1840 (Allentown, 1956), Pennsylvania German Folklore Society, Volume XX. In addition, there are

**Genealogy**

The Pennsylvania Germans created one of the colonial cultures on the Eastern Seaboard. The emigrant forefathers arrived on these shores from William Penn’s time through the 18th Century, with others joining the crowd in the 19th Century. Manuscript genealogies for Pennsylvania German families exist already from the 18th Century, and at least one printed genealogy is dated 1764. The 19th Century was the heyday of genealogical research for Pennsylvania. The printing of family histories was stepped up radically after the Civil War, and particularly after the Centennial (1876), which created a wave of interest in America’s past. This interest swept back into every rural county and produced the first great crop of local and county histories and atlases, as well as family histories. Some of these were produced by family associations. Americans, we are told, are a nation of joiners and soon discovered it pleasant to hold, once a year, a “family reunion” or all-day picnic where the *Freundschaft* (clan) could gather from near and far to hear patriotic, religious, and genealogical addresses, and give prizes to the oldest member present, the youngest member present, the most recently married couple, etc., etc. The format was general American, but the gusto of the picnics was typically Pennsylvania Dutch.

For the printed genealogies, books and pamphlets, produced by and about Pennsylvania German families, the best list thus far is in Meynen, *op. cit.*, “Family Histories and Biographies” (pp. 476-591), with the titles alphabetized. The largest library collections for public use are to be found at (1) The Historical Society of Pennsylvania, 1300 Locust Street, Philadelphia, which houses the Genealogical Society of Pennsylvania Collections; (2) the Genealogical Division of the Pennsylvania State Library, Harrisburg; and (3) the Genealogical Collection of Franklin and Marshall College, built up over many years by Frank Reid Diffendorffer, former Librarian Herbert B. Anstaett, and Genealogist Elizabeth Clarke Kieffer. Included in the collection is the Pennsylvania Genealogical and Biographical Index prepared in the 1950’s by the Pennsylvania Dutch Folklore Center (Pennsylvania Folklore Society). This is a card catalogue of many names mentioned in several of the sets of serials dealing with Pennsylvania German subjects, including the yearbooks of the Pennsylvania German Society and the Pennsylvania German Folklore Society.

Genealogical publications of use to Pennsylvania family history researchers are the *Pennsylvania Genealogical Magazine*, edited by Hannah Benner Rohach and published by the Genealogical Society of Pennsylvania; *Our Family Tree*, edited and published by Frances Strong Helman in Indiana, Pennsylvania; and *The Genealogical Helper*, published in Logan, Utah, which offers an invaluable nationwide genealogical query program.

The most important unpublished sources for Pennsylvania German genealogy are the church registers and the tombstone inscriptions. The best manuscript collections of typescripts and photostats of church registers are in two libraries, again (1) the Genealogical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia; and (2) the Historical Society of the Evangelical and Reformed Church, housed in the Schaff Library, Lancaster Theological Seminary, Lancaster, Dr. George Bricker, Librarian. In addition to many original Reformed church registers, this society owns the William J. Hinke Collection of typescripts of over one hundred of the 18th Century Reformed Church registers from Pennsylvania and Western Maryland. In addition, the Lutheran seminaries at Mt. Airy (Philadelphia) and Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, have some original and some copied church registers.

In dealing with the plain sects of Pennsylvania (Mennonites, Amish, and Brethren) we are not so lucky in the area of church registers. Since these sects stressed believers’ (adult) baptism rather than infant baptism, they did not normally keep extensive baptismal registers as did the Lutheran and Reformed Churches. Hence for their genealogy one has to depend on wills, deeds, cemetery inscriptions, Bible records, and private family registers. For the Amish we have the Johns Hopkins Index of Amish Genealogy. For this, see John A. and Beulah Hostetler, “Amish Genealogy: A Progress Report,” *Pennsylvania Folklife*, XIX:1 (Autumn 1969), 23-27. This lists all the available printed Amish genealogies.

The tombstone inscriptions of the Pennsylvania German cemeteries are of course not all transcribed. There are a few printed transcriptions, as for example the magnificent work by Augustus Schultz, “The Old Moravian Cemetery of Bethlehem, Pa., 1742-1897,” *Transactions of the Moravian Historical Society*, V (Nazareth, 1899), 99-267, Index 271-294. The only counties which have a relatively complete transcription of tombstone inscriptions (vital statistics only) are York and Adams, done under the direction of Henry J. Young, former Director of the Historical Society of York County. Most county historical societies have some tombstone transcriptions, and larger collections exist at the Genealogical Society of Pennsylvania and the D.A.R. Library in Washington, D.C.

The major problem in Pennsylvania German genealogy is determining where the family came from in
Europe. The basic work on the emigration, Ralph Beaver Strassburger and William J. Hinke, Pennsylvania German Pioneers (Norristown, Pennsylvania, 1934), Pennsylvania German Society, Volumes XLII-XLIV, lists the emigrants at the Port of Philadelphia from 1727 to 1808, but with minimal exceptions, mostly after 1800, gives no indication of European origins. Fortunately, there is a growing number of 18th Century emigrant lists published in the yearbooks of the Pennsylvania German Folklore Society (Volumes I, X, XII, XVI) and in Pennsylvania Folklife. For the most complete listing of these articles, see Harold Lancour, compiler, A Bibliography of Ship Passenger Lists, 1538-1925: Being a Guide to Published Lists of Early Immigrants to North America, 3d edition, revised and enlarged by Richard J. Wolfe (New York: New York Public Library, 1963).

RELIGION

The Pennsylvania German culture is split down the middle into two sub-cultures, the "Church People" (Kaerischeit, Kirchenleute) or "Gay Dutch" and the "Plain People" or "Plain Dutch" (Sektenleute) or sectarians. The basic criterion is the sociological distinction between "church," a group which accepts the "world" or "culture" at least in large part, and the "sect," a protest group, smaller in numbers, which opposes both the larger "churches" and the "world" (surrounding culture), preferring nonconformity ("plainness" in dress, speech, pacifism, etc.). For the basic distinction between these two major forms of the Pennsylvania German culture, see "Plain Dutch and Gay Dutch: Two Worlds in the Dutch Country," The Pennsylvania Dutchman, VIII:1 (Summer 1956).

Of these two patterns the Church groups (Lutherans and Reformed) are much in the majority, representing at least 90% of the entire Pennsylvania German population. This is a fact which the tourist and the outsider often fails to comprehend. For the largest of the church groups, the Lutherans, see the work of Abdel Ross Wentz, A Basic History of Lutheranism in America (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1955, revised edition 1963), and the often very good 19th and 20th Century histories of the various Lutheran synods and conferences in Pennsylvania. These give detailed histories of each individual congregation, lives of pastors, and some detail on church customs and memorabilia. More local than these are the denominational histories. For the Lutheran printed histories, one turns to the Libraries
of the Philadelphia Lutheran Seminary, Mt. Airy, and the Gettysburg Lutheran Seminary, Gettysburg.

The Reformed Church (after 1934 part of the Evangelical and Reformed Church and since 1957 merged into the United Church of Christ) produced the same range of historical materials. Local church histories include William J. Hinke's masterful *A History of the Tohickon Union Church, Bedminster Township, Bucks County, Pennsylvania* (Meadville, Pennsylvania, 1925), Pennsylvania German Society, Volume XXXI, which includes both the Reformed and Lutheran church registers. For the Reformed church literature, the basic Library is the Historical Society of the Evangelical and Reformed Church, Schaff Library, Lancaster Theological Seminary, Lancaster, Pennsylvania.

Biographical materials on the ministry of the Pennsylvania German churches are more plentiful and in general more detailed on the Reformed side. The six-volume series initiated by Henry Harbaugh and completed by Daniel Y. Heisler, *The Fathers of the German Reformed Church in Europe and America* (Lancaster, 1857-1872; Reading, 1881-1888); and William J. Hinke's *Ministers of the German Reformed Congregations in Pennsylvania and Other Colonies in the Eighteenth Century*, edited by George W. Richards (Lancaster, Pennsylvania: Historical Commission of the Evangelical and Reformed Church, 1951) are unfortunately not matched for Lutheranism. In fact, a biographical index and historical dictionary of Pennsylvania's Lutheran clergy is still an urgent and hoped-for task in Pennsylvania German research.


For the Amish sect, a full reading list is given in the article cited, "What to Read on the Amish." The best single treatment of the Amish is John A. Hostetler, *Amish Society*, revised edition (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1968), now in paperback. For the Mennonites, see the indispensable quarterly, *The Mennonite Quarterly Review*, published since 1927, covering Mennonite (and Amish) history, sociology, and education. Also the 4-volume *Mennonite Encyclopedia* (Scottdale, Pennsylvania: Mennonite Publishing House, 1955-1959), by far the best denominational encyclopedia dealing with any of the Pennsylvania German religious groups, is full of articles dealing with every aspect of the meshing of Mennonite (and Amish) life with the larger Pennsylvania German and general American cultures. For Mennonite bibliography, see also Harold S. Bender, *Two Centuries of American Mennonite Literature: A Bibliography of Mennonitica Americana, 1727-1928* (Goshen, Indiana: Mennonite Historical Society, 1929).

The Church of the Brethren has had a series of distinguished historians from Martin Grove Brumbaugh (governor of Pennsylvania), whose *A History of the German Baptist Brethren in Europe and America* (Mt. Morris, Illinois: Brethren Publishing House, 1899) laid

---

The "Martyr's Mirror," published in 1748-1749 on the presses of the Ephrata Cloister, was a Mennonite book, a chronicle of Christian martyrdom from the first century to the seventeenth.
the groundwork for all later historical work. The best scholarly research on Brethren history is, however, the work of Dr. Donald F. Durnbaugh, whose documentary series on Brethren history has produced thus far two distinguished volumes, (1) *European Origins of the Brethren* (Elgin, Illinois: The Brethren Press, 1958); and *The Brethren in Colonial America* (Elgin, Illinois: The Brethren Press, 1967). Both are sourcebooks revealing a wide variety of material on Brethren life, from personal letters to official church documents.

For Brethren bibliography and imprints, see Donald F. Durnbaugh and Lawrence W. Shultz, "A Brethren Bibliography, 1713-1963: Two Hundred Fifty Years of Brethren Literature," Brethren Life and Thought, IX: 1-2 (Winter and Spring 1964), 3-177.

On the history of the Ephrata Cloister, the Protestant monastic establishment in Lancaster County founded by radical Pietists in 1732, much has been written. Earlier works include the chronicle produced by the cloister community itself, the so-called Chronicum Ephratense (Ephrata, 1768), translated by J. Max Hark and republished in Lancaster in 1869; and the antiquated but still valuable works by Julius Friedrich Sachse, The German Sectarians of Pennsylvania, Volume I: 1708-1742 (Philadelphia, 1899); and Volume II: 1742-1800 (Philadelphia, 1900). The more recent scholarship on the Cloister includes (1) Eugene E. Doll and Anneliese M. Gunke, compilers, The Ephrata Cloisters, an Annotated Bibliography (Philadelphia: Carl Schurz Memorial Foundation, Inc., 1944); (2) Felix Reichmann and Eugene E. Doll, Ephrata As Seen by Contemporaries, The Pennsylvania German Folklore Society, Volume XVII (1952); and (3) James E. Ernst, Ephrata, A History, Posthumously Edited with An Introduction by John Joseph Stoudt, The Pennsylvania German Folklore Society, Volume XXV (1961).

On the Moravians (Unitas Fratrum, Moravian Brethren, Herrnhuter) much has been published in the Transactions of the Moravian Historical Society, along with excellent denominational and community histories by J. Taylor Hamilton (A History of the Church Known as the Moravian Church or the Unitas Fratrum or the Unity of the Brethren, During the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, 1900), and many works on the relations of the Moravians to the Indian tribes of North America. Perhaps the best general introduction to the spirit and ethos of Colonial Moravianism is Jacob John Sessler, Communal Pietism Among Early American Moravians (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1942); and the best biographical introduction to the work of the founder of the renewed church is John R. Weinlick, Count Zinzendorf (Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1956).

**MEDICINE**

Of the two "branches" of folk or traditional medicine, it is the magico-religious or occult branch which, quite predictably, has attracted the most attention.

Pennsylvanians know much, even in the 20th Century, about a strange healing art called by the Algonquin Indian word "powwowing". Despite the Indian origin of the name, the charms and techniques involved in powwowing (Pennsylvania German: Brauche, Braucherei) are Continental European and were brought to Pennsylvania by the 18th Century emigration. The charms are ancient, some traceable to medieval sources and others even to the classical Mediterranean cultures (the SATOR-formula, for example).

An emigrant named Johann Georg Holman, who arrived in Pennsylvania in 1802, standardized the charm literature in his influential book, Der lang verborgene Freund (Reading, 1819-1820). Of this book there are two English translations, The Long Lost Friend (Harrisburg, 1846), the basis of the current pulp edition, and The Long Hidden Friend (Carlisle, 1863). For an analysis of the book, see Robert H. Byington, "Powwowing in Pennsylvania," in Keystone Folklore Quarterly, IX:3 (Fall 1964), 111-117. For the sources of Holman's volume, its relation in particular to the German volume Romanushütlein (1788) and the manuscript charm literature both of Germany and Pennsylvania, see the article by Don Yoder, "Holman and Romanus: The Problem of the Origins of Pennsylvania's Powwow Charms," scheduled for publication in Western Folklore in 1972.

For an analysis of the charms, the folk ailments, and a discussion of the "laws" of folk healing, see the indispensable volume by Thomas R. Brendle and Claude W. Unger, Folk Medicine of the Pennsylvania Germans: The Non-Occult Charms, Pennsylvania German Society, Volume XLV (1935). For a brief introduction to powwowing, what it is and why it is, see "Twenty Questions on Powwowing," Pennsylvania Folklore, XV:4 (Summer 1966), 38-40, also available as a separate pamphlet. For insight into the practitioners of powwowing, see Betty Snellenburg, "Four Interviews with Powwowers," Pennsylvania Folklore, XVIII:4 (Summer 1969), 40-45.


For herbal medicine, see David E. Lick and Thomas R. Brendle, Plant Names and Plant Lore Among the Pennsylvania Germans, Pennsylvania German Society, Volume XXXIII (1923); and Alan G. Keyser, "Gardens and Gardening among the Pennsylvania Germans," Pennsylvania Folklore, XX:3 (Spring 1971).

On witchcraft, usually thought of as the obverse (black magic) of powwowing (white magic), a great deal has been written in Pennsylvania, some of it scholarly, much of it sensationalistic. A good basic account of the York County "hex murder" trial of 1928, which gave the word "hex" to the American vocabulary, is given in Arthur H. Lewis' recent paperback, Hex (New York: Pocket Books, 1970). There are also short popular treatments of Hexerei in the volumes by Klees, Hark, and others.

For the folktales of witchcraft from Pennsylvania German field research, see John A. Burrison, "Penn-

For veterinary medicine on the folk level, see Thomas R. Brendle and Claude Unger, "Witchcraft in Cow and Horse," The Dutchman, VIII:1 (Summer 1956), 28-31; and "Veterinary and Household Recipes from West Cocalico," Pennsylvania Folklore, XVI:2 (Winter 1966-1967), 28-29.

The Arts

For the arts in general among the Pennsylvania Germans, most work has of course been done on the so-called folk arts. For the higher level of the arts, many histories of American art deal with the contributions of the German artists and high-level furniture makers in Eastern Pennsylvania. A few of these have achieved separate monographs—for example, the portrait art of the Lancaster artist, Jacob Eichholtz (1776-1852) has finally been dealt with professionally in Rebecca J. Beal, Jacob Eichholtz 1776-1842: Portrait Painter of Pennsylvania (Philadelphia: Historical Society of Pennsylvania, 1969).

The most representative folk portrait of the Pennsylvania German culture was the York County artist Lewis Miller (1796-1882). For examples of his work see the color-plate volume, Lewis Miller: Sketches and Chronicles (York, Pennsylvania: Historical Society of York County, 1969), with introduction by Donald A. Shelley.

Of the regional arts, the work in iron in the form of decorated stove plates is discussed in Henry C. Mercer, The Bible in Iron, or Pictured Stories and Stove Plates of the Pennsylvania Germans (Doyles-town: Bucks County Historical Society, 1914). The pottery, including sgraffito and other forms, is treated in Edwin A. Barber, Tulip Ware of the Pennsylvania-German Potters (Philadelphia: Patterson and White, 1903).

The most widespread Pennsylvania German contribution to American art has been the genre called "fraktur," the decorated manuscripts or manuscript art of the church and sect groups. The context of fraktur, out of which it grew, was the folk community and the individual’s relation to it through the rites of passage (baptism, parochial schooling, confirmation, marriage, and death). Documents of this sort, involving religious texts plus decoration, sometimes related to the subject matter symbolically, sometimes extraneous if delightful decoration, were produced by the thousands in Pennsylvania from the 1750’s to mid-19th Century, when printed forms took over the field.

Again the discoverer of fraktur was Henry C. Mercer. The pioneer article on the subject was Mercer’s “The Survival of the Mediaeval Art of Illuminative Writing Among Pennsylvania Germans,” Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, XXXVI:156 (December 1897), 424-433.

The two principal 20th Century scholars who have analyzed fraktur have been John Joseph Stoudt and Donald A. Shelley. Stoudt’s work, beginning with Consider the Lilies (Pennsylvania German Folklore Society, Volume II, 1937), reprinted in revised and enlarged form as Pennsylvania German Folk Art: An Interpretation (Pennsylvania German Folklore Society, Volume XXVIII, 1966) is symbolistic, finding the meaning of the fraktur decorations in the medieval and pietistic mystical movements of Europe, which channeled down into Pennsylvania German religion in the 18th Century. His latest book, Early Pennsylvania Arts and Crafts (New York: A. S. Barnes and Co., Inc., 1964) relates fraktur to all forms of art in Eastern Pennsylvania, and for the first time gives adequate coverage to the relation
of Philadelphia (largely British) forms to the upcountry (he calls them “piedmont”) rural forms (dominated by the Pennsylvania Germans).

The work of Donald A. Shelley, Director of the Henry Ford Museum at Dearborn, Michigan, is The Fraktur-Writings of the Pennsylvania Germans (Allentown, 1961), Pennsylvania German Folklore Society, Volume XXIII (1958-1959). For the first time, this book made two necessary links in the chain of origins of Pennsylvania’s fraktur art. It looked carefully into European (German and Swiss) fraktur and calligraphic techniques and schools in and before the 17th Century, the period immediately preceding the emigration, and gave detailed attention to analyzing the various “schools” of fraktur production in Pennsylvania, i.e., Mennonite, Schwenkfelder, and others.

For those who wish to look at examples of fraktur, there are three principal collections: (1) Henry S. Borneman, Pennsylvania German Illuminated Manuscripts (Norristown, 1937), Pennsylvania German Society, Volume XLVI; (2) Henry S. Borneman, Pennsylvania German Bookplates (Philadelphia, 1953), Pennsylvania German Society, Volume LIV; and (3) Pennsylvania German Fraktur and Color Drawings (Lancaster: Pennsylvania Farm Museum of Landis Valley, 1969). In addition there are fraktur plates in some of the works cited above. Other useful volumes on Pennsylvania German folk art are Francis Lichten, Folk Art of Rural Pennsylvania (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1946), taking up, in turn, the arts which made use of iron, wood, clay, straw, and textiles.


Monographs and articles on individual fraktur scribes are fortunately increasing in number, so that we can study the production of fraktur in relation to its producers, its geographical spread, and its cultural context. The work of one of the earliest clerical scribes, the Reverend Daniel Schumacher, some of whose work dates from mid-18th Century, appears in Frederick Weiser, “Daniel Schumacher’s Baptismal Register,” Publications of the Pennsylvania German Society, I (1968), 185-407. The deep interest of Alfred L. Shoemaker in fraktur and its production is evident in the series of articles in The Pennsylvania Dutchman (Krebs, Dulheuer, Montelius, Egelmann, Schuller, and others); for the complete list see the detailed bibliography on fraktur in Shelley, op. cit., pp. 216, 218. Identification of hitherto unknown frakturists has become fascinating detective work among the present generation of scholars. For two articles announcing such discoveries, see Monroe H. Fabian’s recent article on Conrad Trewitz, formerly known only as the “Weak Artist,” in Prologue: The Journal of the National Archives, II:2 (Fall 1970), 96-97; and Frederick Weiser’s article in Der Regebeobge, the new quarterly of the (new) Pennsylvania German Society.

The best analysis of the printed fraktur forms, which replaced the manuscript ones, is Alfred L. Shoemaker, Check List of Pennsylvania Dutch Printed Taufscheines (Lancaster: Pennsylvania Dutch Folklore Center, 1952).

The tombstone decoration of the Pennsylvania Germans has been adequately and beautifully dealt with in Preston A. and Eleanor Barba, Pennsylvania German Tombstones: A Study in Folk Art, Pennsylvania German Folklore Society, Volume XVIII (1953). The drawings in this volume, which show up the actual designs better than most available photographs, were done by Eleanor M. Barba. Apart from the Barb’s work, little has been done on this important subject, except Klaus Wust’s recent pamphlet, Folk Art in Stone: Southwest Virginia (Edinburgh, Virginia: Shenandoah History, 1970).


On the so-called “hex signs” on Pennsylvania barns, there are two opposing schools of thought. The symbolist approach is that they are apotropaic symbols, literally to scare witches away from the barn, and in origin are ancient pre-Christian symbols from Europe. For this viewpoint, see August C. Mahr, “Origin and Significance of Pennsylvania Dutch Barn Symbols,” in Alan Dundes, The Study of Folklore (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965), pp. 373-399. For the opposite view, that they were simply the common designs used on other media from tombstone to fraktur, applied to the large bare spaces of the supported forebay barns of the Eastern parts of the Dutch Country, see Alfred L. Shoemaker, Three Myths About the Pennsylvania Dutch Country (Lancaster: Pennsylvania Dutch Folklore Center, 1951). Whatever their ultimate origins in pre-Christian Europe or Asia, they had no occult meaning by the time after the Civil War when our first documented barn decorations appear. In this viewpoint they are decorations and nothing more. Witchcraft beliefs were never paraded before the public, on barns or anywhere else in the Dutch Country. Apotropaic symbols are found not outside but inside some Pennsylvania German barns, in secret symbols formed by nails driven into the animal troughs or occult inscriptions plugged into rafter or lintel. These are the true “hex signs”. These are the two scholarly views of the subject. The current “hex sign” revival with its fake symbolism for suburban garages is something entirely tangential to the culture.

Among the basic treatments of religious architecture among the Pennsylvania Germans are William J. Murtough, Moravian Architecture and Town-Planning: Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, and Other Eighteenth-Century American Settlements (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1967). The only fresh material in recent years on the meetinghouse architecture of the plain sects is the article by Clarence Kulp, Jr., “A Study of the Dialect Terminology of the Plain Sects of Montgomery County, Pa.” Pennsylvania Folklife, XII:2 (Summer 1961), 41-47, which offers the theory of Holland Dutch influence on the interior arrangements of the Mennonite meetinghouses of the area, and provides the scholar with many new dialect architectural terms not recorded in Lambert.

The Pennsylvania Germans were influenced by the same general American stylistic influences in architecture as their English and other neighbors. The Victorian decoration on the 19th Century homes of the Kutztown area has been analyzed, with excellent drawings of the principal motifs, in Elizabeth Adams Hurwitz, “Decorative Elements in the Domestic Architecture of Eastern Pennsylvania,” The Dutchman, VII:2 (Fall 1955), 6-29.

The smaller outbuildings of the Pennsylvania German farmstead have been analyzed, one after another, by Amos Long, Jr., of Lebanon County. In the 19th Century our farms looked like small villages, what with barns, tenant houses, carriage houses, wagon sheds, smokehouses, springhouses, dryhouses, bakeovens, chicken coops, pigpens, and last but not least, privies. A list of Amos Long’s articles on these subjects, both in Pennsylvania Folklife and other periodicals, appeared in Glassie, op. cit. The series is being revised at present for a forthcoming yearbook of the (new) Pennsylvania German Society.

Music

The Pennsylvania German culture produced several types and levels of music which has attracted the attention of musicologists and other scholars. The high-
level creations of chamber music and choral productions by Pennsylvania’s colonial Moravians are now generally appreciated through the histories of American music, and through the series of long-playing discs issued, among others, by Decca Records, “Music of the Moravians in America: Six Quintets by John Frederick Peter” (DXSA 7197). The Early American Moravian Music Foundation of Winston-Salem, North Carolina, is continuing the research in this field and publishing in it.

The choral hymnody of the Ephrata Cloister has been studied by Julius Friedrich Sachse, The Music of the Ephrata Cloister (Lancaster, 1903), Pennsylvania German Society, Volume XII.

While there have been many doctoral dissertations on the official hymnody of various of the Pennsylvania German churches and sects (particularly the Lutherans, the Mennonites, and the Brethren), the only decent treatment thus far of the German hymnody of the colonial Pennsylvania churches in a general work is Robert Stevenson, Protestant Church Music in America (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1966), especially Chapter IV, “Pennsylvania Germans.”

It is toward the folk levels of music that the most widespread interest in Pennsylvania German music has been oriented. Of the secular folk music, the first collection published was Thomas R. Brendle and William S. Troxell, “Pennsylvania German Songs,” in George Korson, editor, Pennsylvania Songs and Legends (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1949), pp. 62-128; although the first complete volume of Pennsylvania German folksongs was Walter E. Boyer, Albert F. Buffington, and Don Yoder, Songs along the Mahantongo (Lancaster: Pennsylvania Dutch Folklore Center, 1951, 2d ed., Hatboro, Pennsylvania: Folklore Associates, 1964). Both were based on extensive field work in the Dutch Counties. Other unpublished collections, also based on field work, are those of Robert C. Bucher, Clarence Kulp, Jr., and Alan G. Keyser, collected from the “Goschenhoppen” area of Southeastern Pennsylvania; and the separate collections of C. Richard Beam, Albert F. Buffington, and Don Yoder. It is hoped that these collections will eventually all be published, to round out our picture of the Pennsylvania German folk-musical tradition.

Work on the musical instruments of the Dutch Country has been somewhat more meager. There are a few articles on the zither, played, believe it or not, by Mennonite grandmothers to accompany their balladsinging, in the publications of the Bucks County Historical Society and the Lehigh County Historical Society. Authorities on the Appalachian folk instruments assure me that the two traditions are related. We have as yet no definitive articles on the fiddle and its use among the Pennsylvania Germans, but the best collection of Pennsylvania dance tunes is Samuel P. Bayard’s Hill Country Tunes of Southwestern Pennsylvania (Philadelphia, 1944). The dance tradition among the Pennsylvania Germans and its music are treated in several articles in The Pennsylvania Dutchman: “Pennsylvania Dutch Folk Dancing,” II:5 (July 1950); “The ‘Strauss Dance’ of the Dutch Country” and “Three Fiddle Tunes from the Dutch Country,” V:1, February 1, 1954. See also “The Strouse Dance,” Pennsylvania Folklore, IX:1 (Winter 1957-1958), 12-17.

Of the religious folk music or folk hymnody of the Pennsylvania Germans, there are two principal varieties: (1) the “slow tunes” of the plain sects, principally the hymns of the Aushund as used among the Old Order Amish; and (2) the livelier “Pennsylvania Spirituals,” which are the Pennsylvania German versions, ranging from broad dialect to adjusted High German, of the Methodist camp-meeting spirituals (“white spirituals” or “revival choruses”) of the Second Awakening around 1800. For the Amish music, see The Mennonite Encyclopedia; Joseph W. Yoder’s Anische Lieder (Huntingdon, Pennsylvania, 1942); and the article, “What to Read About the Amish,” which gives a detailed list of periodical literature. For the Pennsylvania Spirituals, see (1) Songs along the Mahantongo, Chapter X, “Songs from the Camp Ground”; (2) Don Yoder, Pennsylvania Spirituals (Lancaster: Pennsylvania Folk-life Society, 1961); and (3) Albert F. Buffington, “Dutchified German Spirituals (Lancaster, 1965), Pennsylvania German Society, Volume LXII.


Costume.

The subject of dress among the Pennsylvania Germans is one that has been approached by scholars only recently. The subject is of great interest, since among the plain sects there is perhaps a greater variety of living traditional costume than in any of the relict costume areas of peasant Europe. There are over a dozen “plain” sects all of which wear a garb which differentiates themselves both from the outside “world” (which of course wears “fashionable” dress) and from their “plain” neighbor sects.

Early treatments of the subject include (1) a series of articles in The Pennsylvania Dutchman (Women’s Costume, IV:13, March 1, 1953; Men’s Costume, IV:15 (Easter 1953); (2) Mary Jane Hershey, “A Study of the Dress of the (Old) Mennonites of the Franconia Conference 1700-1953,” Pennsylvania Folk-
life, IX:3 (Summer 1958), 24-47; (3) John A. Hostetler, "The Amish Use of Symbols and their Function in Bounding the Community," The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute, Volume XCIV, Part 1 (1963), 11-22; and (4) Melvin Gingerich, "Change and Uniformity in Mennonite Attire," Mennonite Quarterly Review, October 1966, 243-259. The two most extensive treatments of the subject are Don Yoder, "Sectarian Costume Research in the United States," in Austin and Alta Fife and Henry Glassie, editors, Forms Upon the Frontier: Folklife and Folk Arts in the United States (Logan, Utah: Utah State University Press, 1969), pp. 41-75; and Melvin Gingerich, Mennonite Attire Through Four Centuries (Breinigsville, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania German Society, 1970), Pennsylvania German Society, Volume IV (1970). The former views Pennsylvania German "plain" dress synoptically alongside other forms of non-conforming dress (Roman Catholic monastic costume and Hasidic dress in Judaism). Dr. Gingerich's book is the most detailed, most thorough historically based study of sectarian dress yet produced on any of the Pennsylvania German plain sects. It is copiously illustrated with drawings and photographs of Anabaptist, Mennonite, and Amish dress, and includes chapters detailing each separate item of clothing from the "plain" cap to "plain" underwear.

On the subject of the everyday and festival dress of the "Gay Dutch," there is as yet unfortunately no work published. For those interested in contributing to our knowledge about rural dress, see the Pennsylvania Folklife Questionnaire on "Farm Dress" (Folk-Cultural Questionnaire No. 9), in Pennsylvania Folklife, XVIII:1 (Autumn 1968).

Cookery & Foodways

In the 20th Century, the regional foods of the Pennsylvania Germans have attracted nationwide attention. It is strange therefore that there are still, strictly speaking, no "Pennsylvania Dutch" restaurants in Philadelphia or even in the Dutch counties, of the same authenticity that we have, for example, in the Mexican-American restaurants of Texas and California, or the Creole restaurants of Louisiana. It is still true that one of the few places where authentically prepared Pennsylvania Dutch rural foods can be sampled in public is the Pennsylvania Dutch Folk Festival, which from its very beginning in 1950 has featured the production and sale of local food specialties.


On the festival foods of the Pennsylvania Germans, see especially Alfred L. Shoemaker, Christmas in Pennsylvania: A Folk-Cultural Study (Kutztown, 1959), which has detailed historical references to Christmas cookies and confections; and Easteride in Pennsylvania:
A Folk Cultural Study (Kutztown, 1960), which does the same for the specialties associated with the Easter cycle of holidays.


THE PENNSYLVANIA DUTCHMAN IN FICTION

The Pennsylvania Dutchman, like other regional figures in American life (the New England Yankee, the Negro, the Southern “poor white,” the Appalachian “hillbilly,” the cowboy, etc.) was early captured and stereotyped in regional or local color fiction. Short stories and sketches, as well as jokes about the Dutchman, began to appear in 19th Century newspapers and almanacs. The best collection of the jokes and jests about the ‘Dutch’ is Alfred L. Shoemaker, My Off is All (Lancaster: Pennsylvania Dutch Folklore Center, 1952). Several 19th Century short stories about Pennsylvania Dutch life, with notes on authorship by Alfred L. Shoemaker, were reprinted in the 1950’s, a century after their original appearance in upstate newspapers, in The Pennsylvania Dutchman.

For its portrayal of the nuances of Pennsylvania Dutch life, including everything from dialect to pew-pewowing and witchcraft, the best early novel is Francis T. Hoover’s Enemies in the Rear; or, A Golden Circle Squared (Boston: Arena Publishing Company, 1895). The scene is laid in Civil War times, when enemies in the rear (Copperheads) were supposed to have been common among the Democrats of the Dutch counties. A similar Civil War story about the Pennsylvania Dutch, although laid in Western Maryland, is Katy of Catocin; or, The Chain-Breakers (1886), by the Delaware journalist George Alfred Townsend, and again available (Cambridge, Maryland: Tidewater Publishers, 1959). The tension produced by the Civil War in the Dutch Country was, it seems, a favorite setting for our early novelists; just as the problems of Pennsylvania’s Quakers during the Revolution provided our 19th Century writers with their favorite approach to describing Quaker life in Philadelphia and the Quaker counties.

In the 20th Century, the two principal novelists who used Pennsylvania Dutch themes were Helen Reimensnyder Martin and Elsie Singmaster. Helen R. Martin, a Lutheran minister’s daughter from Lancaster, captured the field with her satiric novel of “plain” life, Tillie, A Mennonite Maid: A Story of the Pennsylvania Dutch (New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1904). The theme, one way of highlighting plain life, was to introduce an outsider, in this case a schoolmaster, who, naturally, falls in love with Plain Tillie. The book was badly received by some over-sensitive Pennsylvania Germans who were at the time in a defensive stage in their ethnic development. While they were afraid to laugh at themselves, the public enjoyed the book, which went through many editions and even achieved a stage version. Mrs. Martin went on to write several dozen other books about the Dutch, satirizing their authoritarian fathers (a theme which was to be central in the Broadway play “Papa is All”), their conservatism, provincialist outlook, and their awkward English speech. Most of her novels use the same device—the outsider among the Dutch farmers or villagers.

Elsie Singmaster, another daughter of the Lutheran parsonage, wrote many short stories about the Dutch, mostly about the “Gay Dutch”. Her favorite among her works is The Magic Mirror (New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1934), a story of a year in the life of the Hummer family, row-house residents in Allentown at the turn of the century. The book contains charming vignettes of Dutch life and shrewd analyses of the ethnic mixture and tensions in Allentown and the rapidly industrializing Lehigh Valley at the end of the 19th Century. A classic chapter follows the summer activities of young Jesse Hummer, who sells Bibles and The Royal Path of Life on a memorable bicycle tour of Lehigh County, where he takes part in the local Sunday School festivals and meets the Country Dutch. As a fictional portrait of rural Dutch life this chapter is unsurpassed. My second choice among Mrs. Singmaster’s works is the short story collection, Bred in the Bone, and Other Stories (New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1923). Here the author shows herself equally expert in the portrayal of the “plain Dutch” ethos in several stories about the “Shindledeccker sisters,” saintly but human Mennonite old maids, whose motto emblazoned on their show towel on the back stairway door, is “Little and Unknown, Loved by God Alone”.

German-speaking peoples from northern Switzerland, Baden, Württemberg, Alsace, Lorraine, the Palatinate, the Rhineland, and Silesia, as well as from other provinces in Germanic Europe began migrating to southeastern Pennsylvania toward the end of the seventeenth century. Although these migrations continued into the nineteenth century, most of the ancestors of today's southeastern Pennsylvania Dutch were pre-revolutionary Americans, colonial German-dialect-speaking immigrants.

These German immigrants brought with them their strong Protestant religious heritage together with many other mores. But the culture of southeastern Pennsylvania never was a pure German transplant. There was, from the beginning, an interplay and mixing of their culture with that of other colonial Pennsylvanians. After more than two and a half centuries of such mixing, there can be no possibility of a pure Dutch culture today.

Actually, the elements of the American sub-culture which is today called Pennsylvania Dutch, developed as two distinctive culture patterns, the main cleavage having been along religious lines. This religiously caused cultural division has been between the Gay Dutch rural-urban and the Plain Dutch rural folk cultures. The Gay Dutch, i.e., the Lutheran and Calvinist Reformed sects, theologically representing the conservative and middle-of-the-road branches of the Protestant Reformation, are those who live in what is religiously called the world. The Plain Dutch, i.e., the Anabaptist sects, theologically representing the radical wings of the Protestant Reformation, are those who prefer to live apart from this world.1

The Gay Dutch have always been the majority and the Plain Dutch the minority. Thus, the Gay Dutch set the primary pattern for what is called the Pennsylvania Dutch culture. But the Plain people created a culture of their own, which, because of its distinctiveness to the non-Dutch observer, is now the symbol of everything Dutch.2

Anabaptist forefathers of the Plain Dutch, to escape European religious intolerance, commenced their migrations to Pennsylvania shortly after the colony was founded in 1682. First the Mennonites began to arrive in the 1680's, then the Amish and Dunkards in the 1720's, and finally the Schwenkfelders in the 1730's. By the end of the eighteenth century, between 20,000 and 25,000 German-speaking Anabaptists had migrated to southeastern Pennsylvania.3

These German immigrants brought their very conservative European cultural customs with them. The core of European Anabaptism was an intensely profound veneration of the Scriptures, particularly St. Paul's injunction to retreat from the world. This reverence of things biblical caused the European Anabaptists and their Pennsylvania Plain Dutch descendants to become tradition-directed peoples.4

To preserve their religious identity, and to defend their traditional societies against extinction by persecution, the Anabaptists in Europe isolated themselves from the world culturally and socially. Spatio-economic isolation, however, was not and is not tenet of Anabaptism, but emerged only when the movement was banished from the European towns and forced to survive in the hinterlands. Since they were accustomed to residing in spatially and culturally isolated rural farm villages in the European hinterlands, the Ana-

2Ibid., pp. 36-37.
3Ibid., pp. 36-37.
4Ibid., pp. 36. Calvinist Reformed and Reformed are used interchangeably throughout the remainder of this thesis.
5Ibid., p. 3-4.
6Ibid., p. 36.
10Ibid., p. 18.
baptist immigrants avoided the towns and cities in southeastern Pennsylvania.

After arriving in Philadelphia, the Anabaptists dispersed into the rural territories of all the counties now comprising the Southeastern Pennsylvania Plain Dutch Community in search of fertile farm lands. They preferred to live adjacent to one another if suitable agricultural lands were available. The alternative was to reside in as close proximity as possible. But, even during the early eighteenth century, much of rural southeastern Pennsylvania was already somewhat populated and, in addition, many uninhabited tracts had been surveyed and purchased. Hence, in most places, the Plain Dutch settlers were unable to obtain lands adjacent to each other, and they could only live in as close proximity as the availability of farm land would permit.

The Southeastern Pennsylvania Plain Dutch Community never became a German cultural transplant, for, despite Plain Dutch efforts to the contrary, the interspersing of Plain Dutch and non-Plain Dutch peoples caused cultural mixing to begin almost immediately. Thus, the patterns of spatial development and internal areal organization of the Plain Dutch are clearly Pennsylvania types. But, like their European counterparts, they emerged as distinctively religiously controlled spatial systems.

Generally, the entire population of each shipload of Anabaptist immigrants docking at Philadelphia was comprised of adherents belonging to the same sect, being either all Amish, Dunkards, Mennonites, or Schwenkfelders. Frequently, choosing to continue their close transatlantic relationship, they left Philadelphia as a group. Unsuccessful in their endeavor to live adjacent to each other, the Plain Dutch were at least able to obtain land and develop farms in sufficiently close proximity so as to produce clusters of sectarian rural farm residences (Figure 1). Successive such waves of immigrants either moved into an area adjacent to a cluster already developed by members of their sect, thus expanding it, or they organized a new sectarian rural farm cluster (Figure 1). This pattern of migration and settlement, adhered to by most Anabaptist sects, repeated itself until the southeastern Pennsylvania Dutch Community landscape was dotted with these rural farm clusters.

Each Plain Dutch sect's rural clusters were early organized into congregational districts (Figure 2). Depending upon the number and distributional pattern of families comprising a cluster, it might have been organized into one or several congregational districts (Figure 3). Considering church buildings worldly, the Plain Dutch conducted religious services either in private homes or in meetinghouses. As private homes and meetinghouses could only accommodate a small number of persons, congregational populations were small, being comprised at most of only a few dozen families (Figures 2 and 3). The districts were territorially small, ranging in size from 2 to 30 square miles (Figures 2 and 3). Their size was primarily
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\[\text{Example of a Plain Dutch Dispersed Rural Farm Cluster Settlement Pattern Consisting of Many Closely Spaced Farms}\]

\[\text{Example of a Plain Dutch Dispersed Rural Farm Cluster Settlement Pattern Consisting of Fewer More Widely Spaced Farms}\]
determined by a combination of three factors: (1) the number of persons that could assemble in the smallest homes and meetinghouses, (2) the spatial distribution of families that comprised a cluster and, (3) the distance a horse-drawn carriage could transport a person in approximately an hour. Depending upon the number, and distributional pattern, of families comprising a single settlement cluster, it might have been divided into several congregational districts (Figure 3). The broad pattern of spatial development, and territorial organization, of each congregational district practically duplicated all others because of the similarity of religious and cultural influences.

The economic attributes of the congregational districts were quickly oriented toward achieving self-sufficiency. As perceived by the Plain Dutchman, this goal was closely associated with, and almost entirely dependent upon, farming and ancillary occupations. Farming was not an original tenet of Anabaptism; it developed as a major value only after the movement was banished to the European hinterlands.

Hence, to the Plain Dutchman in southeastern Pennsylvania, tilling the soil was looked upon as a Godly endeavor. Most of the original Plain Dutch land purchases were comprised of extensively forested tracts which ranged from 300 to 700 acres in size. Plain Dutch agriculture has evolved in three stages: (1) intensive subsistence farming, (2) intensive subsistence combined with general commercial farming, and (3) intensive subsistence along with specialized commercial farming.

Intensive subsistence farming prevailed during most of the eighteenth century. The Plain Dutchman began the development of his farm by constructing a make-shift log house and barn, and deforesting a plot large enough to provide sufficient food for the first year’s subsistence. Additional area was cleared each year until most of the suitable crop and pasture land was developed. Major crops included wheat, corn, rye, oats, barley, buckwheat, potatoes, squash, pumpkins, lima beans, apples, peaches, flax, and hemp. Each farm contained a small dairy herd, several beef cattle, a few hogs, some sheep, and a variety of fowl.

When labor time, formerly allocated to clearing land, was available for other purposes, and harvests were large enough to provide salable surpluses, the period of simple subsistence farming ended. The earning of profit, the construction of farm buildings, and the diversification of land-use marked the advent of general commercial farming. Agricultural surpluses were usually abundant within a few decades after the first land clearing. Hence, the period of general commercial ag-
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riculture had its beginning during the latter part of the eighteenth century and exemplified Plain Dutch farming throughout the nineteenth century. Time formerly used during the earlier simple subsistence phase to clear land was now devoted to building a permanent home and a substantial barn. As prosperity increased, many outbuildings were constructed such as a windmill, wash-house, springhouse, bakehouse, tenant house, summer kitchen, corn crib, pig pen, chicken house, woodshed, and toolshed. In time, the individual Plain Dutch farm, comprised of about 15 buildings, took on the appearance of a prosperous and diversified economic unit.

General commercial farming was developed for the purpose of maximizing surpluses, and minimizing the possibility of economic failure from depending upon only a few specialized crops. Agricultural diversification was accentuated by the production of a variety of grains, vegetables, fruits, technical crops, and livestock. The major crops produced during the general farming phase of Plain Dutch agriculture were wheat, corn, rye, oats, barley, buckwheat, hay, potatoes, green veg-

---

etables, and various deciduous fruits. Plain Dutch farmers also increased the size of dairy and beef cattle herds, and the number of hogs, sheep, and fowl, during this period.\textsuperscript{23} Large quantities of wheat, the principal cash crop, along with other technical crops, were marketed in the larger cities. Salted and smoked meats, cheese, poultry, eggs, and other products were sold in surrounding towns. Profits from the sale of these excess commodities were used to purchase farm implements, draft animals, breeder stock to develop herds, and for many other associated purposes. Additional purchases included salt, pepper, spices, molasses, tea, and shoes.

The above-described farm situation prevailed throughout the Southeastern Pennsylvania Plain Dutch Community during the nineteenth century. It is only in the production of certain technical crops that several noticeable spatial variations can be observed. Plain Dutch farms in Lancaster County began the production of tobacco, and the tobacco curing shed became one of the most conspicuous farm buildings in this section. In Bucks and Montgomery Counties, on the other hand, flax and hemp became the main technical crops, and the Plain Dutchmen erected drying kilns to process them.

Despite the development of general commercial farming by the nineteenth century Plain Dutch, their own home economy remained essentially self-sufficient.\textsuperscript{24} Homegrown rye became the staple bread grain. Vegetables and fruits were dried and preserved for winter use. Corn, oats, and hay provided an abundant supply of feed and, in return, farm animals yielded ample supplies of milk, butter, cheese, beef, pork, ham, poultry, and eggs. Animals also supplied fertilizer, and fats for making of soap and candles. Each farm had a spinning wheel where flax, hemp, and wool were spun into cloth for the making of Plain Dutch clothing.\textsuperscript{25} Cut-over woodlands furnished building materials, fencing, and domestic fuel.

Plain Dutch farming gradually converted to a specialized commercial economy during the twentieth century. The farm enterprise is now devoted essentially to the production of feed grains and hay to fatten beef cattle or sustain dairy herds, and to the production of a cash crop or two.

The self-sufficiency concept of the Plain Dutchman encompassed more than the economic life, for his insistence upon retreating from the world was predicated upon a high degree of cultural independence. Hence all spiritual, social, and cultural needs of the individual literally from the cradle to the grave were met and satisfied by the local community. Congregational districts, therefore, emerged as multibonded, symbolic, self-governing communities. The membership of each congregational district was firmly bonded together symbolically by its own set of traditions, conventions, and ceremonial functions,\textsuperscript{26} which found expression through a formal set of church rules. Since the Plain Dutch tend to be pervasively religious,\textsuperscript{27} the church became the center of authority, and, through the ironclad leadership of its bishop,\textsuperscript{28} the church controlled all aspects of Plain Dutch life.

As head of the church and leader of the congregation in his district, the bishop was entrusted with the enforcement of the Ordnung,\textsuperscript{29} or rules of the church. Moreover, the bishop was empowered with the Meidung,\textsuperscript{30} which he placed upon all those who violated the rules.

Since, in effect, each congregational district was religiously autonomous, Regel und Ordnung\textsuperscript{31} were

\textsuperscript{23}Ibid., pp. 193-195.
\textsuperscript{24}Ibid., pp. 58-62.
\textsuperscript{25}"Ibid., p. 11.
\textsuperscript{26}"Ordnung rendered in English means rules of the church. For an excellent description of the enforcement of the Ordnung, or Bann, see William A. Schreiber, Our Amish Neighbors (The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois, 1962).
\textsuperscript{27}"Regel und Ordnung translated into English means rules and orders. Literally, it signifies that the individual in his daily life will never depart from the rules of the church. See John A. Hostetler, Amish Society, p. 57.

\textsuperscript{21}
formulated independently by each congregation. However, the bishops of all the congregational districts comprising a given sect assembled periodically in order to formulate specific church rules which were to be binding on all the member congregations. Since none of the Plain Dutch sects possessed a supreme clerical authority, absolute uniformity was not achieved by any sect. But, except for some minor variations among its congregational districts, each sect succeeded in developing some common church rules. These rules had subtle symbolic significance which permitted the knowledgeable observer to identify the adherents of each Plain Dutch sect.

The more specific aspects of *Ordnung*, as well as any of its general features which caused variations in the spatial development and socio-cultural attributes of the various Plain Dutch sects, will be elaborated in greater detail in appropriate places in this chapter. Rules characterizing eighteenth-century Southeastern Pennsylvania Plain Dutch Community society as a whole are reviewed below.  

Except for illness, compulsory attendance at religious services was demanded. The Plain Dutch believed that regular church attendance bonded the community together and cemented family solidarity. The congregational districts placed great stress upon the wearing of plain clothes, for such attire was considered to be religious garb worn to set the wearer apart from the world.  

Each sect adopted its own particular styles. Hence, the sectarian affiliation of the Plain Dutchman could be identified by the type of plain clothing worn. The Plain Dutch community became a trilingual speech community. High German was the language required for use in religious services, and in printed materials whose circulation was limited to the Plain Dutch world. The Pennsylvania Dutch dialect was expected in everyday conversation. English was permitted when communicating, in conversation or in print, with non-Dutch people. Hence, required speech patterns tended to bond the community and isolate it socially. Cultivation of the soil was considered a moral directive, and farming and related occupations were strongly encouraged by the church. Education was rigidly controlled. Formal schooling beyond the elementary grades was forbidden on grounds that it was of little practical value for farmers. Most congregational districts operated a parochial school which, in addition to teaching elementary subjects, was entrusted with instilling in the student a profound respect for the past and a deep suspicion of anything new. Contemporaneous eighteenth-century inventions and changes were rejected on the assumption that they were worldly things, and therefore sinful and ungodly. The major ceremonial functions of life—baptism, courtship, marriage, burial—were closely supervised.

Conforming to such traditions as wearing plain clothing, conversing in the Pennsylvania Dutch dialect, till- ing the soil, resisting cultural change, perpetuating the ceremonial community, and controlling education developed as conventional practices in the eighteenth century. These conventions became visible or perceptual symbols which identified the Plain Dutch community, symbols which served as a constant reminder to the Plain Dutchman that sacred tradition was the best way of life. Thus, the eighteenth-century Southeastern Pennsylvania Plain Dutch Community sectarian congregational districts emerged as small, distinctive, cohesive, static, close-knit, self-sufficient, isolated, rural folk-communities. The extent to which the various Plain Dutch sects have been able to preserve these folk cul-

"Ibid., Chapters 6, 7, 8.
ture attributes through time is closely related to the degree of retention of their religious beliefs and practices. Respect for tradition was one of the original major values of European Anabaptism, and conformity to tradition caused conservatism and socio-cultural isolation. Thus, sects adhering to the purest forms of Anabaptism became much more traditionally oriented than sects adopting more modified types of Anabaptism. Tradition-directed peoples perpetuate their mores through attitudes of conservatism and social isolation. Isolation is predicated upon limited and controlled communication. The most conservative Plain Dutch sects have attempted to prevent cultural change by regulating the frequency and direction of their communication. Spatially, three eighteenth-century Plain Dutch religiously controlled communication links can be recognized, namely: (1) between congregations of the same sect, (2) between different sects, and (3) between a sect and the outside world.

Because of their common Ordnung, and the subsequent similarity of religious beliefs, ways of thinking and behaving were similar for all members of a given sect (Amish, Dunkard, Mennonite, or Schwenkfelder). Hence, a strong cultural and psychological homogeneity developed among the congregations belonging to the same sect, and they communicated as frequently as possible. However, since the component congregational districts of a sect were exemplified by a high degree of social as well as economic self-sufficiency, communication between congregational districts was generally limited to discussions of religious subjects. Nearby con-


egregational districts belonging to a sect communicated among themselves frequently and directly (Figure 4). Communications became less frequent as distances separating congregational districts increased (Figure 4). If congregational districts were quite remote from each other, communications were infrequent and indirect; instead information was usually relayed via congregational districts situated at intermediate locations (Figure 4). The eighteenth-century spatial organization of a sectarian sub-regional communication pattern, as illustrated by Figure 4, with certain modifications continues to be valid today.

Bonds of cultural kinship resulting from related Reformation heritages also existed among the several eighteenth-century Plain Dutch sects of southeastern Pennsylvania. Frequency of communication among these sects varied inversely with differences in the degree of their sectarian religious conservatism (Figure 5), but the frequency of communication between each sect and the outside world varied directly with the degree of their religious liberalism (Figure 5). These Plain Dutch religious sect communication patterns were conditioned by a dualistic view of the world. The Plain Dutch concept of reality included an inside sectarian view of a virtuous religious culture and an outside world view of an impure and evil non-religious culture. Moreover, each of these sects perceived its own inside culture as one of extreme purity and goodness, coexisting with, and in continual conflict with, the less virtuous cultures of the other related sects.

The intensity with which each Plain Dutch sect valued its culture, perceived the contrasts between its mores and those of other sects, and feared socio-cultural contact and conflict with the outside world was directly related to the degree of conservatism in their beliefs. Sects practicing the most original and fundamental forms of Anabaptism believed their Plain Dutch cultures were pure and undiluted in comparison to sects practicing more modified types of Anabaptism. In the eyes of those practicing original Anabaptism, as other sects modified their religious beliefs and cultures, they became increasingly worldly. As the more conservative sects attempted to prevent modification of their cultures, and thus remain static in relationship to the changing world, contrasts between the sectarian and outside world cultures became greater through time.

The importance assigned by each Plain Dutch sect to its cultural contrasts with other sects, and to cultural conflicts with the surrounding world, diminished as


cell of T.John A. Hostetler, Amish Society, p. 18.  
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"Occasionally, there was some courtship, and subsequently marriage, between persons of different congregational districts.
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sectarian religious conservatism decreased. Hence, the degree to which each sect valued social isolation as a means of preventing cultural change can be recognized and evaluated according to a scale of relative communications frequencies. The Amish, practicing the purest form of Anabaptism, became an ultra-conservative sect. The Mennonites, adhering to a slightly less rigid type of Anabaptism, emerged as a conservative sect. The Dunkards, a related sect insisting on adult baptism and stemming more directly out of Pietism than from Anabaptism, developed as a moderately conservative sect. And the Schwenkfelders, adhering to an Inner Light faith akin to but separate from Anabaptism, became a liberal sect (Figure 5).

The flow of communication between a more conservative sect and a less conservative sect was nearly always initiated by the former. The frequency of this communication was contingent upon the more conservative sect's fear of cultural dilution by the less conservative sect. Cultural differences became more pronounced, and the frequency of communication decreased, as the degree of conservatism separating the sects increased. A counterflow of communication from the less conservative to the more conservative sect followed, and was equal in frequency to the opposite flow because it depended on the more conservative sect's willingness to accept contact.

Culturally, the ultra-conservative Amish considered the mores of the conservative Mennonites to be most like theirs, those of moderately conservative Dunkards less so, and those of the liberal Schwenkfelders as least like their own. Thus, the Amish communicated moderately frequently with the Mennonites, infrequently with the Dunkards, and very infrequently with the Schwenkfelders. The Mennonites, in turn, communicated moderately frequently with the Dunkards, and infrequently with the Schwenkfelders. Both the Dunkards and Schwenkfelders disregarded any cultural differences between them, and they communicated frequently. The counterflow of communication from the Schwenkfelders and Dunkards to the Mennonites and Amish was controlled by the latter two sects: and that between the Mennonites and Amish by the last named (Figure 5).

Communication between the various Plain Dutch group religious sects and the outside world was predicated on factors similar to those controlling the communications among the several Plain Dutch sects themselves. The Amish, almost completely rejecting non-Plain Dutch cultures, communicated very infrequently with the outside world. The Mennonites, who were slightly less insistent upon retreat from non-Anabaptist mores, communicated infrequently with the surrounding world. The Dunkard communication with the world society at large was moderately frequent since they were considerably more tolerant of other cultures. Holding to a much more liberal viewpoint, the Schwenkfelders communicated frequently with non-Plain Dutch society (Figure 5). With one major alteration, several moderately important revisions, and some minor changes, many spatial vestiges of the above-described eighteenth-century Plain Dutch religious group communications pattern can still be recognized today.

Despite the intensity of their efforts to the contrary, not even the most ultra-conservative Plain Dutch sect has been able to remain completely cohesive and static through time. Each sect has experienced different kinds and amounts of social, cultural, and economic changes. These changes have occurred both internally and externally; some have been progressive and others regressive. The velocity and direction of territorial adjustments, and internal spatial reorganizations, caused by these changes, has varied considerably among the sects. Some continue to survive the impact of the modern world relatively unshaken, whereas, for other sects, this impact has proven to be a devastatingly traumatic experience.

To most non-Dutch persons, the southeastern Pennsylvania Plain Dutchman is viewed as an ultra-conservative, plainly dressed, team-driving farmer. Therefore, to gradually dispel this stereotype, it seems most appropriate to proceed from the most ultra-conservative to the least conservative sect in the following discussions. Moreover, this approach effectively demonstrates and emphasizes the ongoing processes of acculturation.

---

Footnotes:
1 John A. Hostetler, Amish Society, pp. 3-23.
During this brief European experience, the Amish probably occurred between about 1720 and 1775. The total number of Amish persons who migrated to southeastern Pennsylvania is surprisingly small, the number being estimated at 500. Amish spatial history in Germanic Europe was brief prior to their migrations to southeastern Pennsylvania. The sect was founded in the 1690s, and significant migrations to America commenced about 30 years later. During this brief European experience, the Amish did not have time to develop a rural folk culture of the European farm-village type. Always fleeing before their persecutors, they never resided in any locality long enough to establish permanent homes for a sustained period. Even though they were sectarian, and in their economy rural, they were too mobile, too widely dispersed, too persecuted, and too youthful historically to constitute a folk culture.

When the Amish came to southeastern Pennsylvania, they were able to establish permanent family farms in relatively close proximity to each other, and sometimes even adjacent to a fellow sectarian. Under these conditions, and through time, the Amish successfully developed a relatively self-sufficient, rural folk culture in the Southeastern Pennsylvania Dutch Community.

The Period to 1750
Very little is known of the spatial history of the Amish during the first half of the eighteenth century. Exactly where the first Amish immigrants located in Pennsylvania is not certain, and details of their cultural and economic development are likewise obscure. It is believed that a few Amish people may have arrived in southeastern Pennsylvania as early as 1710 or 1711. At least one Amish family is definitely known to have been in the area by 1714; Barbara Yoder, a widow, settled with her children near Oley in Berks County in that year (Figure 7).

A small Amish congregation was organized about 1737 along Northkill Creek in Berks County (Figures 6 and 7). The Northkill Amish suffered greatly from Indian raids, the congregation was soon abandoned, and its members relocated elsewhere where they founded three congregations: along Tulpehocken Creek in Lebanon County, along Maiden Creek in Berks County, and in the region around Oley (Figures 6 and 7). Evidence indicates that these Amish congregations also were soon abandoned. Some of their members migrated into central and western Pennsylvania, but many of them remained in southeastern Pennsylvania, joining the Conestoga Congregation (Figure 7).

When the Conestoga Congregational District, the first permanent Amish community in southeastern Pennsylvania, had its beginning is unknown, but it was probably founded before the middle of the eighteenth Century by immigrants from Germanic Europe. The original site of this congregation was probably near the present-day town of Morgantown in southernmost Berks County (Figure 7).

The Period 1751-1800
All of the Amish people who migrated from Germanic Europe and became permanent residents of the southeastern Pennsylvania Dutch Community eventually moved into the Conestoga Amish Congregational Dis-
district. It is here that the Amish began developing their ultra-conservative sectarian folk culture.

From the original nucleus in southernmost Berks County, the Conestoga Congregational District was gradually extended, during the latter half of the eighteenth century, southward into northwestern Chester County and westward toward Conestoga and Pequea Creeks in Lancaster County" (Figures 6, 7, and 8). By 1800, therefore, Amish people of the Conestoga Congregational District were scattered across an area extending about 9 miles east-west and 6 miles north-south, and embracing a territory of about 50 square miles" (Figure 8). Considering probable out-migrations from the district, together with births and deaths within the district, the population of the Conestoga Congregation can be estimated up to 1800 at about 300 persons.

These Amish people emigrated from Germanic Europe to the Conestoga Congregational District in small groups," each of whose adult male members was relatively successful in purchasing land and starting a farm in very close proximity, if not adjacent, to others in the group. This land purchasing procedure was repeated by each group of Amish migrants from Europe. The members of each group, living in close proximity, constituted a sectarian rural farm cluster consisting of some 4 or 5 large-sized families. Thus, with an estimated total population of some 300, the Conestoga Congregational District was probably comprised of between 6 and 9 of these clusters in 1800." Since the Conestoga District embraced some 50 square miles of territory, these clusters must have been widely dispersed.

As an ultra-conservative sect, the Amish practiced all the original tenets of Anabaptism in unmodified form. They worshipped only in private homes because they denied the necessity of the physical church, i.e., elaborate church buildings." Considering the geographical dimensions of the Conestoga Congregational District and the primitive transportation facilities of the times, it was probably difficult, if not impossible, for the entire congregation to assemble for worship. It is believed, therefore, that each farm cluster was organized into a sub-congregational district within the larger Conestoga District.

Since the eighteenth-century Amish of the Conestoga Congregational District probably lived in comparative isolation from non-Amish peoples, a formal Ordnung was probably unnecessary, for one of the major ob-

jectives of the Ordnung in future years was to isolate the Amish community socially and culturally. Given the circumstances of the time, it was relatively easy to discover and punish those sectarians who associated, unnecessarily, with non-Amish people and thus failed to follow St. Paul's precept to retreat from the world." Socio-cultural isolation was partially dependent upon economic self-sufficiency. This self-sufficiency was contingent upon agriculture. Thus, the early Anabaptists were strongly attracted by the physical environment, especially the soil. Anything not coming from the soil was considered worldly and not in keeping with Saint Paul's injunction." Through time, farming became the traditional, almost sacred, occupation of the Amish." The driving ambition of every Amish man was, and still is, to own a farm. As time passed, and the eighteenth century came to a close, surplus farm products became available for sale and the period of subsistence farming came to an end in the Conestoga Congregational District.

The Period 1801-1850

The period from 1801 to 1850 was characterized by further territorial growth of the Amish community in southeastern Pennsylvania, various internal spatial changes, an increase in population, the formulation of an Ordnung, and by changes in the land-use system. Between 1801 and 1850, the Amish extended the earlier Conestoga Congregational District boundary several miles farther southward through western Chester County. But the major movement reached about 10 miles westward across east-central Lancaster County in the area between Pequea and Conestoga Creeks" (Figures 6, 8, and 9). Thus, by 1850, the Amish community had an east-west extent of about 16 miles and a north-south dimension of some 10 miles, and embraced approximately 160 square miles of territory.

The Amish population increased to between 500 and 600 during the period 1801-1850." This growth in population, together with increases in the areal extent of the Amish community, caused the Conestoga Congregational District to be divided into Millcreek and Pequea Congregational Districts in 1843" (Figure 9). Millcreek (Figure 6), a tributary of the Conestoga was selected as the boundary between the two districts, which were roughly equal in size. Each district probably included about one-half of the Amish population, i.e., between 30 and 35 families totalling from 250 to 300 sectarians.

"Ibid., p. 58.
"Territorial extent of the Conestoga district is estimated from John A. Hostetler, Amish Society; Calvin George Bachman, The Old Order Amish of Lancaster County; and C. Henry Smith, The Mennonites of America. Published by the author, Goshen, Indiana, 1999, pp. 210-212.
"The Conestoga District was atypical, for it was considerably larger in areal extent than the model eighteenth-century congregational district shown in Figure 17, and the population of the Conestoga Congregation was much larger than that of the model.

See Footnote 16.
"John A. Hostetler, Amish Society, p. 45.
"Ibid., pp. 92-93.
"Calvin George Bachman, The Old Order Amish of Lancaster County, pp. 57-58.
"Estimated from the following sources: John A. Hostetler, Amish Society, p. 78; Calvin George Bachman, The Old Order Amish of Lancaster County, p. 38; and C. Henry Smith, The Mennonites of America, p. 212.
"John A. Hostetler, Amish Society, p. 78.
"Estimated from past and present procedures used in the organization of Amish Congregational Districts.
The purpose of the formation of these two congregational districts was to eliminate the large number of religious services that were being conducted simultaneously in the several sub-congregations of the original Conestoga District. All of the families in each of the two newly organized Congregational districts were able to assemble for the worship services. Since the Amish worshipped every second Sunday, the first family hosted the group once in a little more than a year. Since few homes could accommodate 30 to 35 families, services were conducted outdoors, which was satisfactory in the warm season but not when the weather turned cold. In winter, religious services were held in the barns.

The economic organizations of the Amish congregational districts changed considerably during the period 1801-1850. Farms were becoming more numerous but smaller in size. Moreover, they were becoming even more diversified and self-sufficient.

Since several generations had grown to adulthood by 1850, the sons, grandsons, and great-grandsons of the original Amish immigrants were confronted with the problem of obtaining a farm, for local farm land was becoming scarce. Some descendants of the original immigrants were able to purchase nearby developed non-Dutch farms, and others obtained undeveloped tracts from non-Amishmen, but many of the young Amishmen received a section of their father's farm. Large portions of these farms had not been developed by the original owners, and the young Amish farmers received the undeveloped parts.

The economically relatively self-sufficient Millcreek and Pequea Congregational Districts continued, in the socio-cultural and religious sense, as self-governing units throughout the period 1801-1850. Authority was centered in the church, which exercised its power through the clergy. Each congregational district had a bishop, minister, and a deacon, the first-named having final authority in all church affairs. Since the ultra-conservative Amish church required its adherents to conform almost completely to the mores of their ancestors, few cultural changes were adopted and Amish society changed little from generation to generation. As the nineteenth century progressed, the Amish congregational districts began to emerge as distinctive ceremonial communities. A definite ceremonial calendar regulated many phases of everyday life. Baptism, marriage, and other ceremonies were performed at specific times. Social activities were controlled by the Ordnung. Welfare and care for the aged were more completely provided for by the Amish than by any other Plain Dutch sect.

Extreme socio-cultural isolation of the nineteenth-century Amish Community was contingent upon maintaining rigidly controlled communications with the surrounding world. Except for economic necessities, the Amish rarely communicated with the non-Plain Dutch community of southeastern Pennsylvania. They also attempted to avoid communicating with the Schwenkfelders, and communicated only slightly more frequently with the Dunkards. Most of their outside contacts were with the Mennonites because of their close religious affinities. Communications between the Pequea and Millcreek districts was unrestricted.

**The Period 1851-1900**

The period 1851-1900 in the spatial history of the southeastern Pennsylvania Amish was marked by several important developments. The community increased in territorial extent. More congregations were organized and new congregational district boundaries were authorized. Amish agriculture was featured by the increasing rapid sub-division of farms, and these smaller farms became self-sufficient more quickly than their larger counterparts of earlier times. Under the control of an ultra-conservative church, Amish life became even more tradition-directed by 1900. A stronger emphasis was placed upon social isolation, and the culture became even more static. The visible identifying symbols of Amish society in southeastern Pennsylvania became even more evident than before by the beginning of the twentieth century.

Spatial expansion of the Southeastern Pennsylvania Amish Sectarian Sub-Region proceeded in the second half of the nineteenth century, the territory being extended about 10 miles westward and approximately 12 miles southward between 1851 and 1900 (Figures 9 and 10). Amish settlement by the latter date extended

---

*Calvin George Bachman, *The Old Order Amish of Lancaster County*, pp. 113-115.
from southernmost Berks County and westernmost Chester County, to west-central Lancaster County, a
distance of about 27 miles, and southward from Con-
estoga Creek across some 23 miles of Lancaster County.
Thus, the Amish community of southeastern Pennsyl-
vania embraced about 400 square miles by 1900*
(Figure 10).

As population increased, the Millcreek and Pequea
congregations of the early nineteenth Century became
too large for their members to assemble in private
homes or barns for church services. Moreover, distances
involved in travelling across the enlarging sub-region
required too much time. To permit continued use of
private homes for religious services, and to reduce time
and distance in travelling to church, the Amish created
three additional congregational districts between 1851
and 1900. The territorially expanded Pequea Congregational District was divided into Pequea Upper
and Pequea Lower Congregational Districts in 1852.
Later, in 1865, Pequea Upper was divided into Pequea
Upper and Pequea Middle Congregational Districts.
In 1873, the geographically enlarged Millcreek Congregational District was reorganized into Upper Millcreek
and Lower Millcreek Congregational Districts.**
A comparison of Figures 23 and 24 indicates that most
of the territorial growth occurred in the old, pre-1852,
Pequea District. If, as is believed to be the case, the
Amish attempted to keep their congregational districts
approximately equal in population, then density of
Amish people must have been greatest in the territorially smallest Lower Millcreek District (Figure 10).

*Calvin George Bachman, *The Old Order Amish of Lan-
caster County*, pp. 58-59; and John A. Hostetler, *Amish Soci-
ety*, p. 73.

The total population of the southeastern Pennsylvania
Amish Sectarian Sub-Region is estimated to have
been about 1100 at the beginning of the twentieth
century." This estimate is not difficult to validate.
Religious services were conducted every second Sun-
day," and each family was expected to host the service
once a year. Therefore, 26 families would constitute
a model Amish congregational district. Thus, the Amish
community as a whole, with its five districts, was prob-
ably comprised of from 90 to 135 families. If the con-
grangements were about equal in size, then between 18
and 27 families resided in each Amish district. Based
on estimates of average size of families (10 persons in
late nineteenth-century rural America), each congrega-
tion consisted of an average of about 216 persons. Since
there were five congregational districts, the 1900 popu-
lation of the southeastern Pennsylvania Amish Sec-
tarian Sub-Region was about 1080."*

After the mid-nineteenth century, it was exceedingly
difficult for the southeastern Pennsylvania Amish to
obtain new farm land, particularly in the area of the
Millcreek congregational districts where the Mennonites
were competing for land. However, some farms were
available in southeastern Lancaster County and the
Amish community quickly spread southward in this
direction, thus accounting for the significant territorial
expansion of the Pequea congregational districts in the
1850's and 1860's. After the division of the original
Millcreek District (Figure 9) into two districts of
slightly greater combined extent in 1873 (Figure 10),
no new congregational districts were organized and no

*Calvin George Bachman, *The Old Order Amish of Lan-
caster County*, p. 59.
*See Footnote 78.
additional territory was added to the Amish Sub-Region in the nineteenth century, signifying that all available local farm lands had been procured by the 1870’s. After 1850, the subdivision of farms became a common practice among the Amish. By 1900, many farms were already so small that further subdivision would have made their operation economically unprofitable. At the end of the nineteenth century, therefore, the size of farms, and the distribution of farms among non-Dutch farms in the Amish congregational districts, were about the same as shown by the Pennsylvania Plain Dutch model (Figure 2).

But there were some important spatial differences between Amish and non-Amish Plain Dutch congregational districts. Amish districts were considerably larger in size, and therefore Amish families were more widely dispersed. Moreover, unlike the Dunkards, Mennonites, and Schwenkfelders, the Amish congregational districts did not have meetinghouses. Under the prevailing set of circumstances, i.e., the rapid subdivision of farms and the unavailability of additional local agricultural land, the southeastern Pennsylvania Amish were confronted with the necessity of forced migration and, since farming to the Amish was a sacred occupation, there was no alternative to migration. Many newly-married Amish couples had no choice but to migrate to the Mid-West and other regions. The sectarians remaining behind in the southeastern Pennsylvania Amish congregational districts operated smaller, but progressively more intensively cultivated, farms. By the latter half of the nineteenth century, the period of subsistence farming had long since ended, and intensive subsistence combined with general commercial agriculture had become common throughout the Amish Community. The most striking feature of Amish land use at the end of the nineteenth century was the emphasis that was beginning to be placed upon the commercial fattening of livestock and the production of tobacco. Ultimately, in the twentieth century, general commercial farming was to be superseded by specialized commercial agriculture.

The southeastern Pennsylvania Amish congregational districts continued to be almost entirely self-sufficient socially and culturally during the 1851-1900 period. All of the social needs of the individual were provided for by these ultra-conservative congregational districts. Economic and social self-sufficiency permitted the Amish to completely control communications with other Plain Dutch and non-Plain Dutch groups. Even the individual congregational districts comprising the Amish sub-region were relatively independent of each other, and communication between them continued to be limited to infrequent business transactions, mate seeking, and the occasional discussion of religious controversies. Closing themselves off almost completely from the surrounding world in the socio-cultural sense caused the late nineteenth-century Amish to become an even more tradition-directed people than they were before. Hence, they placed even stronger emphasis upon the traditional identifying symbols and ceremonial rituals that bonded and unified their society.

The Period 1901-1970

External territorial boundaries of the Southeastern Pennsylvania Amish Sectarian Sub-Region have not changed appreciably during the twentieth century (compare Figures 10 and 11). Internally, however, this sub-region has been divided into many component congregational districts in recent decades. Between 1901 and the present (1970), only two small areas have been added to the Amish Sectarian Sub-Region. One of these is in Lancaster County and represents a slight westward extension of the late nineteenth-century main Amish community (compare Figures 10 and 11). The other, a small outlier to the northwest (compare Figures 10 and 11), is located in eastern Lebanon County, and was organized early in the twentieth century by Amish migrants from the main community. This outlier, together with the main area, are the only two territories inhabited by Amish people in the entire Southeastern Pennsylvania Plain Dutch Community.

An anomaly in the geographical history of the southeastern Pennsylvania Amish is the ready availability of farm land in the twentieth century in contrast to its unavailability during the nineteenth century. This situation accounts for the many congregational districts organized in the twentieth century as compared with earlier times. Moreover, the organization of many new congregational districts also indicates an exceedingly rapid growth in twentieth-century Amish population, for the availability of additional farmland is essential to the sustained population growth of a rural folk society such as that of the Old Order Amish.

Since 1900, more than 30 southeastern Pennsylvania Amish congregational districts have been formed from the five districts existing prior to that time (compare Figures 10 and 11). The Upper Millcreek Congregational District of 1900 (Figure 10) was divided into Millcreek and Millcreek Upper Congregational Districts in 1907. In 1931, the Millcreek Upper Congregational District was reorganized as Millcreek West Upper (Figure 11, No. 1), and Millcreek East Upper Congregational Districts. In 1959, this latter district was split into Millcreek East Upper No. 3, and Millcreek East Upper Congregational Districts (Figure 11, Nos. 2 and 3). The Millcreek Congregational District founded in 1907 was divided into the Millcreek West

and Millcreek East Congregational Districts in 1940 (Figure 11, Nos. 4 and 5).

The Lower Millcreek District of 1900 (Figure 10) was divided into Millcreek Lower and Groffdale Congregational Districts in 1903. These two congregational districts were subsequently reorganized, the former as Millcreek East Lower and Millcreek West Lower in 1951, and the latter as South Groffdale and North Groffdale in 1945 (Figure 11, Nos. 6, 7, 8, and 9).

In 1913, the Pequea Upper Congregational District of 1900 (Figure 10) was broken up into the Pequea Upper and the Pequea Northwest Upper Congregational Districts. The Pequea Upper Congregational District was reorganized in 1943, forming the congregational districts of Pequea Southwest Upper and Pequea East Upper. In 1955, these latter two congregational districts were again divided, with Pequea Southwest Upper becoming the present congregational districts of Pequea Southwest Upper and Beaver Creek, and Pequea East Upper becoming Mount Pleasant No. 1, and Mount Pleasant No. 2 (Figure 11, Nos. 10, 11, 12, and 13). In 1951, the Pequea Northwest Upper Congregational District was divided into the present Ronks and Greenland Congregational Districts (Figure 11, Nos. 14 and 15).

The Pequea Middle Congregational District of 1900 (Figure 10) became two congregational districts in 1905, Pequea Upper Middle and Pequea Lower Middle. The Pequea Upper Middle Congregational District was later reorganized, forming the present Pequea North Upper Middle and Pequea South Upper Middle Congregational Districts in 1949 (Figures 11, Nos. 16 and 17). During 1930, Pequea Lower Middle was split and reorganized as Pequea Middle and Pequea Lower Middle Congregational Districts. The Pequea Middle and Jacob K. Lapp Congregational Districts formed in 1957 (Figure 11, Nos. 18 and 19) were formerly the Pequea Middle Congregational District. In 1944, the Pequea Lower Middle Congregational District was broken into the congregational districts of Nine Points and Pequea Lower Middle. This latter one became the Pequea Lower Middle and South Side Congregational Districts in 1959 (Figure 11, Nos. 23 and 24). Between 1955 and 1959, the Nine Points Congregational District was split into the four presently existing congregational districts of Nine Points No. 1, Nine Points No. 2, Georgetown, and East Georgetown (Figure 11, Nos. 20, 32, 21, and 22).

Seven congregational districts were eventually developed from the 1900 Pequea Lower Congregational District (Figure 10). The original district was broken into the Pequea Lower District and Pequea West Lower District in 1915. During 1938, the Pequea Lower Congregational District was reorganized into the Pequea Southeast Lower and Pequea Northeast Lower Congregational Districts. Pequea West Lower was divided into the Pequea Southwest and Pequea Northwest Lower Congregational Districts in 1935. Between 1949 and 1950, these congregational districts were reorganized into seven Congregational Districts: Pequea Northeast Lower, White Horse, Pequea Southeast Lower, Pequea Southwest Lower, Kinzer, Pequea Northwest Lower No. 1, and Pequea Northwest Lower No. 2 (Figure 11, Nos. 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, and 31). The Lebanon County Amish are divided into three Congregational Districts: Richland, Schaefferstown, and Myerstown (Figure 11, Nos. 33, 34, and 35). Lebanon County Amish will probably form two more congregational districts in the near future. Presently, there are six unnamed Amish congregational districts in southeastern Pennsylvania.

Altogether, this highly subdivided southeastern Pennsylvania Amish Sectarian Sub-Region embraces a territory of approximately 475 square miles. Amish people are dispersed across an area of about 25 square miles in Lebanon County. The much larger original Amish community encompasses about 450 square miles—between seven and eight in Berks County, from 75 to 80 in Chester County, and between 360 and 365 in Lancaster County. Of the 41 Amish congregational districts, only 16 have definite boundaries on all sides. The area within these 16 districts ranges from two to nine square miles each, the average being 4.3 square miles. On the other hand, districts along the outer margins of the entire Amish Sectarian Sub-Region have no distinct outer boundaries; instead, they reach out to include the most distant Amish family. The average such partially unbounded district probably has an area of about 20 square miles. The average size of all Amish districts is about 12 square miles (475 square miles divided by 41 congregational districts). The mean size of districts with boundaries approximates that of congregational districts of other horse-and-buggy Plain Dutch peoples. Partially unbounded districts are larger, but future subdivisions to accommodate a growing population will undoubtedly diminish their average size.

The formation of numerous additional Amish congregational districts in southeastern Pennsylvania after 1900 indicates a rapid and sustained growth of population during the twentieth century. Unfortunately, the Amish do not compile accurate census information. The names of Amish congregational districts and their total memberships, when provided at all, appear only in the Mennonite Yearbook and Directory.\(^\text{4}\) Districts reporting such population figures usually do so in round numbers. Many districts are uncooperative and do not make official population reports of any sort. Complicating this problem still further is the reluctance of the Amish to cooperate in general with outsiders, which makes it exceedingly difficult for an interested person to obtain any kind of census figures for individual districts.

\(^4\)Mennonite Yearbook and Directory, Annual editions.
In 1960, 258 Old Order Amish districts throughout the United States reported, in the *Mennonite Yearbook and Directory*, a total population, including children, of 43,300, giving a mean population per district of 168. In 1962, the 59 Old Order Amish congregational districts in all of Pennsylvania reported a total baptized membership of 4,889 in the *Mennonite Yearbook and Directory*. The number of non-baptized children was calculated by the same source to be 5,085. The mean population of the 59 Pennsylvania Amish congregational districts, therefore, can be estimated at 169, which is very close to the national average. Based on a mean of 168 persons per district, the southeastern Pennsylvania Amish population was estimated in the *Mennonite Yearbook and Directory* to be 5,712 in 1962, and 6,216 in 1965. These estimates, however, are for only 34 districts reporting in 1962, and for 37 districts reporting in 1965. In 1967, after two years of intensive study, Egeland estimated the population of the southeastern Pennsylvania Amish community, alone, to be 8,856, and the mean population of the component 41 congregational districts was calculated at 216.

The author here suggests that the estimates of the *Mennonite Yearbook and Directory* of 1962 and 1965 were too low, whereas that by Egeland of 1967 was probably too high. Census information obtained by Hostetler in eight Amish congregational districts in Lancaster County in 1960 indicates that the true population in 1962 was considerably greater than the above *Mennonite Yearbook and Directory* estimate, but in 1967 was less than the above Egeland estimate. Hostetler computed a mean population of 193 per district. Since there were 34 congregational districts in the county in 1960, the total Amish population of southeastern Pennsylvania should have been about 6,562 in that year. The author made a detailed personal census in 1970 for one of the districts studied by Hostetler, and found a population of 215.

Since currently there are 41 districts in the Amish community of southeastern Pennsylvania, the writer estimates the total 1970 Old Order Amish population of southeastern Pennsylvania at about 8,815.

The author's 1970 population estimate would appear to be confirmed when one considers the average size of Old Order Amish families and the ideal number of families comprising an Old Order Amish congregational district. Two dozen families seem to constitute this ideal, but the number of families per congregational district ranges from 20 to 24. Hence, there are probably between 820 (20 families x 41 districts), and 964 (24 families x 41 districts) Amish families in southeastern Pennsylvania. Several studies indicate that the average number of children per completed Old Order Amish family ranges from seven to nine. Thus, the population would range from a minimum of 7,380 (820 families x nine persons per family) to a maximum of 10,604 (964 families x 11 persons per family). The mean population would be 8,891 which comes very close to the author's estimate of 8,815.

Rapid growth of the southeastern Pennsylvania Amish population during the twentieth century can be attributed in large part to the continued sub-division of pre-1900 farms, and to the purchase and subsequent sub-division of the many additional farms that became available locally as non-Amish farmers abandoned the land. Indeed, Amish people who have migrated from southeastern Pennsylvania in recent years usually have done so for non-economic reasons. Diversity of the Amish farm enterprise, and exceedingly intense cultivation of the soil, permits the typical southeastern Pennsylvania Amish farmer to operate profitably with horse-powered equipment despite recent large-scale mechanization by his non-Plain Dutch competitors. The Amish have been willing to pay exceptionally high prices for farms. They paid more than $1,000 an acre before, and over $1,500 an acre after, World War II. Today, farm land is valued at from $1,500 to $2,000 an acre in most Amish-occupied parts of the Southeastern Pennsylvania Dutch Community. Elsewhere, in the non-Amish portions of the community, land prices are somewhat lower. Amish farms now average about 50 acres, but many young men do not own a farm. Instead, they rent from a relative or a non-Amish person. Their ambition is to save enough money to buy a farm if one becomes available. Thus, the tenancy rate is higher among Amish than regional non-Amish farmers.

Old Order Amish society remains today extremely cohesive, close-knit, and static in comparison with the prevailing culture of modern southeastern Pennsylvania.

---

Ibid.
Ibid.
Ibid.


John A. Hostetler, *Amish Society*, pp. 79-85. Hostetler reports census information obtained from eight church districts which he examined in detail. These districts constitute a 22% sample, sufficient for a valid population estimate. The writer studied the population of one of the sample districts during 1970 and verifies Hostetler's earlier study.

During the summer of 1970, the author surveyed the population of an Amish Congregational District previously examined by Hostetler. The Amish refused to cooperate with the writer, but, through informants, the author knew which family was hosting the religious service. Thus, on three occasions he parked along the road and counted everyone who arrived for the worship service. Although the unbaptized are not members, they must attend worship services.

---

Ibid.
Contrastingly, Amish society is internally dynamic, for socio-cultural changes that conform to the traditional society, and do not dilute the ultra-conservative Amish Anabaptist beliefs and practices, are often innovated. Despite this internal flexibility, conflict between the Amish culture and the surrounding American culture has produced tension and crisis within the southeastern Pennsylvania Amish community in recent years.

Constantly exposed as they are to influences emanating from the large urban centers of southeastern Pennsylvania, the Amish are besieged by the pressures of the modern world. A flood of books, pamphlets, and articles have brought the Amish to the attention of the American public and they have been subsequently exploited by the tourist industry, especially along U. S. highway 30. More importantly, the encroachment of the large urban and industrial complexes of southeastern Pennsylvania has forced the Amish to reexamine their Ordnung. Thus, as anomalous as it may seem, in order to resist assimilation into the general American culture, the Amish community has affected numerous internal changes. Diffusion of outside technological devices into the Amish community, for instance, frequently causes temporary tension but is usually reacted to by a change in Ordnung or by church schism. The introduction of the telephone is one example. Although originally prohibited in the Amish home, the use of a non-Amish neighbor's home phone or a pay phone is now sometimes permitted. Or, a congregational district's Ordnung may be revised to permit the use of public telephones for emergency purposes, but what constitutes an emergency is left to the discretion of the individual. This type of reaction achieves its purpose, which is in general to keep the telephone out of the community. And, by permitting its limited use, tension subsides and the essence of the internally static culture is preserved. Many similar examples could be cited. As a result, to the outsider, Amish society seems to be remarkably uniform and static.

In circumstances where an Ordnung is absolutely inflexible, sectarian cleavage may result from a cultural contradiction. Such schisms have caused the Amish church to move in several directions over the years. One division of the church favored retaining the old traditions and became known as the Old Order Amish. A second division adopted a liberal policy and favored change. A third group favored moderation and took a middle-of-the-road position, accepting neither radical changes nor absolute conformity. Finally, a very progressive wing of the Amish church, called the Beachy Amish, have gone so far as to adopt electricity and the automobile. As a result of all such changes, the southeastern Pennsylvania Amish Sectarian Sub-Region has emerged as the largest contiguous ultra-conservative Old Order Amish community in North America. The main changes in old European church precepts have developed outside the southeastern Pennsylvania Dutch Community, and southeastern Pennsylvania Amish people who have become dissatisfied with the Old Order have quietly migrated to other areas. Thus, these church divisions are not discussed in this study.

As already stated, the Amish congregational districts are self-governing units. Hence they are made deliberately small in population and territorial extent. The church supervises religious, social, and cultural life of the district population. By strict obedience to the rules of the church, which sometimes seem rather inconsistent to the outsider, the Old Order Amish of southeastern Pennsylvania have developed a multi-bonded, symbolic, ceremonial community which has been able to confront, and effectively resist, cultural assimilation.

10 John A. Hostetler, Amish Society, Chapters 11 and 12.
The Mennonite Sect

Persecution of the Mennonites prevailed throughout Germanic Europe during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. These persecutions were especially severe in places where the Mennonites comprised a substantial part of the population, such as in the Germanic cantons of Switzerland.

Indignities suffered by the Mennonites can be traced mainly to a few religious causes. Two of their Anabaptist religious tenets—adult faith baptism, and separation of church and state—were the major factors causing persecution. Both Lutherans and Roman Catholics attempted to force the Mennonites into accepting infant baptism and a state-controlled church. Most other Mennonite Anabaptist religious concepts were relatively unimportant factors contributing to their persecution.\textsuperscript{10}

Economic sanctions were imposed on the Mennonites to persuade them to denounce their religious principles. During the latter years of the seventeenth century, the Mennonites experienced great poverty, particularly in the Palatinate and the Germanic parts of Switzerland. Special taxes were levied against them. As tenants, they were frequently subjected to extortion at the hands of landlords. In many places they were unable to operate a business or even obtain employment. Despite these hardships, the Mennonites refused to compromise their Anabaptist religious beliefs.

At about this time, the late seventeenth century, William Penn invited the Mennonites to settle in Pennsylvania where religious freedom was promised for all.\textsuperscript{11}

The Period to 1750

The first Mennonite group to set foot on Pennsylvania soil established a congregation at Germantown (Figure 12, No. 1) on October 6, 1683.\textsuperscript{12} This group consisted of 35 persons and was comprised of 13 families.\textsuperscript{13} These were the only Mennonites to migrate to Pennsylvania during the seventeenth century.

The first half of the eighteenth century was characterized by the migration of numerous Mennonite groups from Germanic Europe and their resettlement in southeastern Pennsylvania. Most of these immigrant groups followed identical procedures. Upon their arrival in Pennsylvania, they moved directly to Germantown where they remained temporarily to obtain information about lands that might be available for settlement and to procure supplies for their journey to the frontier areas of southeastern Pennsylvania. From Germantown, they moved to permanent sites short distances to the north or west, and, after establishing permanent homes, organized congregations and engaged in farming. It is estimated that a total of about 25,000 Mennonites moved to southeastern Pennsylvania from Germanic Europe, the majority arriving during the first half of the eighteenth century. The decade, 1717-1727, was a period of exceptionally heavy migration.\textsuperscript{14}

The early Mennonite immigrants expected to obtain large jointly-owned tracts of land, and to organize them into the European-type communal agricultural villages to which they were accustomed. Since no such large tracts of land were available in southeastern Pennsylvania in the early eighteenth century, the members of each successive group of migrants decided to procure small privately-owned tracts in as close proximity to each other as possible. Thus, over the decades, the territorial organization of the southeastern Pennsylvania Mennonite community, like that of the Amish community previously described, developed into a pattern of many dispersed farm clusters. Eventually, each of these clusters was organized into one or more congregational districts. By 1750, the Mennonites had organized 33 such congregational districts in southeastern Pennsylvania (Figure 12), the majority being found in two major clusters, one north of Germantown in the vicinity of Skippack and Perkiomen Creek, and the other to the west near Pequea Creek (Figures 6 and 12).

The Skippack-Perkiomen Creek area consisted of 25 Mennonite congregational districts in 1750 (Figure 12). The first to be founded, after the original Germantown district, was the Skippack Congregational District in 1702. Subsequently, congregational districts were formed at Mainland, Pottstown, Towamencin, Franconia, Telford, Kulpsville, Swamp, Methacton, Worcester, and Gilbertsville in Montgomery County. Berks County Mennonite congregational districts were founded at Goshenhoppen, Oley, Hereford, Bally and Boyertown. The Mennonites developed congregations at Bedminster, Sellersville, Rockhill, and Deep Run in Bucks County. Two congregational districts were founded in Lehigh County at Upper Milford and Saucon, and two in Chester County at Valley Forge and Phoenixville.\textsuperscript{15}

The Pequea Creek Mennonite area consisted of eight congregational districts, all of which were located in Lancaster County.\textsuperscript{16} Following the founding of the Pequea Congregational District about 1710, additional congregational districts were organized at Conestoga, Rock Hill, Strasburg, Manheim, Lampeter, Weaverland, and Groffdale\textsuperscript{17} (Figure 12).

Individual Mennonite congregational districts probably ranged in size from two to three square miles during the early eighteenth century. The congregations each consisted of 10 to 15 farm families, comprising

\textsuperscript{10}C. Henry Smith, \textit{The Story of the Mennonites}, p. 134.
\textsuperscript{11}Ibid., p. 544.
\textsuperscript{12}Ibid., pp. 536-538.
\textsuperscript{14}Ibid., pp. 547-548.
\textsuperscript{15}Ibid., pp. 10-12.
\textsuperscript{16}Ibid., p. 547.
\textsuperscript{17}C. Henry Smith, \textit{The Mennonites of America}.
a population of from 50 to 100 persons. Since the Mennonites were not accustomed to constructing church buildings, most congregations conducted religious services in private homes. Hence, as in the previously described case of the Amish, the population of each district was limited by the number of persons that could assemble in an individual private home. Moreover, the poor condition of the few roads that were then available caused the Mennonite congregations to be small in areal extent.

Mennonite congregational districts of the New World, like those of the Amish, emerged as conservative, largely self-governing communities during the early eighteenth century. The Mennonite church controlled its congregations through the authority vested in its clergy. Since Anabaptists did not believe in a professional ministry, the Mennonite clergy consisted of laymen selected by lot. Each congregational district chose three clergymen—a bishop, a preacher, and a deacon, the bishop alone possessing complete and final authority in clerical and secular affairs of the congregational district which he implemented through its Ordnung.

The purpose of the Ordnung was to assure that church members conformed to the mores of their traditional European Anabaptist culture. Among the many rules of the Mennonite Church, several were most salient to this study, for they bonded each congregational district into a cohesive, static community. Except for illness, church attendance was compulsory, which produced a strong bond of kinship within the district. Adherents were expected to speak the dialect when conversing with one another. The wearing of Mennonite plain garb was absolutely required, for it identified the wearer as a Mennonite and, therefore, distinguished him from the surrounding population of southeastern Pennsylvania. The Mennonites early established parochial elementary schools and utilized sectarian lay teachers, who inculcated in youths the traditions of Anabaptist religious and secular life and advocated the rejection of contemporaneous things. Finally, although not a tenet of Anabaptism, respect for nature emerged as a major value of the Mennonites as of the previously described Amish. Hence, nearly all Mennonites became farmers because non-land oriented occupations were considered sinful. They hoped that agricultural self-sufficiency would permit them to become economically, as well as socio-culturally, independent from the surrounding world. Although the Mennonites were not nearly self-sufficient economically by the middle of the eighteenth century, they had maintained a sufficient degree of such self-sufficiency to assure their continuance as a static, cohesive, close-knit, socio-culturally isolated rural society.

Because of their religious beliefs, and their self-imposed isolation, a strong Mennonite community psychology, quite analogous to that of the Amish, seems to have developed. Psychologically, they conceived of Anabaptism as the true Christian faith, and saw the outside world as a sinful place to be avoided. Hence, contact with the surrounding world was not encouraged and Mennonites communicated as seldom as possible with the non-Plain Dutch people of southeastern Pennsylvania. Frequency of communication with other Plain Dutch sects depended upon the similarity of Mennonite tenets to those of the various other Anabaptist religious beliefs. Considering the Schwenkfelders liberal, almost worldly in cultural outlook, the Mennonites communicated infrequently with them, but communicated somewhat more often with the more conservatively conservative Dunkards because there were some religious similarities between the two sects. The Mennonites considered themselves almost identical to the Amish, religiously, and attempted to stimulate communications with them. But the ultra-conservative Amish believed the Mennonites practiced a diluted form of Anabaptism, and refused to permit an unlimited flow of communication (Figure 5). Hence, nearly all Mennonite communications occurred between the Mennonites themselves, and much of this took place between the congregational districts. Districts located in the Skippack Creek area, for example, communicated with each other very frequently, as did those of the Pequea Creek area. But, because these two areas were territorially widely separated in terms of early eighteenth-century transportation facilities (Figure 12), communications between these two groups of congregational districts were relatively less frequent (Figure 4). Mennonite congregational districts in southeastern Pennsylvania conferred with each other in regard to both clerical and secular matters. Moreover, there was a considerable amount of social interaction such as courtship and marriage between members of different Mennonite congregations. The effect of the above-described interaction pattern of course, was to minimize early eighteenth-century Mennonite dependence upon the surrounding world and to intensify the conservatism of the Mennonite community.

The Period 1751-1800

The period from 1751 to 1800 was marked by further territorial expansion of the Mennonite sect sub-region in southeastern Pennsylvania as new congregational districts were established. However, the rate of geographical expansion decreased from that of former decades because of the decline in number of Mennonite migrants coming from Europe after 1750.

Ibid.
Figure 13.

Some 22 new Mennonite congregations were organized between 1751 and 1800, eight in the Skippack-Perkiomen Creek area in the east, and 14 in the Pequea Creek section in the west (Figure 13). In the former area, congregational districts were founded at East Swamp, Plains, West Swamp, Souderton, and Limerick in Montgomery County, and at Lexington, Blooming Glen, and Doylestown in Bucks County. In the latter area, congregations were organized at Landis Valley, Neffsville, Landisville, Rohrerstown, Goodville, Martindale, Bareville, and Bowmanville in Lancaster County. In addition, districts developed in the west at Stonybrook, Codorus, and Hanover in York County, at Swatara in Dauphin County, at Quitopahilla in Lebanon County, and at Tulpehocken in Berks County (Figure 13). At the close of the eighteenth century, therefore, the southeastern Pennsylvania Mennonite sub-region consisted of some 55 congregational districts.

In general, Mennonite congregations were larger in population, and districts were more extensive territorially, in 1800 than in 1750. It is estimated that the population of most congregational districts increased from between 50 and 100 persons prior to 1750, to between 100 and 150 persons by 1800; and each congregation grew from between 10 and 15 families in the earlier period, to between 15 and 20 farm families by 1800. In like manner, whereas congregational districts organized prior to 1750 ranged in size from two to three square miles; by 1800, the average size of the 55 Mennonite districts was about four square miles.

This increasing geographical size of Mennonite congregational districts, together with their growing populations, eventually produced a situation that precluded the conducting of religious services in Mennonite homes. As an alternative to ornate church buildings, the Mennonites constructed simple structures called meetinghouses in which to hold religious services. These meetinghouses were built large enough to accommodate several hundred people, and were all architecturally almost identical. They were invariably situated as close to the geographical center of the congregational district as possible, for centrality minimized the time and distance involved in travelling over very poor roads to religious services for persons located near the outer margins of the districts.

Agriculturally, the Mennonite community of southeastern Pennsylvania, like the previously described Amish community, experienced considerable change during the period 1751-1800, for districts organized before 1750, while remaining largely self-sufficient, were rapidly developing the commercial facets of their general farming. Only those districts founded after 1750 now depended almost solely upon subsistence farming.

Socially, the Mennonite community during the latter half of the eighteenth century remained a conservative, isolated, tradition-directed, almost self-sufficient rural farm society. However, despite continued economic and territorial growth after 1800, the dawning nineteenth century was destined to become a period of religious and cultural tension and conflict within the Mennonite community of southeastern Pennsylvania.

The Period 1801-1850

The territorial expansion of the southeastern Pennsylvania Mennonite community continued during the period 1801-1850, but growth came more slowly than during the previous century. Seven congregational districts are known to have been formed in the eastern, Skippack-Perkiomen, portion of the Mennonite sub-region: near Schwenksville in Montgomery County; at Plumstead, Quakertown, and Applebachsville in Bucks County; at Coopersburg and Zionsville in Lehigh County; and near Hellertown in Northampton County (Figure 14). Thus, this eastern part of the sub-region expanded only slightly into new territories in northern Bucks, southern Lehigh, and southern Northampton counties. In the western, Pequea, portion of the Mennonite sub-region, seven additional congregational districts were organized: at Churchtown, Adamstown, Ephrata, Lititz, Muddy Creek, and New Holland, in Lancaster County; and at Schaefferstown in Lebanon County (Figure 14). During the period, 1801-1850,

\[12^\text{C} \text{Henry Smith, The Story of the Mennonites, pp. 176-178; C. Henry Smith, The Mennonites of America, p. 173; and John C. Wenger, History of the Mennonites of the Franconia Conference, pp. 12-13.} \]
\[13\text{Ibid.} \]
\[14\text{Frederic Kees, The Pennsylvania Dutch, pp. 191-202.} \]
\[15\text{John C. Wenger, History of the Mennonites of the Franconia Conference, p. 16.} \]
therefore, only small sections in northern Lancaster County and southeastern Lebanon County were added.\textsuperscript{122} Hence, by 1850, the outer configuration of the Southeastern Pennsylvania Plain Dutch Mennonite Sectarian Sub-Region, with its now 69 congregational districts, was not far different than what it had been in 1800 (Figure 14).

Except for the most recently formed districts, the populations of most congregations in the first half of the nineteenth century were much larger than those of earlier periods, consisting of from 20 to 30 farm families and comprising between 150 and 250 persons. Most of the population increase was attributable to the formation of new families within the Mennonite congregational districts, for there were very few Mennonite migrants arriving from Germanic Europe after 1800. Moreover, there was only limited intra-district movement of Mennonites.

Farms were becoming increasingly more difficult to obtain since nearly all desirable local agricultural lands had been developed. Hence, the subdivision of farms by the older Mennonites among their sons was becoming increasingly common. Consequently, Mennonite congregational districts were not much larger territorially in 1850 than they were in 1800, for, while the number of farms in the districts was increasing, the individual farms were decreasing in acreage. The Mennonites remained almost exclusively a farming people during the first half of the nineteenth century. At mid-century, nearly all Mennonite farms had reached a relatively high level of self-sufficiency, but were also becoming increasingly commercially oriented and selling much produce to nearby towns and cities. Most of these prosperous agricultural units fitted the pattern described earlier in this chapter.

Unfortunately for the early nineteenth-century Mennonites, economic prosperity did not bring socio-cultural and religious tranquility, for some liberally-minded adherents began to question the inflexibility of the sectarian culture and the consequent rigidity of the Mennonite way of life. On the other hand, more conservatively-minded sectarians thought the church was becoming too lax and worldly. Hence, internal religious tensions emerged and sometimes mounted to crisis proportions, causing sectarian schisms among the Mennonites. These religious divisions caused much socio-cultural change within the southeastern Pennsylvania Mennonite community during the 1800's.

Conservatively-minded dissidents proclaimed that Mennonite Anabaptism was becoming diluted and therefore was causing the sectarian society to become less isolated and the culture more worldly. A schism subsequently occurred among the Lancaster County Mennonites in 1812.\textsuperscript{123} The individual primarily responsible for the split was John Herr, son of Francis Herr, a former preacher. Herr and his associates, former members of the Strasburg congregational district (Figure 12, No. 29) in Lancaster County, organized a new and separate Strasburg congregation (Figure 17, No. 1). Thus was launched what soon became known as the Reformed Mennonite Church, the members of which were called Herralites by the main Mennonite church (Table I). The founders of the Reformed Mennonites became so traditional that many of their descendants refused to join the movement. Hence, this branch of the Mennonite faith has grown very slowly. Today, the Reformed Mennonites have congregations only at Rohrerstown, Landisville, and Strasburg (Figure 17, Nos. 1, 2, and 3).

Another nineteenth century split from the Mennonite church, this one pro-liberal in nature, was known as the Oberholtzer schism,\textsuperscript{124} and occurred in 1847. This schism affected many of the Mennonites in Montgomery and nearby counties, who became known as the East Pennsylvania District Mennonites (Table I). Its originator was John H. Oberholtzer, who was ordained as preacher of the East Swamp congregation.

\textsuperscript{122}All information appertaining to the Reformed Mennonite Church was obtained from C. Henry Smith, The Mennonites of America, pp. 134-182; and C. Henry Smith, The Story of the Mennonites, pp. 540-547.

\textsuperscript{123}All information relating to the East Pennsylvania District Mennonite Church was also obtained from the two above-named works of C. Henry Smith.

\textsuperscript{124}All information pertaining to the Reformed Mennonite Church was obtained from C. Henry Smith, The Mennonites of America, pp. 134-182; and C. Henry Smith, The Story of the Mennonites, pp. 540-547.
in 1842 (Figure 13, No. 36). The original East Pennsylvania District of Mennonites congregational district was organized at Skippack on October 28, 1847 (Figure 17, No. 4). The liberal Oberholtzer Mennonites relaxed the clothing requirements and, in time, the wearing of plain garb was no longer required. This new Mennonite body was more tolerant of new things and permitted much more communication with the surrounding world. Because of these rather liberal views, the Oberholtzer movement was popular from its beginning and soon claimed about one-third of the Mennonites of Montgomery and adjacent counties. Indeed, so many of the Skippack, East Swamp, West Swamp, and Schwenksville congregations joined the new movement that they took over the existing meeting-houses, and those remaining within the old church were forced to build new ones. Within a few more years, Oberholtzer congregations were also formed at Bally and Boyertown, and, later, congregations were established at Saucon and Phoenixville (Figure 17, Nos. 4 through 11). Unfortunately for the Mennonites, this was not the last schism; in fact, many more were to occur during the next 100-year period. By the middle of the twentieth century, few American religious bodies would be divided into as many factions as the Mennonites.

### The Period 1851-1900

Very few congregational districts were founded within, and only small amounts of territory were added to the main-division Southeastern Pennsylvania Mennonite sub-region during the 1851-1900 period (Figure 15), for migration of Mennonites from Germanic Europe to southeastern Pennsylvania had long since ended and additional local agricultural lands were practically unobtainable by newly-formed Mennonite families. Only

---

**Table I**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1812</td>
<td>Herrite Reformed Mennonites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>Martin Mennonites, later absorbed by Old Order Mennonites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>Johnson Mennonites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847</td>
<td>District (Oberholtzer) Mennonites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td>Evangelic Mennonites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>Hunsicker Mennonites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Wenger Old Order Mennonites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Pike Old Order Mennonites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>35'er Old Order Mennonites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Hornung Mennonites</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

four congregational districts were organized by the main-division Mennonites during the second half of the nineteenth century: at Collegeville in Montgomery County, at Monterey and Clay in Lancaster County, and at Mt. Aetna in Lebanon County\textsuperscript{137} (Figure 15), giving a total of 73 for 1900 in comparison with 69 some 50 years earlier.

It was becoming almost impossible to buy a farm in southeastern Pennsylvania during the latter years of last century. The period 1851-1900, therefore, was one of the subdivision of farms throughout the entire Mennonite community. Indeed, by the latter years of the century, many farms had been so subdivided among the sons of farmers that any further division was economically impractical\textsuperscript{138} and the surplus population was forced to either emigrate or give up farming. Since the latter choice was inconceivable to the tradition-steeped Mennonites, they chose to leave southeastern Pennsylvania and seek new land elsewhere. Thus, it was that, by 1900, the number of Mennonite families in a typical southeastern Pennsylvania district had only increased to between 30 and 35, and the average population district was only about 300.\textsuperscript{139} Emigrating newly-married Mennonite couples moved chiefly to the Lower Great Lakes area, the eastern Great Plains, and Ontario.\textsuperscript{140} The decision to migrate was a frightfully traumatic emotional experience, for family ties were intense and kinship bonds within the community were close. The prospect of never again seeing family and friends became a frightening one. Such fears were not unfounded for, at that time, the Mennonite church permitted its adherents the use of only horse-and-buggy land travel. Therefore, a visit between Mennonite relatives in southeastern Pennsylvania and those in distant parts of the United States and Canada was almost impossible.\textsuperscript{141}

During the 1851-1900 period, additional religious divisions occurred among the Mennonites which resulted in subsequent changes in the Mennonite way of life. Certain schisms\textsuperscript{142} were temporary and soon disintegrated, whereas others proved permanent. Details of the significant ones are given below.

All charter members of the aforementioned liberal East Pennsylvania District (Oberholtzer) Mennonite movement did not agree on the extent to which this liberalizing movement should be carried. To the ultra-liberal, Abraham Hunsicker, the views of John Oberholtzer, founder of the East Pennsylvania District movement, were not tolerant enough. Hunsicker, together with a small group of sympathizers scattered throughout the various Oberholtzer congregations (Figure 17), was expelled from the East Pennsylvania District Mennonite Church in 1851, but the Hunsicker faction failed to form a congregational district and the membership was ultimately absorbed by other sects (Table I).

Whereas the Hunsickers found the Oberholtzer faction too conservative, another group under the leadership of Henry G. Johnson considered it too liberal. In

\textsuperscript{137} C. Henry Smith, The Story of the Mennonites, Chapter IX; and C. Henry Smith, The Mennonites of America, Chapter VII.

\textsuperscript{138} Personal interviews with numerous Mennonites, particularly Ivan Leid, Elam Leid, Ivan Martin, and Bishop Eib Burkholder.

\textsuperscript{139} C. Henry Smith, The Mennonites of America, Chapters VII and X.

\textsuperscript{140} See Footnote 137.

\textsuperscript{141} All information relating to all religious divisions occurring between 1851 and 1900 is based upon C. Henry Smith, The Story of the Mennonites, pp. 540-547; C. Henry Smith, The Mennonites of America, pp. 134-182; and John C. Wenger, History of the Mennonites of the Franconia Conference, pp. 16-20.
1853, Johnson and a small number of sympathizers withdrew from the East Pennsylvania District Mennonite Church and became known as the Johnson Mennonites (Table I). The Johnson party, however, experienced only slow growth and today there are but two small Johnsonite congregations in southeastern Pennsylvania (Figure 17, Nos. 13 and 14).

The end of Mennonite religious division was not yet in sight. Even the liberal Oberholtzer Mennonites did not believe in prayer meetings, but William Gehman, an Oberholtzer Mennonite, began conducting such meetings, and he and his followers were excommunicated from the Oberholtzer Church in 1858. This movement, taking the name Evangelical Mennonites (Table I), soon developed a congregation at Upper Milford (Figure 17, No. 12), but subsequently experienced very slow growth. Later, through amalgamation with similarly-minded groups in other states and Canada, they developed into a body of substantial size.

The final nineteenth-century division among the Mennonites of southeastern Pennsylvania occurred in the Weaverland congregational district in 1899 (Figure 12, No. 32). Bishop Jonas Martin of the Weaverland congregation attempted to keep the main Mennonite church within very narrow traditional bounds. Ultimately, Martin and about one-third of the membership withdrew from the Weaverland congregation and founded their own church in the area (Figure 17, No. 15). These Martin Mennonites of Pennsylvania (Table I), together with three other like-thinking groups (the Ohio Wislerites, the Ontario Woolwichers, and the Virginia Martinites), comprised an extremely conservative wing of the Mennonite church. The above-described divisions, along with several later schisms, were to have a tremendous impact upon the twentieth-century Mennonite community of Southeastern Pennsylvania, causing many religious, socio-cultural, and economic changes.

**The Period 1901-1970**

During the present century, the main body of the Mennonite Church in southeastern Pennsylvania has been further splintered by schismatic movements. In 1925, some Mennonites of Lancaster County decided to purchase automobiles.\(^{14}\) Since the main body of Mennonites did not accept this method of transportation until 1929, the automobile-buying Mennonites were excommunicated and became Horning Mennonites sub-sect (Table I). Thus, the Horning groups originated as a liberal sub-sect.\(^{15}\) Today, however, members of the Horning division of the Mennonites are classed as moderately conservative sectarian, for their religious practices and mores are almost identical to those of the main body of Mennonites. There are now six Horning Mennonite congregational districts in southeastern Pennsylvania.

---

\(^{14}\)Ivan Leid, personal interview.

\(^{15}\)Ibid.
Pennsylvania: Groffdale, Bowmansville, Martindale, Churchtown, and New Holland in Lancaster County, and Walnuttown in Berks County (Figure 17, Nos. 24-29).

In 1929, when the main division of the Mennonite church in southeastern Pennsylvania decided to follow the example of the then liberal Hornung Mennonites and accept the automobile, a large segment of the Mennonite population in northeastern Lancaster County objected and seeded from the main Mennonite Church. Unfortunately for them, these conservative Mennonites could not formulate an Ordnung acceptable to the entire group. They soon split into three groups: the Pikers, the 35'ers, and the Wengerites (Table I). From their beginning, these groups have been so similar religious beliefs and socio-cultural practices that it is impossible for the majority of any of the three groups to explain their differences. Since they all are so very conservative and have preserved virtually intact all of the traditional features of pre-twentieth century Mennonite religion and culture, these three groups are collectively referred to as the Old Order Mennonites. Today, there are nine Old Order Mennonite congregational districts in southeastern Pennsylvania: eight in Lancaster County (Weaverland, Groffdale, Bowmansville, Martindale, Churchtown, Muddy Creek, New Holland, and Hinkeltown), and one, Penn Valley, in Berks County (Figure 17, Nos. 15-23). The Martin Mennonites, organized in the nineteenth century and previously mentioned, have been absorbed by the Old Order Mennonites (Table I).

The overwhelming majority of Mennonites in southeas tern Pennsylvania have remained members of the original European Mennonite Church despite all of the internal doctrinal controversies of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, but the nature of their religion and culture has been greatly modified by the schismatic process. These main-division Mennonites (Table I) now occupy a position somewhat intermediate between the liberal and conservative splinter factions of the Mennonite faith. They adhere to most of the principles and practices of original European Anabaptism, but the formal Ordnung and Meidung are no longer in effect. Moreover, they now reject the principle of socio-cultural isolation. They employ semi-professional clergy and worship in simply designed modern church buildings. Modern styles of clothing generally have been adopted, but men still wear lapelless coats and the women wear prayer caps to religious services. Educational and occupational limitations have been removed, and the young are permitted to obtain high school and college educations. Tilling the soil is no longer considered a holy endeavor, so that large numbers have obtained employment in a wide variety of non-agricultural occupations. Many sectarians have sold their farms and moved into the towns and cities of southeastern Pennsylvania. Others reside in the rural areas and commute to work in nearby urban centers.

These moderate main-division southeastern Pennsylvania Mennonites are receptive to cultural and economic changes. They accept the automobile, but some congregations require that the chrome be painted black. The use of them of electricity, refrigeration, telephone service, radio, and certain household appliances are permissible, and agriculture has been almost completely mechanized and commercialized. They still reject, however, many contemporaneous social mores such as using tobacco, consuming alcoholic beverages, dancing, gambling, and joining social organizations.

Thus, adherents of the original southeastern Pennsylvania Mennonite Church are gradually being assimilated into American society. It is becoming increasingly difficult to distinguish these sectarians and their close kin, the liberal Mennonites, from other Plain Dutch peoples of southeastern Pennsylvania. Only the Old Order Mennonites retain much of the flavor of bygone days.

The present-day Mennonite sub-region of southeastern Pennsylvania is comprised of 116 congregational districts, 87 of which are a part of the main division of the church and 29 of which are associated with the various sub-sects (Figures 16 and 17). Among the 29 new congregational districts founded in this century, 14 were organized by Mennonites of the original church: at Myerstown, Reistville, and Richland in Lebanon County; and at Hinkeltown, Brownstown, Neffsville, Brickersville, Hopeland, Hesdall, New Providence, Smithville, Buck, Bart, and Bartville in Lancaster County (Figure 16, Nos. 74-87). The remainder of the 29 new twentieth-century districts include the nine founded by Old Order Mennonites and the six established by Horning Mennonites (Figure 17, Nos. 15-29).

A quick comparison of Figures 16 and 17 will show that most members of all shades of Mennonite faith in southeastern Pennsylvania are geographically intricately intermixed. The additional comparison of the above two figures with Figure 11, showing the distributional pattern of the southeastern Pennsylvania Amish, reveals the interesting fact that, whereas the Mennonites and Amish coexist in large numbers in the Lancaster County portion of the area, mostly Mennonites are found in the 11 additional counties that comprise the Southeastern Pennsylvania Plain Dutch Community. It is evident from this that the reputation of Lancaster County as the focus of southeastern Pennsylvania's Plain Dutch culture is indeed merited.
Palatine Emigrants of the 18th Century
By FRIEDRICH KREBS
Translated and Edited by DON YODER

I. ODERHEIM ON THE GLAN
[The following article by Dr. Krebs, entitled in German “Einige Amerika aus wanderer des 18. Jahrhunderts aus Oderheim am Glan,” appeared in the Nordpfälzer Geschichtsverein: Beiträge zur Heimatgeschichte, Volume 49, Number 1 (March 1969), 20-21. The periodical is published at Rockenhausen in the Palatinate. The village of Oderheim can be located on the map in the vicinity of Kaiserslautern.—EDITOR.]

1. In the guardianship accounts of the community archives of Oderheim emigration to Pennsylvania before the year 1757 is documented for one Johann Heinrich Wölfling, son of David Wölfling, citizen and master tailor at Oderheim. In 1757 there appeared at Oderheim Henrich Messemer (Misser, Mesemer), formerly of Mandel bei Kreuznach, who was a merchant in Philadelphia, with power of attorney from the emigrant Wölfling, who is said to have been a master shoemaker in the city of Philadelphia, for the purpose of collecting his inheritance for him. Messemer received from the curators for delivery to his client, after deduction of the sextile tax, 210 florins 5 batzen and 10 pennies. Heinrich Wölfling landed in Philadelphia on the Ship John & Elizabeth in 1754 as Henry Welfling (Wolflinger) and took the oath of allegiance there on November 7, 1754 (Strassburger-Hinke, Pennsylvania German Pioneers, List 231 A-C).

2. In an inventory dated August 23, 1769, of the estate of the citizen and master shoemaker Valentin Scheib of Oderheim, who is said to have died “about four weeks ago,” therefore probably in July 1769, a son of the first marriage is listed named Christian Scheib, of whom it is said that he was married and living in America, whither he had emigrated 23 years previously as a single man. The emigrant may be identical with the Christian Scheib who landed in Philadelphia in 1751 on the Ship Edinburgh and took the oath of allegiance there on September 16, 1751 (Strassburger-Hinke, List 167 C).

3. In a release of the citizen Leonhard Weydner of Oderheim and his wife Susanna Margaretha, dated January 29, 1763, it is said of the son Leonhard Weydner, Jr., that he went to America at the end of April 1741 and is 33 years old. Of Johann Heinrich Weydner, a son of the first marriage to Anna Margaretha Hofmann, it is said that he was a shoemaker (Schuhmacher), emigrated to America in 1734, and is 44 years old. To increase the confusion it is stated that several children of Leonhard Weydner’s wife, to her first marriage with Valentin Graf, have moved to Pomerania. From a document dated January 24, 1768, we can gather that Leonhard Weydner, Sr., died about 1765 and that the two emigrants to America, Henrich and Leonhard Weydner, Jr., who emigrated in 1734 and 1741, still had claims on 365 florins and 3 batzen as their inheritance after deduction of the sextile tax. In a letter of May 14, 1765, Johann Heinrich Weydner of Oderheim inquired of his brother, Philipp Conrad Weydner, citizen, master cabinetmaker and glazier of Germantown near Philadelphia, for the address of the emigrants for the purpose of settling their inheritance. Later, in

Bergzabern in the Palatinate — engraving by Matthaeus Merian, from the Topographia Germaniae (1672).
1767-1768, there appeared as attorney for both brothers Philipp Odenwälder, who had emigrated to America and hailed from Weinheim on the Bergstrasse, to whom, according to an agreement to bring over the inheritance to his clients, there was finally turned over the sum of 339 florins 2 batzen and 8 pennies (August 22, 1768). The information on the emigration year of both Weydners is not free of contradictions. But that they were certainly in America is proved by a letter of both dated October 19, 1767, which is addressed to Friedrich Graf or Nicolaus Weidner in Odenheim, in which reference is made to the regulation of the inheritance business and the sending over of Philipp Odenwälder. Leonhard (Lenert) Weydner lived at that time at Easton in Northampton County, Pennsylvania, Henrich Weydner in Oxford (?) in Sussex County, New Jersey.

II. Frankenthal

[Frankenthal in the Palatinate can be located on the map between Worms and Ludwigshafen, a few miles northwest of Mannheim. In the 17th Century it received many Huguenot refugees after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685. This article listing seven emigrants of the 18th Century from Frankenthal is translated from Friedrich Krebs, "Amerikauwanderner des 18. Jahrhunderts aus der Stadt Frankenthal," Mitteilungen der Westdeutschen Gesellschaft für Familienkunde, XIX (1959), columns 577-580.—EDITOR.]

The few following names of emigrants were taken from the Ausfauteiakten (inventories, lists of property, and wills) of the City Archives of Frankenthal. As far as possible they have been supplemented through genealogical data from the church registers. As far as the arrival of the said emigrants in the port of Philadelphia can be documented in the published ship lists (Strassburger-Hinke, Pennsylvania German Pioneers), this information is given in parentheses. The list makes no claim of comprehensiveness.

1. Henrich Basler, son of Andreas Basler, citizen and master cartwright at Frankenthal and his wife Anna Catharina Schubard (Schuppert), "at this time gone to Pennsylvania and resident there" [dertahmen in die Böhnsylvaniam gereist und sesshaften allia] (Inventory No. 62, dated December 17, 1735). According to data in this inventory Andreas Basler must have died about 1730.

2. Johann Heinrich Chembenois—son of the Frankenthal citizen Jacob Chembenois (who died probably in 1767) and his wife Catharina Götz—"who is at this time in the New Land in America and is 18 years old"

[welcher dermahlen im Neuen Landt in America und 18 Jahr alt ist] (Inventory of Jacob Chembenois, No. 239, dated October 16, 1767). The family name was also written Chenebenois. A letter from the emigrant from the year 1779 has been published in the Monatschrift des Frankenthaler Allertumsvereins, 1:3 (1893), according to which he had settled in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, not far from the county seat of Lancaster.

3. Johann Christoph Hartmann, born August 30, 1744, at Frankenthal, son of Valentin Hartmann and his wife Elisabeth Catharina Bayer, married at Frankenthal April 23, 1767, Maria Susanna Böhm from Baumholder. He is described as "married and living in the New Land" [verheirathet und in dem neuen Landt wohnhaft] (Inventory No. 545, of Valentin Hartmann, dated October 15, 1767). Strassburger-Hinke, List 265 C: Christoph Hartmann.

4. Juliana Krick, daughter of the citizen and invalid Wilhelm Krick, who must have died at Frankenthal in 1782, was, according to data in his inventory (No. 768, dated January 31, 1782), married to the master baker Konrad Böhm and living in North America. A brother of Juliana Krick, Jeremias Krick, is, according to data in the inventory, said to have died in Batavia.

5. Johann Wilhelm Litschberg, born at Frankenthal December 23, 1740, son of the master tailor Johann Conrad Litschberg (Lotspeich) and his wife Catharina Elisabeth Wilhelmina Ladenberger (both married at Frankenthal, June 3, 1739), had settled in Virginia and married there, according to data in the inventory of Conrad Litschberg (No. 879, dated October 24, 1778). Conrad Litschberg died September 30, 1778, at Frankenthal. But according to data from the above source there had also emigrated to Virginia Johann Friderica Litschberg (born at Frankenthal March 25, 1744) and Johann Christoph Litschberg (born at Frankenthal July 11, 1750), sister and brother of Johann Wilhelm Litschberg. In any case it is documented of Johann Christoff Lotspeich that he landed at the port of Philadelphia in 1772 (Strassburger-Hinke, List 297 C). The family name is written sometimes Lotschberg, sometimes Lotspeich. Johann Conrad Litschberg, the emigrant's father, was the son of Johann Conrad Litschberg, master shoemaker from the district of Mahlberg in Baden-Baden, and therefore the first of the name in Frankenthal. The family is of the Lutheran confession. Perhaps in the case of this family, "Pennsylvania" is meant for "Virginia," since the references to place in the 18th Century documents are not always reliable.2

2Evidently they did settle in Virginia, where some of them were converted to Methodism. An early historian of Methodism tells us of "William Lotspeich, a German, born in Virginia, who, without extraordinary abilities, was a sound, studious, and useful preacher, and, from 1803 to 1813, traveled in Tennessee, Kentucky, and Ohio, and died in the latter year, saying, 'Tell my old friends all is well, all is well!'" (Abel Stevens, History of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States of America, IV, 434.—EDITOR.)
6. Johanna Petri, daughter of Johannes Petri and his wife Anna Weber, "who has already been absent 19 years and from what we hear, is said to be in the New Land" [welche bereits 19 Jahr abwesend und dem Vernehmen nach sich in dem neuen Land befinden soll] (Inventory No. 1070, of Johannes Petri, dated January 24, 1782). It is likely that other Petri families from Frankenthal also emigrated to America.

7. Johann Nicolaus Römer, son of the deceased citizen and master locksmith Wilhelm Römer (who died at Frankenthal February 26, 1740) and his wife Barbara. He is described as "gone to Pennsylvania" [in Pennsylvanien gezogen] (Inventory No. 1147, of Wilhelm Römer, dated April 20, 1758). Johann Nicolaus Römer landed at the port of Philadelphia in 1732 on the ship Loyal Judith (Strassburger-Hinke, List 24 A-C).

III. DISTRICT OF WEGENBURG, DUCHY OF ZWEIBRUCKEN

[The villages referred to in this emigrant list can be located on the Southern border of the Palatinate, South of Bergzabern and very near Weissenburg, across the border in Alsace. The original article by Dr. Krebs is entitled "Amerikauawanderer des 18. Jahrhunderts aus dem Gebiet des zweibrückischen Amts Wegenburg," and appeared in the Mitteilungen der Westdeutschen Gesellschaft für Familienkunde, XXIII (1968), columns 283-284.—EDITOR.]

The District of Wegenburg in the former Duchy of Zweibrücken consisted of the villages of Schönau, Hirschtal, Nothweiler and Rumbach, along with several outlying farms. The source for the following emigrants’ names was the Accounts of the Prefecture (Vogtei) of Wegenburg, also Akt Zweibrücken III Nr. 1838/II in the Palatinate State Archives at Speyer. The year of the accounts, in which the emigrants are mentioned, should almost always be identical with the year of emigration. As far as the said emigrants’ names could be located in the published ship lists (Strassburger-Hinke, Pennsylvania German Pioneers), this has been noted.

In 1737 the following villagers went to Pennsylvania: Georg Kern of Rumbach; Friedrich Neuhard of Rumbach; Michael Neuhard, a tailor, of Rumbach; Hans Georg Neuhard, single, of Rumbach; Christoph Schwenck of Rumbach; and finally Georg Hefft of Nothweiler. As date of emigration, May, 1737, is indicated almost throughout. We find Georg Hefft, Christoph Schwenck, George Kern, Michel Neuhard (Neihart), Georg Neuhard (Neihart), and also Friedrich Neuhard (Jerg Friedrich Neihart) listed as passengers on the Ship St. Andrew Galley which landed at Philadelphia in September, 1737, where they all took the oath of allegiance on September 26, 1737 (Strassburger-Hinke, List 47 A-C).

In 1738 Ulrich Stöckel of Hirschtal; Johannes Weinmüller, single, of Rumbach; and lastly Elisabeth Neuhard, daughter of Christoph Neuhard of Rumbach, likewise were permitted to go to Pennsylvania with official license. Of these only Johannes Weinmüller could be located in the ship lists. He landed at Philadelphia on the Ship Thistle in 1738 (Strassburger-Hinke, List 57 A-C).

In 1751 Nicolaus Wolff of Hirschtal was permitted to emigrate to America. This could be either Nicholas Wolff (Strassburger-Hinke, List 164 C), or Jo. Nicklas Wolff (List 175 C).

In 1753 Martin Schneider, Georg Friedrich Schneider, Maria Elisabeth Schneider and Heinrich Balthasar Schneider, and Johann Adam Bley, all of Rumbach, likewise Magdalena Weber from Schönau, were permitted to emigrate to America. Martin Schneider, aged 26, arrived at Philadelphia September 24, 1753 (Strassburger-Hinke, List 204 A). Likewise in 1755 Jacob Schneider from Nothweiler received permission to emigrate.

On June 1, 1786, the Zweibrücken Government decreed that the property of Michael and of Jacob Schneider of Rumbach, who had “already gone to America 20 years ago” [bereits vor 20 Jahren in America gezogen], as far as the same had been derived from what their parents had acquired, should be handed over to their brothers and sisters. But that part of the legacy which had come from the yielded property of the parents, was to be collected for the treasury.

By decree of April 23, 1765, the property of the brothers Wendel and Peter Scheid, Adam Neuhard, Jacob Schneider (Heinrich Schneider’s son), Henrich Schaub, Georg Bley and Catharina Bley (children of the deceased shepherd, Christoph Bley), all of Rumbach, also that of Catharina Imhoff (daughter of Hans Imhoff of Hirschtal), who was serving in Rumbach as a hired girl, was to be collected for the treasury, since in the past year they had left Rumbach and had evidently gone to the “New Land” without governmental permission. Of these only Henrich Schaub can be identified, as Joha. Henrich Schaub, passenger on the ship Sarah, which landed at Philadelphia in September, 1764 (Strassburger-Hinke, List 241 C). A decree of the government dated June 29, 1769, instructed the prefect (Vogt) at Schönau again to confiscate the property of the following who had secretly emigrated to America: Jacob Neuhard, Henrich and Michael Schneider (sons of Heinrich Schneider), Georg Bley and Catharina Bley (children of Christoph Bley), and Henrich Schaub (son of Balthasar Schaub), all of Rumbach. Since in the years 1763-1764 there was emigration from the Palatinate to Cayenne (French Guiana in South America), that country could possibly be intended in the documents when "America" is referred to.
We are indebted to Dr. Preston A. Barba, whose recent death represents great loss to Pennsylvania German scholarship, for calling to our attention our four sketches of winter scenes at Emmaus, Lehigh County, Pennsylvania. They were done by Rufus A. Grid, Moravian artist, in February and March, 1847, as appeared in Dr. Barba's They Came to Emmaus: History (Emmaus, Pennsylvania: Borough of Emma

A view in Emmaus, done March 26, 1847, showing the arched entrance to God's Acre at the foot of Third Street, with Dr. Christian Frederick Schultz's home on the right (no longer standing) and Sylvester Giering's shop on the left (his father, Thomas Giering, was a saddler).

This view, done February 22, 1847, shows Daniel Keck's white house (with log house attached on the left) and to the right, Dr. Samuel Wilson's barn and office. — Daniel Keck's house stood on lot no. 26, the second from the N.E. corner of Second and Main Streets, and the log house on the corner lot, present site of the now vacant Neimeyer store.
The Rufus A. Grider Sketches of Emmaus

A view in Emmaus, done February 25, 1847, as seen from the "Emaus Inn" (with one "m"!) at Second and Main Streets (later the site of the Exchange Hotel). Opposite is the Road (so the artist designated it in the margin of the original) to Kline's Mill on the Little Lehigh. The log house in the center is at the N.W. corner of Second and Main, where the Neimeyer residence, 203 Main Street, now stands. The house to the extreme left (with log stable to the rear) stands today as the Bowers residence, 209 Main Street.

A view done February 28, 1847, and called "A winter view near Emmaus" shows Jacob Tool's farm, no doubt the farm of Jacob Ehrenhardt, in whose log house Count Zinzendorf preached in 1742. The buildings no doubt date from the early 1800's. The farmhouse is believed to be the fine old stone house on South Keystone just across the Reading Railroad and the road winding up the hill a continuation of Second Street.
Emigrants from Dossenheim (Baden) 
In the 18th Century

By GABRIEL HARTMANN
Translated and Edited by DON YODER

[The following emigrant list, with its intriguing title, "Amerikafahrer von Dossenheim im 18. Jahrhundert," by Gabriel Hartmann of Heidelberg, was published in the series Mannheimer Geschichtsblätter, XXVII (1926), columns 55-58. The materials were extracted from the Family Register of the Reformed congregation of Dossenheim. Dossenheim, Handschuhsheim, and Schriesheim belonged in the 18th Century to the Electoral Palatinate. They are located today in Baden, in the West German state of Baden-Württemberg, and can be found on the map a few miles West of Mannheim and directly north of Heidelberg.—EDITOR.]

In 1761, when the Reformed pastor Kaiser of Handschuhsheim and Dossenheim on the Bergstrasse changed his residence, he wrote the following into the Dossenheim Church Register:

Just as this Dossenheim congregation during my almost 30 year service here has sharply diminished due to raging illnesses and especially the removal of many families to America and Jutland, so may the dear Lord through his grace increase it again in true members in the love of Jesus Christ [Gleich wie diese Dossenheimer Gemeind seit meiner fast 30 jährigen Bedienung wegen gräsernder Krankheiten und besonders Wegziehung vieler Familien nach Amerika und Jütland sehr vermindert worden, so wolle der liebe Gott durch seine Gnade sie wieder vermehren an wahren Gliedern in der Liebe Jesu Christi].

These anxious words of the departing minister had an only too serious and tragic background. Mysterious sicknesses had cut very deeply into the core of the congregation. Beginning with the year 1732 and in accordance with a governmental decree, the sicknesses of the deceased were listed, and the designations consumption (Absehrung), fever (hitzige Krankheit), dysentery and diarrhoea (rote und weisse Ruhr), and purples (weisse Friesen) appear very frequently here. Along with this came bad crop years and a monstrous tax levy. The Electoral Court engaged in all sorts of unprofitable fiscal experiments, like the raising of angora goats, for which honor Dossenheim was chosen. These animals had so to speak a free passport, could gad about at will to feed, wherever it suited them. Naturally through all this great damage was done to fields and vineyards, against which the peasants were unable to protect themselves. All of this turned a great part of the villagers against the homeland government. With sadness many must perhaps have remembered the tales of their parents and grandparents from the times under Karl Ludwig, when work was plentiful and people were happy. Then life still seemed to be worth living. The despair crept through the poverty-stricken huts of the village and many a one told himself: better an end to fear than fear without end.

Away, away from this hard-hearted abode, which to most had become a hell, was the watchword of many. For there was nothing left anymore to live, except hard compulsory labor. The tax vultures indeed took away everything.

It is characteristic of the conditions of that time and place, that the emigration involved not only the young people. There were old people involved too, who had long since passed the zenith of their life. They preferred to die abroad in an unknown land rather than in Karl Theodor's "paradise," and willingly lent their ear to the agents for the "New Land".

The first report of Dossenheim emigrants to America comes to us from the year 1749. Then came the notorious "Black Monday" of May 7, 1752, and the emigration of 1757; the last group of emigrants is mentioned in 1764.

It can be assumed as self understood that these unfortunate lower class farmers of a village that was at that time small, realized but little for their modest properties at the time of this mass flight, and the little that was left could scarcely reach farther than Southampton. There they at once got into a new slavery—the debt slavery of the shipping entrepreneur. The ships would certainly, according to our present day standards, have been the worst type of soul-destroyer, for on them only a very questionable maintenance was allotted to the redemptioners on their long voyage. The ship's sicknesses from that time speak on this question a very eloquent language.

The shipping entrepreneurs, despite their great intimacy with the Bible, were very smart business men, who did not want to take over too much risk with the freighting of their debt slaves.

According to the data from the aforementioned Fam-
ily Register of Dossenheim, we gather that these emigrants all arrived safely in the New World. There are even indications at hand that they were soon relieved of their debts. Of one it is reported that he went to Carolina in 1752, but came back. The year of his return is not indicated, but from this fact we can conclude that he came into some means, and he perhaps brought some along in order to manage, otherwise he would not have been able to pay his ship's debts and the return journey.

The following are the names of these emigrants to America from Dossenheim, as they are to be found in the documentary source listed above:

1749.
1. Johann Bär, Johann Georg Bär and his wife Anna Catharina, May 1749, went to the New Land, three persons.
2. [..........................] Reinsperger, born 1718, and his wife Anna Catharina, left May 16, 1749, for Pennsylvania or St. Mary's Land, two persons.
1752.
3. Johann Georg Bär, born 1706, and [his wife?] Eva Catharina Wedel, born 1706, left May 9, 1752, for Carolina, two persons.

4. Johann Michael Casper, born 1708, went to Carolina in 1752 without his wife and children, but came back, one person.

5. Johannes Fontius, born 1700, and his wife Anna Catharina, went with all eight children, with the exception of the oldest, Johann Georg, to Carolina, May 9, 1752, ten persons.

6. Johannes Federwolf and his wife Anna Catharina and three girls, went to the New Land circa 1752, five persons.

7. Johann Valentin Herder and his wife Anna Elisabeth and three children, to Carolina, May 9, 1752, five persons.

8. Johann Conrad Hungerbieler and his wife Maria Elisabeth and five children, to Carolina, May 9, 1752, seven persons. (The Hungerbielers had gone to the Electoral Palatinate from Thurgau in the second half of the 17th Century, settling in Schriesheim and Dossenheim.)

9. Johann Valentin Möll, born 1731, to Carolina, May 9, 1752, one person.

10. Johann Heinrich Möll and his wife Maria Catharina née Wedel, born 1711, with three daughters, to Carolina, May 9, 1752, five persons. (The Mölls, also
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spelled Möhl, still represented today in Dossenheim, settled in Dossenheim at the end of the 17th Century, stemming from Brüsswihl in Canton St. Gall.)

11. Johann Michael Klein and his wife Susanna née Oberle, to Carolina, May 9, 1752, two persons.
12. Johann Heinrich Scholl, born 1718, and his sister Maria Barbara Scholl, born 1721, to Carolina, two persons.
13. Anna Margaretha Stief, born 1715, Anna Clara Stief, born 1718, and Anna Christine Stief, born 1726, to Carolina, May 9, 1752, three persons.
14. Anna Maria Wedel with her child, to Carolina, May 9, 1752, two persons.
15. Georg Wedel and his wife Anna Barbara née Schlepp, born 1691, with two children, to Carolina, May 9, 1752, four persons.
16. Johannes Werner, born 1702, and his wife Anna Elisabeth née Impfinger, with seven children, to Carolina, May 9, 1752, nine persons.
1757.
17. Johann Georg Bör, with wife and five children, to Carolina, seven persons.
1764.
18. Johannes Dreher, born 1722, and his wife Anna Margaretha, with five children, went to America 1764 (in another citation: "to Philadelphia in the English territories" [ins Engländische nach Philadelphia], seven persons. [Johannes Trehr arrived at Philadelphia in October, 1764 on the Ship Hero (Strassburger-Hinke, Pennsylvania German Pioneers, List 248 C).]
19. Petronella Dreher, born 1697, née Loscher, to Philadelphia 1764 (apparently the mother of Johannes Dreher), one person.

21. Johann Peter Wedel and his wife Anna Sybilla, née Her, went to the New Land, to Maryland, May 7, 1764, two persons. [Petter Wedel, with Johannes Trehr (No. 18, above) arrived at Philadelphia on the Ship Hero in October 1764 (Strassburger-Hinke, List 248 C).]

(WITHOUT DATE.)
22. Mayor [Bürgermeister] Valentin and his wife Susanna Elisabeth and seven children, to America, nine persons.
Total = 84 persons.

Now what became of these 84 homeland-weary emigrants on the other side of the big water? No "song, no heroes' book" reports of them. Not even an "Astor" appears to have arisen from among them. But perhaps somewhere in South Carolina or Pennsylvania the young lads still hold the mock court in the village meadow [Bannweidubengericht] before the village festivals, where they sit in judgment, tongue in cheek, over every sinner who has transgressed the field rules, and consider the atonement money that they rake in as a highly welcome contribution to the common festival celebration. Or somewhere in the United States perhaps the youth still practice the crabapple dance [Holzapfeltanz], and no one remembers anymore that these amusements were brought along from Dossenheim, where they are still practiced.*

In the year 1762 the Reformed pastor Johann Jakob Waltz from Handschuhsheim assumed the Dossenheim congregation also. As answer, so to speak, to those melancholy words of the departing clergyman Kaiser, cited above, he wrote the following in the church register:

Jehovah grant that as this Dossenheim congregation has hitherto decreased, it may henceforth again increase and reveal itself indeed as true members of the congregation of Jesus Christ.

The increase of the congregation had to wait, though, almost a century. New storms of war, new heavy emigrations to the Crimea (or, as it stands in the registers, the "Island of Crimea" [Insel Grienna], and to Russian Poland, did not let the congregation prosper.

In conclusion I wish to express my thanks to Church Councilman Kappler of Dossenheim for his friendly kindness in making the church registers available.

*John Jacob Astor was born in the nearby village of Waldorf, south of Heidelberg, in 1763. He founded the Astor dynasty in the United States and Britain. The name of his home village was preserved for many years in New York's Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, and has come into international cuisine in the form of Waldorf Salad.—EDITOR.

*The author was a bit too optimistic about the transplantations of specific cultural forms from the small village cultures of Europe to the new world setting. Since the village concept and its culture was in most cases not transplanted with the 18th Century emigrants, there was little or no transplantation of the village festivals that are so much a part of European village life.—EDTIVOR.
The University of Pennsylvania Folklore and Folk-life Archive needs materials on the use of space in the various ethnic cultures of Pennsylvania. In connection with our publication in this issue of Dr. Lee Charles Hopple’s work on the Amish use of space, from his dissertation (Spatial Development and Internal Spatial Organization of the Southeastern Pennsylvania Plain Dutch Community, Ph.D. dissertation in Geography, The Pennsylvania State University, 1971), we hereby request our readers to help the further study of spatial patterns in Pennsylvania by drawing (1) approximate maps of the layouts of the homestead farm where they grew up, or where they now reside, and (2) layout plans of the house and barn on the farm involved. On these maps and plans please indicate the following:

1. Location. Give the Post Office address, and the road locations of the farm.

2. Orientation. Indicate the orientation of house and barn to the major roads in the area. Road network: where do these major roads lead? Indicate also the presence of earlier roads on the farm, once public, now private, leading to neighboring farms. Are there also abandoned roads on the farm, in the woods, or evidence of trails once used that are no longer public routes?

3. Community Network, I. Indicate on your layout map the approximate distance, and direction to: (a) the church or meetinghouse your family attended, (b) the country school, (c) the post office, (d) the store, (e) the mill, (f) the blacksmith shop, (g) the railroad station, and other trade or social centers of the 19th Century civilization.

4. Community Network, II. On what social basis was the farm community set up? What relationships did your farm and family have with the neighboring farms and families? With whom did you have the nearest relationships (church contacts, relatives, neighbors)? With which of these did you exchange work, tools, visits, social occasions? Were there occasions on which the entire neighborhood came together in work or leisure?

5. Field Layouts. Draw an approximate layout map of the fields on the farm involved, showing relation to buildings, streams, woodlots, forests, and roads. Did any of the fields have names?

6. Abandoned Buildings. Old farms with a long history often show evidence of previous settlements, now abandoned. Were there ever any additional homesteads on the farm which you are describing. For example, in several of my own ancestral farms there were in my boyhood days traces of earlier houses, on abandoned roads, at clearings in the woods, or by mountain springs, representing earlier but now abandoned living sites. Even when all trace of the buildings is gone, there are telltale signs that certain spots were once homesteads. List these if relevant to the property you are describing.

7. Location of the House and its Outbuildings. Draw a map showing the location of the house in relation to its appended gardens, summer kitchen, grape arbor, well or springhouse, cave or ground cellar, out-house or privy, woodshed, bakeoven, or other structures that were associated with the house.

8. Location of the Barn and its Outbuildings. Draw a map showing the location of the barn in relation to its adjoining barnyard, carriage sheds, pig pens, chicken houses, corn cribs, additional stabling (horse barn in some areas) and hay barns. If the barn complex is drawn on a separate sheet of paper from the house complex, please indicate the relationship between the two.

9. Layout of the House. Draw a layout map of both stories of the farmhouse, naming the rooms, and describing their use. If your house had two front doors, was that the reason ascribed to this phenomenon? What sort of cellar did the house have under it and what use was it put to? What sort of attic or garret did the house have and what use was it put to? If the house had fireplaces (used or unused), please indicate them. Did the house have closets for clothing, or were clothes-presses used? Did the house have shutters? If so, were they functional, i.e., were they actually used?

10. Layout of the Barn. Draw a layout map of both levels of the barn, naming the sections. Were other animals besides cows and horses ever kept in the stables? In some areas the barns contained food storage areas, ham closets, stone arched cellars. Indicate these and describe them if relevant.

We realize that putting this data into the form of layout maps may be difficult and time-consuming. If you prefer to describe the layout in written form, that material will also be quite acceptable. For the best results both approaches will be necessary.

Send your replies to:

Dr. Don Yoder
College Hall Box 36
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104
An invitation to become a subscriber to the Society's periodical PENNSYLVANIA FOLKLIFE, now in its twenty-second year, published five times annually, in Fall, Winter, Spring and Summer, plus a colorful Folk Festival supplement. Each issue appears in a colored cover, with 48 pages of text, and is profusely illustrated. Subjects covered include: architecture, cookery, costume, customs of the year, folk art and antiques, folk dancing, folk medicine, folk literature, folk religion, folk speech, home-making lore, recreation, superstitions, traditional farm and craft practices, transportation lore and numerous others.

The purpose of the Pennsylvania Folklife Society, a non-profit corporation, is three-fold: collecting and displaying the lore of the Dutch Country and Pennsylvania; studying and archiving it; and making it available to the public.