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The traditional arts and crafts of the Pennsylvania Germans constitute a unique and important type of American folk art. What began a century ago as an excited discovery of Pennsylvania German folk art led initially to an equally frenzied search for antiques. During recent decades, however, something new and exciting has arisen from the taste for Pennsylvania German popular art. Beginning uncertainly in the late 1920’s and gathering momentum in the 1940’s, there has been a revival of interest in the crafts themselves and a growing effort to rediscover and preserve craft techniques. The origins and achievements of the crafts revival will be the subject of the present paper. More particularly, the present study will seek to convey some impression of the artists who are involved in this movement and the kinds of craft work which they produce.

Until the middle of the nineteenth century, most households in rural Pennsylvania were furnished with the products of cottage industries. The situation began to change, however, as the increasing availability of industrially produced goods brought in its wake the extinction of many traditional crafts. By the end of the nineteenth century, perceptive observers had begun to take note of the situation and to lament the decline of the popular arts. There was a suddenly heightened awareness of all kinds of American folk art.

One of the first scholars to draw attention to Pennsylvania German art was Edwin Atlee Barber (1851-1916), who collected antique pottery for the Philadelphia Museum of Art and in 1903 published his classic study, Tulip Ware of the Pennsylvania German Potters. Another early enthusiast for Pennsylvania German folk art was Henry Chapman Mercer (1856-1930), who studied Pennsylvania German pottery, calligraphy, and decorative cast iron. Since Mercer’s time notable contributions to the understanding of Pennsylvania German folk art have been made by a number of investigators, including John Joseph Stoudt, Henry J. Kaufman, Frances Lichten, and Earl Robacker.

The early twentieth century witnessed a progressive intensification of interest in all types of American folk art and a dramatic rise in the prices paid for antiques.
In time, the better pieces have tended to disappear from the market and find their way into museums and private collections. Today the leading institutional repositories for Pennsylvania German folk art are the Philadelphia Museum of Art, the Henry Francis du Pont Winterthur Museum (near Wilmington, Delaware), the Abbey Aldrich Rockefeller Folk Art Collection (at Williamsburg, Virginia), and the Metropolitan Museum of Art (in New York City).

With the increasing scarcity and rising cost of American folk art antiques, the collector today finds two roads open to him. On the one hand, he may seek out utilitarian objects, such as agricultural tools, which have been overlooked by the first wave of collectors. On the other hand, he may turn to the collection of modern pieces which imitate earlier craft traditions.

The interest of collectors has been one of the factors which has supported the modern revival of work in the traditional crafts. There have, however, been other factors. There is, for example, the unique role played by the Pennsylvania Farm Museum of Landis Valley, near Lancaster. This institution, established originally to display the antique collection of the brothers George and Henry Landis, now offers crafts demonstrations and crafts courses as an important part of its program. Another institution which has done much to promote interest in traditional Pennsylvania crafts is the annual Kutztown Folk Festival. Since crafts demonstrations constitute an integral part of the annual festival, the festival has fostered public interest in the crafts revival and has served as a meeting place for contemporary craftsmen. An important event in the Kutztown Folk Festival is its annual quilting competition, which receives hundreds of entries each year. Similar to the Kutztown Folk Festival is the annual Goschenhoppen Folk Festival held near Pottsville. The crafts revival has also received considerable support from crafts organizations such as the Pennsylvania Guild of Craftsmen, the Bucks County Guild of Craftsmen, and the Reading-Berks Guild of Craftsmen. Though not all members of these organizations are interested in traditional craft techniques and styles, the crafts associations perform an important function by regularly holding crafts exhibitions and by awarding prizes for outstanding work.

I would now like to consider in turn a number of specific crafts. In doing so, my main interest will be to discuss some of the best work now being done in each craft category and to mention some of the outstanding craftsmen in each field. In passing, however, it will sometimes be convenient to add a few remarks about the historical background of each craft and some of its most notable early practitioners in Pennsylvania. When the occasion presents itself, I will also mention some of the people who have been responsible for the modern revival of each craft category.

Pottery was perhaps the first traditional Pennsylvania craft to be called back to life by the modern interest in traditional Pennsylvania folk art. One of the earliest potters of the crafts revival was Jacob Medinger of Montgomery County. Medinger was a folk potter who grew up making utilitarian redware but turned, toward the end of his life, to making quality reproductions of antique pieces. In 1932 he was killed in an accident while tending his kiln. Working at about the same time as Medinger were the brothers Isaac and Thomas Stahl, two other pioneers in the revival of traditional Pennsylvania pottery who lived and worked at Powder Valley, a remote hamlet in Lehigh County south of Allentown. Sometime prior to 1941, Mrs. C. Naaman Keyser of Plymouth Meeting, Pennsylvania began making decorated pottery of the traditional Pennsylvania German type. As the publisher of an important series of crafts course booklets, Mrs. Keyser also played a role in the revival of several other traditional Pennsylvania crafts.

A sgraffito plate by Dorothy Long of Wayne, Pennsylvania available from the Museum Shop of the Philadelphia Museum of Art. The plate is a reproduction of an 1813 original by Henry Roudabush.

Lester Breininger, one of the best known potters of the crafts revival, sits on the veranda of his home in Robesonia.
Several Pennsylvania potters are currently making redware pottery in the Pennsylvania folk art tradition. One of the most interesting of these is Dorothy Long of Wayne, who has made excellent reproductions of several antique pie plates for the museum shop at the Philadelphia Museum of Art. Lester Breininger of Robesonia is a high school teacher who, with his wife Barbara, produces redware pieces of a variety of types. The Breingiers make figured sgraffito pieces, plates with simple slip decoration, and dishes decorated with combed slip. All of their pottery authentically reflects the Pennsylvania German folk art tradition.

Another extremely interesting contemporary potter is Carl Ned Foltz, who runs a full-time pottery near the village of Reinholds. Foltz, a former crafts teacher, is not only a remarkable potter, but also a skillful graphic artist, basket maker, and candle maker. Although his redware pottery reflects the traditions of Pennsylvania German folk art, Foltz tends to avoid exact reproductions of antique pieces and instead creates original pieces, many of which reflect his own unique style of design. Two other contemporary potters who produce slipware of the traditional type are Walter L. Shunk and Philip A. Richards.

Daniel Strawser stands outside his home in Stouchsburg and displays two characteristic examples of his woodcarving skill, a bird tree and a carved eagle of the Schimmel type.

Another traditional craft which has been affected by the modern revival is woodcarving. An outstanding contemporary woodcarver is Daniel Strawser, who lives in the village of Stouchsburg near Womelsdorf. Strawser’s work owes an obvious debt to the work of Wilhelm Schimmel, a famous itinerant folk whittler of the late nineteenth century. Like Schimmel, Strawser
specializes in animal figures, including figures of eagles with spread wings. His carvings are generally painted with polychrome decoration, much of this work being done by his talented wife Barbara. The Strawbers are also well known for their bird trees, which are similar to those made in Berks County at the end of the last century by an itinerant cane maker known as "Shtock sings tzl Simmons." In each bird tree, several painted wooden bird figures are mounted on an upright sassafras branch.12

Another contemporary woodcarver is Bill Andes of Lancaster, who comes from a long line of craftsmen. Now close to eighty years old, Mr. Andes can often be seen working at the Pennsylvania Farm Museum, where he teaches folk whittling and is a regular crafts demonstrator.

Folk whittler Bill Andes demonstrating his craft at the Pennsylvania Farm Museum.

When Pennsylvania German country antiques became fashionable with collectors during the early twentieth century, examples of Pennsylvania folk furniture were among the most sought after items. Much, but not all, furniture of this type is painted and decorated with stenciled designs. Two other characteristic types of Pennsylvania folk furniture are the unpainted cabinet with decorative punched tin panels and the small undecorated hanging cabinet, sometimes made for hanging in a corner. With antique specimens now in short supply, a number of modern craftsmen are presently making good, individually produced modern reproductions of both types of furniture.

Possibly the most famous type of Pennsylvania folk furniture, however, is the colorful dower chest, the best known pieces having been produced by early nineteenth-century masters such as Jacob Schelli and John Maser.13 Stunningly attractive reproductions of several such chests are currently being manufactured at Toccoa, Georgia by the Habersham Plantation Company, while similar work is being done by several individual craftsmen. Among modern furniture makers who have demonstrated their craft at the Kutztown Folk Festival are Bruce Nunemacher, William H. Heinrich, and Barry McFarland. Several contemporary Pennsylvania craftsmen make Windsor chairs, a type of furniture which originated in seventeenth-century England but which was introduced into Pennsylvania at an early date. Two such chair makers are Drew Lausch of Ephrata and Sam Laity, whose family includes several generations of furniture makers.14

Traditional Pennsylvania metalcraft includes several specific crafts, such as ironcasting, coppersmithing, tinsmithing, pewtercasting, blacksmithing, and whitesmithing. Several early Pennsylvania metalworkers occupy a preeminent position among American craftsmen of the colonial period, the pewterers Joshua Metzger, Johann Christopher Heyne, and William Will being particularly well known. Heinrich Wilhelm Stiegel, a colonial entrepreneur who is best known for his work in glass, also worked for several years at an iron furnace in Lancaster which produced cast-iron stoves with decorative panels. The Country Iron Foundry at Paoli is currently producing beautiful reproductions of eighteenth-century cast iron stove plates and firebacks.

Among contemporary Pennsylvania blacksmiths are Ernie Fredericks of Kutztown and John D. Tyler of Carlisle. A different sort of metalcraft is practiced, however, by Thomas G. Loose, a high school crafts teacher who lives in the village of Dauberville near Womelsdorf. Loose comes from a family which once operated a blacksmith shop, but he himself is a whitesmith, a metalworker who forges ladles, skewers, pie-cutters, and other implements of a bright, reflective color. Loose is presently hard at work building a new forge next to his home and he regrets the fact that his various activities prevent him from spending more time

Charles Messner, tinsmith, at the Kutztown Folk Festival.
working at his craft.\(^{14}\)

Another notable contemporary metalworker is Jay Thomas Stauffer, a pewterer who lives near Lititz. Stauffer, an expert die maker, specializes in making cast pewter tableware, plates, and dishes which are exact reproductions of museum pieces.

One of the most characteristic metalcrafts of nineteenth-century Pennsylvania was the craft of tinsmithing. Early Pennsylvania tinsmiths produced a variety of utilitarian objects, including coffee pots, candle holders, lamps, and cookie cutters. A few of the more elaborate pieces were signed, though in most cases we know little about the artisans who produced these wares. Among modern Pennsylvania craftsmen working in this field are Horman Foose of Fleetwood and Charles Messner of Denver, Pennsylvania.\(^{16}\)

Closely related to the craft of tinsmithing is the craft of tole painting.\(^{17}\) Toleware is tinware which has been colored with a dark background before adding a painted decoration. The most commonly encountered toleware objects are trays, tea boxes, pots, and mugs. Tole painting was not one of the crafts which the Pennsylvania Germans brought with them from Europe, but the technique was introduced into Pennsylvania at an early date. Among the most esteemed early tole painters in Pennsylvania were the eighteenth-century craftsmen Henry Degenhardt and Conrad Babb, both of whom lived in Reading. Jacob Eichholz, another early master of this art, lived in Lancaster at the beginning of the nineteenth century. One of the best contemporary tole painters is Eleanor Charles, who has her own shop in Sunbury.

Very similar to toleware painting is the craft of wood decoration.\(^{18}\) Some artists, including Bea Minton, Mabel Wells, and Evelyn Spanninger, regularly work in both wood and tin decoration. As we have noted above, painted decoration often occurs in connection with both folk furniture and folk woodcarving in Pennsylvania. We may now add that colorful painted decoration is also commonly found in small wooden objects such as pails and salt boxes. One contemporary craftsman, George Kline, likes to work with small pieces of furniture such as footstools.

One of the early masters of polychrome decorated woodware was the Lancaster woodturner Joseph Lehn (1798-1892). Lehn made small lidded containers such as saffron boxes. Two other famous early craftsmen were Heinrich Bucher of Berks County, who produced tulip-decorated boxes, and John Drissel, who produced decorated salt boxes at the end of the eighteenth century.

Commercially produced wooden boxes similar to Lehnware can now be found in gift shops in eastern Pennsylvania, while individually made pieces are being fashioned by craftsmen such as Jacob Brubaker of Landisville. An outstanding contemporary wood painter is Linda Brooke Baxter of Harmony, Rhode Island, whose figure-decorated bentwood boxes are masterfully executed examples of the modern revival of early American crafts. Another contemporary wood decorator is John Claypoole of Lenhartsville, who specializes in the art of traditional Pennsylvania barn decorations. These decorative painted figures, commonly known as “hex signs,” are often seen on barns in the eastern counties of Pennsylvania. Claypoole, however, paints his decorative figures on wooden panels which the buyer can take home and hang on his wall. Claypoole learned his craft from Johnny Ott, a celebrated hex sign artist who died in 1964.

A less widely known type of decorative painting is the art of reverse glass painting. Although traditional Pennsylvania examples of this art seem primitive by comparison with examples found in Bohemia and Austria, the craft of reverse glass painting has a venerable history in Pennsylvania. Some of the artists who are currently working in this medium are David W. Gottschall of Womelsdorf, Lynn Pleet of Lebanon, and Barbara Strawser of Stouchsburg. Claudia Hopf, who is best known for her work in scissors cutting, has also taken an interest in reverse glass painting and has combed museum collections in Germany, Switzerland, and Austria in search of examples.

There are various textile crafts, including needlework, fabric stenciling, quilting, and several types of rug making. Among the most characteristic products of early Pennsylvania needlework are cross-stitched “show towels.”\(^{19}\) A number of contemporary craftsmen, such as Sue Garret and Evelyn Mentzner, do traditional Pennsylvania needlework. Several types of floor coverings were used in early Pennsylvania, including woven, braided, and hooked rugs. Maude Zane, who lives in an eighteenth-century farmhouse near Gap, Pennsylvania, specializes in making hooked rugs, a craft which she teaches at the Pennsylvania Farm Museum.\(^{20}\) Another crafts teacher at the museum is Mae Breneman, who specializes in braided rugs. Still another type of traditional floor covering is made by Evelyn Althouse of Ephrata, who makes floor mats from braided corn husks.

The art of patchwork quilting is, of course, a characteristically American folk art. Contemporary Pennsylvania quilts are much in demand and some quilts, such as the deep-hued quilts made by Amish craftsmen, command high prices.\(^{21}\) Among the many craftsmen active in the field, we mention only Doris Rixinger, who teaches quilting at the Pennsylvania Farm Museum.

Spinning, weaving, and dyeing are also among Pennsylvania crafts which have enjoyed a revival.\(^{22}\) Some of the items most in demand are blue and white hand-loomed coverlets. Among contemporary weavers are John F. Dreibelbis, Perma Dreibelbis, and William Leinbach. Two other expert weavers are Helen Weit of Ephrata and Lyn Jackson of Bedford.
Two other craftsmen who work with textiles are Marjorie S. Yoder and Marie E. DeVerter, both of whom are specialists in theorem painting. This craft, a technique in which stencils are used to paint designs on velvet, is not really characteristic of Pennsylvania German folk art, although the craft was practiced in Pennsylvania during the last century. Marjorie Yoder, who lives in Morgantown, is a versatile craftsman who has also taught wood graining techniques at the Pennsylvania Farm Museum.

The art of decorative penmanship is one of the best-known and most characteristic Pennsylvania folk arts. Colorfully illuminated household blessings, baptismal certificates and the like were an integral part of Pennsylvania German folk life in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Beginning in the early nineteenth century, however, printed certificates began to make their appearance. Certificates of this type were intended to be filled in by the purchaser and colored by hand. The designs found on these so-called Fraktur-Schriften, whether of the penned or printed type, characteristically utilize motifs which can also be encountered in other types of Pennsylvania German folk decoration, such as painted furniture. Among the most recurrent design motifs are flowers (such as the tulip and rose), various bird motifs (including particularly the pelican and parrot), conventionalized hovering angels, and the star motif. The star motif is, of course, particularly characteristic of barn decoration, though it also appears in quilts and punched tin work.

Among the early masters of Pennsylvania folk penmanship was Heinrich Otto, who lived in Lancaster at the end of the eighteenth century. Another early master was Christopher Dock, a schoolmaster who presented his better pupils with meticulously penned certificates of merit. During the early twentieth century several Pennsylvania artists were among the pioneers of the crafts revival. High quality reproductions of early Pennsylvania fraktur were produced by such artists as Irving Mensch, Stuart Heilman, J.D. Sauder, and Fred Bowers.

A distinctive style of early Pennsylvania penmanship appears in the illuminated manuscripts and wall hangings produced at the Ephrata cloister. The manuscript illumination practiced at Ephrata was, however, of such a high order of sophistication that it cannot really be characterized as a type of folk art.

Among the undisputed contemporary masters of Pennsylvania calligraphy is Rosalia Smith, who has made an intensive study of every type of early Pennsylvania penmanship, including the Ephrata style of manuscript illumination. Another well-known artist in this field is Lois Harting. Two other contemporary calligraphers are Amelia Currie of Ambler and Meryl Griffiths of Lancaster.

Closely akin to the art of illuminative penmanship is the art of scherenschnitte, or scissors cutting, which appears to have been introduced into Pennsylvania from Switzerland. Among the early practitioners of the art in Pennsylvania was Christian Stenge, who worked in Lancaster County at the end of the eighteenth century. The Pennsylvania Farm Museum of Landis Valley possesses a unique collection of early specimens.

Claudia Hopf, a native of Cincinnati who now lives in Salem, Massachusetts, occupies a preeminent position in the field of scissor cutting. Her interest in scissor cutting goes back to 1969, when she saw an example

An example of the cut paper work done by Arlene France of Littitz, Pennsylvania.
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which was on loan to the Pennsylvania Farm Museum from the Metropolitan Museum of Art. Mrs. Hopf is a gifted and versatile artist who also has an interest in illuminative penmanship and reverse glass painting.

Another highly gifted artist in this field is Arlene France, a native of Elgin, Illinois who now lives in Lititz. Her work, which characteristically shows black figures silhouetted against a white background, has been exhibited at numerous art shows, including shows sponsored by the Baltimore Museum of Art and the Philadelphia Museum of Art. In 1977 and 1978 she won prizes for her work at exhibits sponsored by the Pennsylvania Guild of Craftsmen.

![Scratch-decorated eggs by Evelyn Althouse illustrating heart and leaf design motifs.](image1)

The art of egg decoration is found in many countries and is, of course, particularly associated with Easter. Evelyn Althouse of Ephrata is a master of the traditional Pennsylvania style of egg decoration, which she learned as a child from her mother. The technique she uses is called “egg scratching” (pier gützele in the dialect). Because the eggs are meant to be kept permanently rather than consumed, they are first treated by slow simmering for up to two hours, a technique which shrinks the yoke, allowing it to dry out completely after several months. The eggs are stained using natural colors and the colors are fixed by using alum or vinegar as a mordant. Finally, the design is applied by scratching away part of the color to reveal the white background. Mrs. Althouse originally used onion skins to give a brown color to the eggs, but she now also uses a variety of other vegetable dyes, such as apple bark, lily-of-the-valley leaves, and sassafras. Her work has been widely exhibited and in 1971 she received a first prize at the Ephrata Farm Show. It usually takes her two to three hours to complete an egg, though some designs, such as those executed on goose eggs, may require a day or more. A variety of design motifs are used, the most characteristic being small-leaf figures, cross-hatched geometric figures, birds, and hearts. Another contemporary egg decorator is Barbara Bomberger.

![Ed Mosheim makes baskets at the Goschenhoppen Folk Festival.](image2)

The art of making hand-made baskets has been generally on the decline in the United States during recent years, with imported baskets being increasingly used to fill domestic demands. One of the few Pennsylvania craftsmen who has tried to keep this craft alive is Carl Ned Foltz, who is better known for his work as a potter. Foltz makes baskets of rye straw and has given demonstrations of this craft at the Kutztown Folk Festival. Ollie Strawser, who died in 1961, was a full-time basket maker whose willow baskets are now collector’s items. Fred Bieber, another notable basket maker of recent memory, preferred to work with split oak which he prepared on the schnitzelbank, a type of planer’s bench traditionally used for this purpose in Pennsylvania.

There are, of course, still other traditional crafts that may be mentioned. Traditional gunsmithing, for example, is an important craft and gunsmiths such as Paul E. Forster make reproductions of antique Pennsylvania rifles. Traditional leathercraft is taught at the Pennsylvania Farm Museum by Harry Breneman. The craft of making bandboxes, bent cardboard boxes covered with decorative paper, is being kept alive by Marjorie Dexheimer and Marie Gottschall. It is also gratifying to note in this age of plastics that at least one craftsman, G. Atlee Crouse, has been making nicely fashioned horn cups of a traditional type. Among the
minor crafts which have recently experienced a revival is the production of chalkware figurines. Such figurines, which were once sold by itinerant peddlars, are made of painted plaster of Paris and typically represent animals, such as squirrels. Modern reproductions of such pieces can now be found in Pennsylvania gift shops. The craft of hand-blown glass has also survived, and occasionally one meets with excellent reproduction pieces, such as those offered for sale by the museum shop at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York.

Unfortunately, some traditional crafts have apparently succumbed to the changed conditions of modern times. The art of wagon building, for example, now appears to be extinct, though the Pennsylvania Germans were once famous for their work in this craft. Traditional clockmaking techniques and building techniques have also apparently been superceded.

For someone interested in purchasing modern reproductions of American folk art antiques, a good place to start looking is in a museum gift shop. The Weathervane Gift Shop at the Pennsylvania Farm Museum offers an outstanding selection of traditional crafts. Two other museum shops which deserve particular praise are those at the Mercer Museum in Doylestown and the Winterthur Museum near Wilmington, Delaware. Some museum shops, including those at the Metropolitan Museum of Art and the Philadelphia Museum of Art, accept mail orders and will provide an illustrated catalog on request.

Another good place to look for traditional Pennsylvania crafts is at a crafts association show or at one of the annual folk festivals. A visit to the studio of an individual craftsman can also be an exciting experience, though the collector should be warned that some craftsmen find their work in such demand that they are months behind in filling orders.

Throughout the United States there are many indications that the crafts revival has met with widespread acceptance. Color photographs of contemporary works done in traditional style appear regularly in popular magazines such as Country Living and in more specialized periodicals such as the Antique Monthly. Contemporary workmanship in the traditional crafts now has the encouragement of a discerning public and there appears to be a bright future outlook for the crafts revival.

**ENDNOTES**

The present paper was originally written for a slide lecture presented in April 1980 as part of a symposium held at the Institute for Texas Cultures in San Antonio, Texas. I wish to express my gratitude to the American Philosophical Society, which has helped to support my research on Pennsylvania German folk art through a
grant-in-aid from the Penrose Fund. I also wish to thank the following craftsmen, who were visited personally during a research trip to Pennsylvania: Evelyn Althouse (Ephrata), Lester Breininger (Robesonia), Carl Ned Foltz (Reinholds), Thomas G. Loose (Dauberville), Jay Thomas Stauffer (Litzit), Daniel Strawser (Stouchsburg), Helen Weit (Ephrata), and Maude Zane (Gap). I also wish to express my appreciation to the following craftsmen whom I have not met personally but who were gracious in answering my questions through correspondence: John Claypoole (Lenhartsville), Amelia Beth Currie (Ambler), Donald Esbenshade (High Spire), Arlene France (Lititz), Meryl Griffiths (Lancaster), Claudia Hopf (Salem, Massachusetts), Bea Minton (Pottsville), David Sharp (Bethlehem), Walter Shunk (Emanuel), John D. Tyler (Carlisle), and Marjorie S. Yoder (Morgantown). I likewise wish to acknowledge the help received from Mr. A. Christian Revi, editor of the magazine *Spinning Wheel*, from Emil W. Peters of the Bucks County Guild of Craftsmen, and from Peg Zecher of the Kutztown Folk Festival.


The following are some of the many people who have taught craft courses or served as craft demonstrators at the Pennsylvania Farm Museum: Evelyn Althouse (egg decoration), Bill Andes (whitilling), Mae Brenceman (rug braiding), Claudia Hopf (scissors cutting), Philip Kelly (tinsmithing), Drew Lausch (woodworking), Evelyn Mentzer (embroidery), Philip Richards (pottery), Doris Riecker (quilting), Hazel Riggs (chair caning), Wayne Rowe (weaving), Rosalita Smith (manuscript illumination), and Maude Zane (rug hooking).

Some of the many persons who have served in recent years as crafts demonstrators at the Kutztown Folk Festival are the following: Robert Blanchard (pottery), Barbara Bomberger (egg decoration), Lester Breininger (pottery), Eleanor Charles (tole painting), John Claypoole (box sign painting), Marie E. DeVerter (theorem painting), John F. Dreibleib (weaving), Perma Dreibleib (spinning and weaving), Earl and Ada Robacker (boraczk), Herman Foos (tinsmithing), David Gottschall (reverse glass painting), Marie Gottschall (band box making), Harry Haupt (blacksmithing), William Heinrich (woodworking), Marie E. Kahl (chair caning), Philip Kelly (metalcraft), Sam Laity (woodworking), Web Latuer (tinsmithing), William Leinbach (weaving), Barry McFarland (woodworking), Charles Messner (tinsmithing), Ross Miller (pottery), Bruce Nunnemaker (cabinetmaking), Walter L. Shunk (pottery), Evelyn Spanninger (tole painting), Abram Stauffer (candle making), Jay Thomas Stauffer (pewter casting), Bruce Udpegde (woodcarving), Frank Udpegde (woodcarving), Mabel Wells (tole painting), and W. Dean Wright (leathercraft).


Mildred W. Keyser (Mrs. C. Naaman Keyser) published these booklets at Plymouth Meeting, Pennsylvania between 1943 and 1947. Some of the contributors to the series were: R. H. Dundore (painted furniture), Elizabeth Swartz Hoke (reverse glass painting and tole painting), Mildred W. Keyser (design, pottery), Frances Lichten (dover chairs), Richard Montgomery (architecture), Bernice B. Osborne (spinning and dyeing), Guy F. Reinert (woven coverlets and baskettry), and John J. Stoudt (barn decoration).


Henry A. Christen Revi, editor of the magazine *Antique Collectors*, 2:9:21-25 (February 1979). See also the unsigned article "Genuine Pennsylvania German Ware," Powder Valley Men Who Produce This Ware," *Bulletin of the American Ceramic Society*, 19:12:22-24 (January 1940), reprinted from the *Reading Eagle* (June 18, 1939).

Mildred W. Keyser (Mrs. C. Naaman Keyser) published these booklets at Plymouth Meeting, Pennsylvania between 1943 and 1947. Some of the contributors to the series were: R. H. Dundore (painted furniture), Elizabeth Swartz Hoke (reverse glass painting and tole painting), Mildred W. Keyser (design, pottery), Frances Lichten (dover chairs), Richard Montgomery (architecture), Bernice B. Os-
The Scotch-Irish have been the ethnic group most associated with frontier settlement, the group that in the eighteenth century conquered the Appalachian frontier, especially in Pennsylvania. The term Scotch-Irish has caused confusion since it refers to the Lowland Scots who participated in a seventeenth-century migration to Ireland, becoming Ulster Scots or Scotsmen who lived in Ireland. Eighteenth-century observers labelled them Irish, disregarding their Protestant and Scottish heritage. Several historians have covered their eighteenth-century migration from Ireland to British America, portraying them as the epitome of frontier settlers, rough and homespun characters, who chose to live at the edge of American civilization. As might be expected, the Scotch-Irish have been praised for their fighting qualities against the native Redman and the British army in the American Revolution. Yet while their virtues as frontiersmen, soldiers, and occasionally educators of the clergy are extolled, there has rarely been mention of their cultural contribution, particularly of their fine arts. The reason for this is evident: consensus has it that as frontiersmen they were too isolated to be involved in cultural activities.

The thrust of this article is different. It treats the Scotch-Irish burial stones in Adams County, Pennsylvania as examples of Scotch-Irish culture in colonial America. Assertion is made that such stones were carved in a sophisticated fashion, as sophisticated as if they had been done in the mother country. Our explanation is that the Scotch-Irish associated with these stones were newcomers who carried the culture of the British Isles directly to the American frontier.

To prove this we have viewed the work of three stoncutters who left their imprint on Scotch-Irish burial stones in central Pennsylvania. Such carving in stone has not always been regarded as a fine art, but recently these works have been studied as pieces of sculpture, with an iconography of their own, reflecting their community’s religious and social values. Such stones have an advantage over other artifacts since they are fixed geographically, giving the researcher the security of knowing where they have been used. In this case, we are looking at 29 burial stones, located in four Adams County cemeteries, covering the span 1741-1770.

Adams County was created in 1800, before that being a portion of York County, and before 1740 being a portion of Lancaster County. During the mid-eighteenth century Adams County was the frontier, the edge of Pennsylvania’s settlement, the home of the “Scotch-Irish of the border.” This region drew them in the 1730s, so that by the 1740s there were Scotch-Irish families settled along or in the vicinity of the Marsh and Conewago Creeks (Fig. 1). This flow of immigrants began in 1729 when 140 Scotch-Irish families arrived at New Castle, Delaware. Among the arrivals was Hance Hamilton who became one of the leaders of the Marsh Creek settlements. His equivalent in the vicinity of the Conewago was David Hunter, who founded a community in 1749 named Woodstock (today’s Hunterstown).

Specific evidence of the settlers first appears in the 1740s when the Scotch-Irish came into conflict with their landlords, the Penn brothers, sons of the colony’s founder, William Penn. As agent for his brothers, Thomas Penn had in 1739-40 established a proprietary estate, the Manor of Maske. In 1745 the brothers sent surveyors and a sheriff to lay out the manor, but to their surprise 60 to 70 Scotch-Irish were already in residence and they attacked the Penns’ party. According to the Penns’ agent, Richard Peters, the settlers wanted no manorial terms, but simple settlement in fees common. Intimidated, Peters decided that those who held land before 1741 should not be subject to manorial dues. The Manor was not surveyed until 1765, at that time a
list being made of those settlers who held land before 1741. The list included James Agnew, James Innis, and Andrew Thompson, all of whose burial stones exist and will be analyzed in this survey.

The Marsh and Conewago Creek communities were also significant in the mid-eighteenth century as defensive outposts during the French and Indian War (1755-1763). Fighting a partisan war, Indian parties in 1755 destroyed homes in the Cumberland Valley, leaving the Marsh Creek settlements as the western defensive line of Pennsylvania. Many of the Scotch-Irish were recruited to man the frontier forts or to serve in the 1758 Forbes expedition which captured Fort Duquesne. One of the stones viewed was that of James Agnew, who in 1756 was captain of the second Associated Company of York County, consisting of 63 men. Agnew had settled on the Manor of Maske before 1741 and in 1743 he was listed as one who had obstructed the manor’s survey. Six years later he was appointed Overseer of the Poor for Hamiltonban Township, then part of York County. There is a slim chance he served with others of Hance Hamilton’s regiment at the Battle of Sideling Hill, where Delaware braves defeated a group of pursuing militia. Certainly he, and perhaps others in these cemeteries, had some pretention to military fame.

Since the four burial yards of interest to us were church yards, it is also significant to follow the development of the area’s Presbyterian churches. As of 1732 western York County was under the jurisdiction of the Donegal Presbytery, and it was their supply pastors who were sent to preach in the homes and clearings along or near the Marsh and Conewago Creeks until enough support was gathered to erect a log church. There are no traces of these early log structures, but it is assumed that they were adjacent to the existing burial grounds. The dates of these first log churches are: Great Conewago 1743-49, Lower Marsh Creek 1741-49, Upper Marsh Creek (Black’s Cemetery) 1749-53, the “Pines” 1753-66. These four church yards contain 29 black or blue slate burial stones which have been identified as belonging to mid-eighteenth century Scotch-Irish families. The stones are mixed with those of later periods, of different styles, and of different materials. The stones of later generations of Scotch-Irish are conventionally neo-classical or Victorian in inspiration. In one case, at the “Pines” burial yard the Scotch-Irish stones are incorporated into a yard of Pennsylvania German stones. The bulk of the 29 stones are upright, but four of the samples and others of similar style are horizontal on supports or on the ground. It is impossible to determine whether this is the result of custom or the practical result of the elements and time.

One person carved the bulk of these stones, but his name is unknown. What clues we have to his identity are derived from stylistic analysis of the stones. The outstanding feature of the bulk of the stones is that they are exclusively baroque in form, a style which is rarely found in mid-eighteenth century American cemeteries. The style is characterized by the mastery of plastic volume techniques to create depth and the use of undulating surfaces to define space (Fig. 2). The most consistent forms of decoration are flowers, vines, and leafage which frame the stones, a commonplace motif; however, they are done in a raised, naturalistic fashion, as if they had been draped across the stone. Several stones are emblazoned with coats of arms decorated with stag heads, lions, and leopards, popular heraldic symbols. More often than not, a single figure rather than a complete shield is portrayed, one of the favorite representations of prowess being a hand wielding a sword (Fig. 3). Several stones have figures of a traditional religious nature such as winged cherubs and turtle
doves, both figures representing the resurrected soul (Figs. 4, 5, 6). Yet the tone of such figures is decorative and exuberantly secular rather than spiritual.

One stone bearing the title, "The weights and measures of Scotland," shows a series of weights and tankards in bold relief (Fig. 7). These articles may be masonic symbols or could be interpreted as the wine cups of the last supper, but again one is left with the feeling that the carver is endeavoring to reproduce the objects of tradesmen or the market place.
The work of this first Scotch-Irish carver is in stark contrast with the bulk of mid-eighteenth century New England stones which have heretofore been studied. As a whole, New England stones do not show baroque characteristics until the later decades of the eighteenth century and then such characteristics are diluted by the already existing New England styles. This New England style, in fact, appears on a few of the stones found in the Lower Marsh Creek burial yard: one dated 1770, belonged to Jane Waugh of Scotch-Irish descent (Fig. 8). Her stone is by the hand of a second carver; its decoration is flat and linear, creating an abstract rather than a realistic interpretation of objects. Actually, the figures have so little depth they can be visualized in a rubbing. The style of this stone not only betrays New England origin, but its conception follows popular New England theological ideals of the perishable state of earthly life. Portrayed are a coffin and grave digger, a combination found on many Yankee stones, but in Adams County found only on this stone. Here is a work of American folk art, not cultivated baroque traditions, a stone which seems out of place in these cemeteries.

If the Waugh stone was done by a second carver, it is also evident that a third carver produced at least three of the stones in our sample. These stones are similar to those of the first carver in their use of black slate and in their popularity among Scotch-Irish families. They seem, however, to have been produced at a later time (about 1760 to 1790) and are more massive, squarish blocks of slate, unsculptured in contrast to those of the first carver. They are also consistently lettered in block form, while carver number one labelled in script and capitals as well as block. Overall, the work of the third carver is much cruder and is limited to a single repetitious design, a chain-like vine, the mystical symbol of one's voyage from life to death (Fig. 9). This carver's design has reverted to linear form, rather than baroque style. It appears, then, that the third carver may have inherited the mantle of the first about 1770, but was unable to maintain the cultivated traditions of the baroque.

How did the first carver come to have such a command of the baroque style on the edge of Pennsylvania's frontier? The answer seems to lie in the fact that he was a recent immigrant who had been trained in the British Isles. He appears to have arrived at the Manor of Maske in the 1740s and reached a peak in his work from 1756 to 1766; his last known stone is dated 1768. While this carver may have come with the earliest wave of pre-1741 Scotch-Irish settlers, he probably came later, but was well established by the time of the French

---

**Figure 8:** Blue slate stone of Jane Waugh who died in 1770 at the age of 18; Lower Marsh Creek Burial Yard.

**Figure 9:** Black slate stone of James Patterson who died in 1769 at the age of 39; Great Conewago Burial Yard.
and Indian War. His skills in the baroque style would not have been unusual in the British Isles, where even country stonecutters had mastered the use of plastic molding and undulating surfaces to create stones akin to plaster decoration. One authority on British burial stones affirms that by the mid-eighteenth century the making of churchyard monuments "encouraged a wide employment of craftsmen both in villages and towns and the latter including men of some local importance, who were statuaries and master masons engaged in building, often supporting more than one workshop."

The first stonemason may have been such a master for he produced stones with skills that could only have been learned in the British Isles.

To find such cultivated carving in what was a frontier backwater, calls for a re-evaluation of the common conception of how material culture was transferred. In the mid-eighteenth century it would normally be assumed that such culture was carried from the British Isles to American coastal cities, where styles would be diluted by American influences and only passed on to the frontier in a modified form, a process involving several generations. But this is not the process represented in Adams County. The Scotch-Irish immigrants did not delay in New Castle or Philadelphia, or even Lancaster and York, but moved quickly to the Marsh and Conewago Creek area. As a result, there was little chance to dilute the cultural tradition they brought from the British Isles and sophisticated skills were thus transported from the Old World to the American frontier. This frontier was clearly neither as American nor as culturally backward as it is often portrayed.

Work on material culture in other regions has begun to substantiate the hypothesis that the material culture of America's eighteenth-century frontier was still strongly European. Photographers, for instance, have portrayed similar stones of a bit later date in three Mecklenburg County, North Carolina cemeteries. From the 1750s on, this region of the Piedmont frontier was settled by Scotch-Irish who came by way of Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia. Documented connection between the Adams County carvers and the North Carolina carvers has not come to light, but one can assume that such stones can be found in other areas of Scotch-Irish settlement. The same pattern is seen in other aspects of Scotch-Irish culture such as their skills in making linen cloth. Their experience in growing, processing and spinning flax in Ulster was part of the heritage they brought to Londonderry, on the New Hampshire frontier, from 1718-1722. So successful were they in this home industry that they were able to draw customers from coastal cities like Portsmouth to buy their prized linen. Nor is evidence limited to the Scotch-Irish. An archeological study of two western Massachusetts defensive posts during King George's War, Forts Shirley and Pelham, concludes that the garrisons drank from salt-glaze teacups, smoked from pipes, and covered themselves with cloth manufactured in England rather than in frontier households. Thus it is beginning to be accepted that America's eighteenth century frontier was not so rude as was thought, but had much in common with Old World culture.
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The Survival of Pennsylvania German: A Survey of Berks and Lehigh Counties

By Robert C. Williamson

Over the last half century there has been an increasing documentation of the cultural and linguistic life of the Pennsylvania Germans. These range from the Lambert dictionary (1924) to works expressing concern for the social institutions (Wood, 1942; Klee, 1950; Parsons, 1976) and include a vast number of themes in the publications of the Pennsylvania German Society. Besides this literature oriented to the society and culture, there have been surveys of the linguistic patterns of given communities, as with Enninger's (1980) study of the morphological and syntactic shift in Kent County, Delaware. On the other hand, there has been relatively less systematic inquiry into the maintenance of the language, even though estimates of language usage have been made (Lambert, 1924; Kloss, 1966). One exception to the impressionistic approach is the Huffines (1980) study of several communities in east central Pennsylvania including both religious minorities and the population acculturated in American society.

The present study is a survey of the attitudes of speakers in certain portions of Berks and Lehigh counties. By no means is it to be considered as a census, rather it is to determine the status of Pennsylvania German as a minority language, and especially what social backgrounds (age, sex, social class, among other variables) are correlated with preference for the language. As a detailed analysis of the effect of these backgrounds or "subcultures" is to be reported separately, the present article approaches the sample as a totality and particularly reports the feelings of the respondents in regard to language loyalty. This information may be useful to individuals and groups concerned with language planning in order to reverse the decline in Pennsylvania German.

The target of the study was the inhabitants of some twenty villages and towns in these two counties. Although some farmers were included in the survey, the Old Order Mennonites (except for five who were included for purposes of comparison) were not, as they represent a totally different population and one about which there is little doubt as to language maintenance. Nor did the study include other areas, the most important being Lancaster County. However, the statistics in Berks and Lehigh are not unrepresentative of other parts of eastern Pennsylvania (Reed and Seifert, 1948).

The situation of Pennsylvania German, or Deitsch, is unique in that it is the only significant linguistic island (with the possible exception of Spanish in New Mexico) in the United States to survive from the colonial period to the present. One critical factor in its survival has been the extensive area over which it is spread—over a dozen counties in Pennsylvania, in addition to migrations into Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia. Even so, the language (or dialect as some prefer to label it) has been remarkably more enduring in some communities than in others.

The movement into Pennsylvania in the early eighteenth century was from various parts of Germany, especially the Palatinate or Pfalz, and to some extent from Switzerland. The immigration into Berks and Lehigh counties was also largely from the Pfalz (Reed and Seifert, 1948), and the dialect of these two counties (along with Montgomery) has been indentified as Southeastern Pennsylvania German (Costello, 1978). In reality, all speakers of Deitsch are mutually understandable, a remarkable phenomenon when one considers the diversity within a minority language of Western Europe such as Breton or Romansch.

The situation of Pennsylvania German can be described as a case of bilingualism or quasi-diglossia. Although bilingualism characterizes many individuals, the majority of the population are not bilingual, therefore the Deitsch-English relationship cannot be labelled as a true diglossia (Ferguson, 1959). However, to the extent that the area is diglossic it conforms to the tendency for one language, the official one, to be the code chosen for status purposes, i.e. formal situations and white-collar occupations, whereas the minority language functions more among rural activities with lower status occupations such as farming.

It is appropriate to compare the status of Pennsylvania German with that of other minority languages. In one respect it is similar to Frisian, which remains more of a dialect than a language; Frisian, however, receives more institutional support than does Deitsch. Kloss (1966) compares the situation of Pennsylvania German to that of Afrikaans, which remained as a dialect with Dutch continuing to be the official written vehicle until the latter part of the nineteenth century, when a written form of Afrikaans became accepted.
Although we have no exact calculation of the number of Pennsylvania German speakers—one estimation a generation ago was 300,000 (Klees, 1950)—it would seem today to be comparable to the 50,000 Romansch speakers in southern Switzerland or to Gaelic speakers in the Hebrides. However, these languages generally have a rich literary tradition stretching over several centuries, and in the case of Gaelic (and Welsh even more so), church liturgy as well as Bible reading was in the minority language. In contrast, literature in Deitsch emerged only a century ago, and the attempt to standardize the written form has never been successful. The conflict over phonetics implies either accepting the Buffington and Barba (1954) system based on Germanic tradition or opting for an anglicized spelling. Most authorities lean to the former approach (Druckenbrod, 1977).

From the Past to the Present

It has been popular to view the future of Pennsylvania German as doomed but, in reality, it is difficult to assess adequately its strengths and weaknesses. Even a casual review of the state of the language notes contradictions. On one side there has been an impressive number of serious publications in and on the language for over a century; on the other side one sees the buffoonery reflected in the Fersamlinge and Grundsoew ceremonies. Contradictions in the status of Pennsylvania German are hardly new. Early in the last century a number of religious groups—Moravians, Lutherans, Schwenkfelders, and especially the Amish and Mennonites—were reluctant to press for the instruction of German in the schools even though a number of ministers had played a role in fostering German studies during the colonial period (Glatfelder, 1981). The reluctance to take advantage of the 1834 Free School law to establish German-speaking schools occurred in the same decade that “Die Deutche Reform” was pushing for use of the language in the courts, in the registration of public documents, and in education (Kloss, 1966:218). Inevitably the struggle between Standard German and Pennsylvania German heightened this inconsistency.

A German press remained healthy through much of the nineteenth century. Newspapers in Standard German flourished, the Readinger Adler reaching a circulation of roughly 5,000 in 1891 (Wood, 1942:147), before an unending decline set in. One obstacle to a Standard German press was a growing acceptance of the Pennsylvania German dialect in newspaper columns, plays, and other literature. In the end, the conflict between the two forms of German was nearly fatal to both.

In the present century the failure to maintain Pennsylvania German has been basically the end result of social change—rampant industrialization and urbanization, increasing mobility, and rising standards of literacy through public education which seldom fails to have adverse effects on a minority language. Moreover, as the Revolutionary and Civil Wars had hindered the development of Deitsch, two World Wars had even deeper effects, probably more because of geographic mobility imposed on the area than because of anti-German feeling. Indeed, the two wars only hastened processes that were already in motion. As Kloss (1966:219) puts it: “At the outbreak of World War I, the German press in Pennsylvania had all but disappeared. By the outbreak of World War II, the last traces of High German preaching had followed.”

With the increased movement of people into the two counties (Reading no less than Allentown displaying ever greater industrialization and suburban sprawl) the postwar period has been marked by accelerated neglect of Pennsylvania German. Awareness of the plight of the language has led to attempts at revitalization, for instance by establishing classes in Deitsch. Yet the consciousness of an endangered species is not as acute as with several of the secondary languages of Western Europe, where political considerations are present.

But no less basic to the disappearance of Pennsylvania German is its proximity, physically and linguistically, to English. Although it has been estimated that the amount of borrowing from English has varied from 0 to 15 per cent (Lambert, 1924), the best writers use only the pure Pennsylvania German which is derived from the Westrich speech of the Palatinate. The result of more than two centuries of contact has been a source of continuing corruption. Also, as Schach (1951) documents, the close relationship of English and German in phonetics, structure, and semantics has had its own enormous impact. It is to this situation of desperation arising from linguistic problems as well as the social setting that the present research is directed.

Methodology and the Sample

The questionnaire, which contained both standardized and open-end items, was adopted from the instrument the author used in his research in other minority language areas. It was administered in the subjects’ homes with a refusal rate of less than five per cent. The interview was conducted in English even though a taping of conversation or reading of Deitsch was occasionally included.

As a criterion for selecting the sample the individual must have had some exposure to Pennsylvania German speech within the home. That is, in-migrants were eliminated unless they had married or been adopted into a Pennsylvania German culture. In this respect between 20 (as, say, for Lenhartsville) and 60 per cent (in Hamburg, for example) of the houses approached were omitted. A minor bias was the elimination of urban communities (Allentown, Emmaus, Macungie) where
the ratio of dialect speakers was sufficiently meager that it appeared impractical to ferret out these relevant subjects. Also, the farmer population is underrepresented. The focus is on the villages, where from the author’s viewpoint the survival of Pennsylvania German is at stake.

The distribution of the 171 interviews (five Old Order Mennonites are not included) were as follows: Berks County (99); Mertztown, Topton, Bowers, New Jerusalem (31); Fleetwood (10); Hamburg (10); Windsor Castle, Lenhartsville, Krumsville (17); New Berlinsville, Becheltsville (12); Huff's Church (9); Kutztown (14). For Lehigh County (72): Zionsville and Old Zionsville (11); Albertus (16); New Tripoli (13); Saegersville, Germansville, Pleasant Corner, Lynnville (32).

Interviewees ranged in age from 19 to 91 years, the sample having an average age of 61.8 years. In order to assure a relatively even sex ratio, the interviews were held predominantly on weekends, males accounting for 57 per cent of the interviewees. (It is relevant that if both spouses were present the subjects suggested that I interview the husband rather than the wife. Women's liberation has seemingly not invaded the rural landscape of eastern Pennsylvania.) Over 90 per cent of the sample were or had been married, less than one per cent had been divorced, but 20 per cent were widows. Their relative conservatism is also indicated by a high per cent of church attendance; nearly 80 per cent were (or had been until health problems intervened) attending church at least once a month. In view of the rural environment and the large number of upper-age adults, the low educational attainment (8.3 years for the men and 9.8 years for the women) is not surprising. Over three-fourths of the household heads were in manual work ranging from farming and routine factory labor to highly specialized skills.

On the whole, the sample represented a variety of communities that were not only detached from Megapolis but also from the urban centers of Allentown and Reading. However, there has been an increasing drift toward the cities—a principal factor in the average age of the sample. Only in the last decade have a minority of those finishing high school entered college, as the tendency to enter and possibly complete high school became apparent around the period of World War II. These factors have been crucial in the shift from Pennsylvania German to English.

The Speech Repertory and Shifting Domains

The most glaring finding of the study is the decline of Pennsylvania German over the life cycle of the subjects. Yet on the whole the data point to the twilight rather than to the death of a language. For the moment Deitsch remains healthy in some domains. Nearly two-thirds, or 64 per cent, of the sample asserted that they speak Pennsylvania German fluently, in addition to 15 per cent who speak it “fairly well.” Yet as seen in Table 1 (No. 1), almost half preferred to use Deitsch when they were children as compared to about a fourth today.

Almost three-fifths were socialized in Pennsylvania German, with half that ratio growing up in English and less than a tenth acquiring both languages in their early years (No. 2). The spouse was slightly less likely to have come from a Pennsylvania German background.

### Table 1

**Speech Patterns and Domains as Reported by 171 Pennsylvania Germans**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Per Cents</th>
<th>Pennsylvania German</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Language preferred as a child</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Today as an adult</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Language first acquired by interviewee</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First acquired by spouse</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Language used:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Parents</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With playmates as a child</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With a teenager</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With spouse today</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With one's children</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With friends</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With neighbors</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With work peers</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To the best of your knowledge, in which language do you tend to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dream</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Express strong feelings</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The explanation may lie in the tendency of the wife to follow her husband to his chosen area of residence. Also, there is evidence of the husband encouraging the wife to acquire the dialect rather than the reverse process. Although verbal abilities are more associated with women, allegiance to a minority language rests more with the male (Dressler and Wodak-Leodolter, 1977; Williamson and Van Eerde, 1980).

Children drift away from Pennsylvania German as they begin to socialize with peers, and the adherence to English becomes accelerated with the entry into adolescence (No. 3). This process is enhanced with the school. Teachers—and more than occasionally parents—have deliberately discouraged the use of the minority language by the use of sanctions, even though more often than not the teacher is a Pennsylvania German speaker. Over the last few decades the stigma of the accent has been a deterrent, as a number of the interviewees remarked.

The effect of the generational difference can hardly be overstressed. Even more visible than the contrast between the interviewees and their parents is the gap between interviewees and their children in the choice of a language code. Most subjects were much more likely to use Deitsch with their spouse than with their children. Those who are presently in middle age—50 to 65 years—tend to speak Deitsch to their children, the latter answering in English—a phenomenon current among many minority language areas of Western Europe. Only rarely do parents under 50 years of age attempt to use Pennsylvania German, except in a joking fashion. However, it is used in front of the children as a secret language, another index to the ambivalent status of the language. It is significant that several of the younger subjects mentioned that they learned Pennsylvania German from their grandparents.

If communication in Pennsylvania German is declining on an intergenerational basis, intragenerational speech remains more hopeful. As we note in No. 3, more than half of conversational networks among friends and neighbors are in Deitsch or in a combination of Deitsch and English. In the work setting the use of Pennsylvania German is current in many of the smaller establishments. In Topton, for instance, conversations among work peers in the Caloric Corporation were reported to be in Pennsylvania German. The data show that either the partial or the predominant choice of the Pennsylvania German code for conversing at a tavern or meeting friends at church is approximately 40 per cent, dropping to 17 per cent for shopping and to only 10 per cent for organizational meetings. Of the subjects who went to cafes or bars, about 10 per cent indicated that almost all of their conversations were in Deitsch. The choice of code depends not only on age but on the setting, the social climate of the community, and the number of Deitsch speakers. The case of a 23 year old worker at the Caloric plant in Topton is illustrative, if rather unique. He had learned the dialect from his grandparents, and later insisted on using it with his parents, uncles, and aunts. His major speech domain besides the plant was the local volunteer fire company where the older members provided the atmosphere for the younger volunteers to maintain the language tradition.

Whether valid or invalid, the subjects' estimation of the code used in their cognitions (No. 4) revealed greater commitment to Pennsylvania German than did other indices except for the code used with one's spouse. When asked in which language they think, the subjects associated Pennsylvania German more with farm life, with humor, and with certain interpersonal situations. English was almost exclusively used for commerce and technology. The subjects were usually uncertain about the code in which they dreamt, but even marginal speakers chose Pennsylvania German to express their feelings. Profanity, for example, seems less offensive in Pennsylvania German! For the half of the sample who uses Pennsylvania German or combines Pennsylvania German with English for expressing emotion—a higher proportion than for thinking or dreaming—the language remains a vehicle to vent frustration, anger, or humor. One can only guess whether this response indicates a sentimental attachment to the language or simply the traces of childhood speech habits. The response does imply a latent vitality to the language, which may be a resource if Pennsylvania German is to be resuscitated.

Attitudes and Language Loyalty

In determining the chances of survival for Pennsylvania German, several behavior patterns are revealing. One is interference, or the switching between the two languages. As seen in Table 2-1, more than half of the subjects reported switching "very often." If judged by the conversations recorded, it seems that their estimates underestimate the degree of switching. In part, the problem is the importation of English into Deitsch, and most speakers are not always aware of which words belong to which language. The older reported less switching into Pennsylvania German than did the younger. The reverse, or inserting Pennsylvania German into English, was less frequent (No. 2) and was often done for the sake of humor, or as several exclaimed: "There's no real English equivalent."

Pennsylvania German represents a bilingual but not a diglossic situation; only a portion of the population can function in both languages. Consequently there is marked sensitivity to the choice of code, which is related to the question of language loyalty. The interviewees were asked if they could recognize an accent among those persons they met on the street and if they did,
Table 2

| Attitudes, Habit Systems, and Selected Domains Among 171 Pennsylvania Germans' |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|
|                             | Per Cents                        |
| 1. When speaking PG do you  |                                  |
|   find yourself switching   |                                  |
|   into English              |                                  |
|   Very often                | 53.0                             |
|   Once in a while           | 32.1                             |
|   Never or almost never     | 14.9                             |
| 2. When speaking English    |                                  |
|   do you switch to PG:      |                                  |
|   Very often                | 9.5                              |
|   Once in a while           | 58.6                             |
|   Never or almost never     | 32.6                             |
| 3. When you meet a stranger |                                  |
|   are you usually able to   |                                  |
|   tell whether he or she is |                                  |
|   Deitsch from the way he   |                                  |
|   or she speaks English     |                                  |
|   Yes                       | 50.0                             |
|   Yes, and I then go into   | 22.6                             |
|   PG                        |                                  |
|   No                        | 27.4                             |
| 4. Reported situations in   |                                  |
|   which interviewee feels   |                                  |
|   ill-at-ease or           |                                  |
|   uncomfortable            |                                  |
|   In speaking PG           | 44.6                             |
|   In speaking English      | 48.1                             |
| 5. How often do you read    |                                  |
|   a newspaper in PG:        |                                  |
|   Fairly regularly         | 27.5                             |
|   A few times a year       | 21.6                             |
|   Almost never             | 50.9                             |
| 6. Agreeing that the schools|                                  |
|   should be giving         |                                  |
|   instruction in PG:        |                                  |
|   Yes                      | 68.4                             |
| 7. When they are your age, |                                  |
|   would you want your      |                                  |
|   children to speak PG:     |                                  |
|   Yes                      | 73.7                             |
| 8. On the whole would you   |                                  |
|   say that knowing PG has   |                                  |
|   been an advantage in your |                                  |
|   life.                    |                                  |
|   Yes                      | 86.5                             |
| 9. The main reasons I am    |                                  |
|   glad to know PG:          |                                  |
|   It's the language of my   | 54.4                             |
|   people before me          |                                  |
|   I feel it enriches my    | 43.3                             |
|   life to know more than    |                                  |
|   one language.            |                                  |
|   It has a lot of humor;    | 37.4                             |
|   jokes are better in      |                                  |
|   Deitsch than in English.  |                                  |
|   Deitsch is a rich and    | 26.9                             |
|   expressive language.      |                                  |
|   I feel more part of the  | 21.5                             |
|   group; I don't want to    |                                  |
|   feel left out of things.  |                                  |
|   It's the language of my   | 18.7                             |
|   best friends and         |                                  |
|   neighbors.               |                                  |

would they then go into Deitsch (No. 3). Nearly three-fourths were aware of an accent, which gave a feeling of in-group, but for those who had dropped or had never acquired an accent the reaction was often a feeling of superiority. Those who chose to go into Deitsch were usually older, or felt less comfortable in their English, but occasionally it was the younger respondents who were taking advantage of every opportunity to learn or perfect their Pennsylvania German. Those who could not recognize an accent possibly had little self-consciousness about their accent or simply could not recognize this kind of verbal cue.

Another aspect of language sensitivity is revealed in the question as to whether the interviewees ever felt any self-consciousness about their use of the dialect (No. 4). Over two-fifths did, and for a variety of reasons: being in a mixed or bilingual group; not speaking the language well enough; anxiety about acquiring an accent or being identified as a foreigner; situations in school (notably among the older population). Even more respondents had been embarrassed about their use of English: not speaking the language well enough, or consciousness of accent. The percentages of reporting embarrassment were higher than what had appeared for minority languages in Europe, for instance Breton (Williamson et al., 1982).

An explanation of embarrassment can be the degree to which the subjects forget their Deitsch; one-third said "yes" and two-thirds said "no," when asked this question. At least ten interviewees felt that their Pennsylvania German had improved after they had deliberately tried to preserve or build their ability in the language. The question of forgetting is almost irrelevant for most subjects under age 50 as they have never really learned the language.

One index of the commitment to Pennsylvania German is exposure to the mass media (No. 5), as for example the columns found in the newspapers of Allentown, Kutztown, Pennsburg, and Reading. The ratio of readers is only slightly larger among the older generation, who were committed to Deitsch but lack the necessary reading skill. For the half of the sample who do not read these columns there is the difficulty of translating sound symbols to the printed page: "The
spelling doesn't seem right.'" "It's too close to High German for me." It is relevant that a surprising number of homes were without any newspaper on a regular basis.

As another index, the habit of listening to weekly radio programs in Pennsylvania German has largely given way to television. Still, 17 per cent were listening to a program (usually from Boyertown) at least several times during the year, and an additional 29 per cent had heard a program during the year or at one time had been a regular listener. A no less serious symptom was the decline of attendance at folk festivals. Only seven per cent attended regularly, i.e., once a year or more often. Another 28 per cent had at some time attended events like the Kutztown Fair, in which a program in Deitsch was heard.

Four questions were directed to the subject's feelings about the language itself and the values placed on this heritage. Possibly the most significant is the response as to whether the schools should be giving instruction in Pennsylvania German (No. 6). Over two-thirds said "yes," but with reservations: "It should be voluntary or extracurricular," "It should not interfere with studying a 'useful' language like Spanish or German," or "There is little hope for the language anyway," "The children simply won't take it." In other words, the sentiment was generally less salient than for instruction in minority language in Western Europe, although respondents there, too, expressed some doubts in view of the many priorities in the curriculum. Several Pennsylvania German subjects turned to other solutions: parents speaking more in the home, voluntary associations assuming a greater effort, and echoing the words of Ralph Wood thirty years ago that if only Pennsylvania Germans would read one book each year, the battle might be won. Whatever their reservations about the school as the solution, over seven-tenths answered affirmatively to "When they are your age, would you want your children (or nephews and nieces) to speak Deitsch?" (No. 7). Again the percentage was smaller than for the same question among Friulans or Welsh, and even those who responded "yes" did so half-heartedly.

Nonetheless, most subjects realized that their knowledge of Pennsylvania German had been of value in their lives. "It's nice to know more than one language." "I have something other people don't have." "It helped me while working at the state hospital." "Once I translated for some tourists in Switzerland." "It helped me in my study of regular German." And few veterans of World War II who had been stationed in southern Germany failed to mention its usefulness.

As still another approach (as suggested by Dorian, 1981), the subjects were asked to indicate which one or two of six possible reasons why they were glad to know Pennsylvania German (No. 9). Most universally accepted was the sense of heritage, followed by the advantage of knowing a second language, with the humor aspects as the third most important reason. The expressiveness of the language, in-group feelings, and the idea of communication with friends and neighbors were reasons for roughly a fifth or more.

Finally, the question of language identity was tested in the item: "In regard to a candidate for local office, would you (other things being equal) be more likely to vote for him (or her) if he (she) knew Deitsch?" With a loaded question of this type any reply is of dubious validity, yet 60 per cent said "yes," the remainder protesting that language competence would be irrelevant. Still, the majority felt that such a candidate would know the people and their problems better. As more than one retorted: "The Pennsylvania Dutch are a little more honest—or less dishonest—than most people."

Conclusions

The fundamental question raised in this report is the possibility of survival of Pennsylvania German into the next century as indicated by its usage in two counties. Its status is akin to many languages over the world which have been reduced to a highly subordinate position, whether by colonial regimes as throughout history, or as in Western European languages representing a regional culture stretching over many centuries. As compared to the language areas familiar to the author, Pennsylvania German is in one sense similar to the situation of the 50,000 speakers of Gaelic in the Hebrides, where there is often an apathy, all in contrast to the militancy surrounding the Welsh cause. Also, the Romansch in Switzerland and the Friulans in northeastern Italy are mixed in their feelings about language maintenance. One could also make comparisons with the minority languages of France, where perhaps more than elsewhere, the drive for a national language has meant ridicule not only for Breton but for the variants of Occitan (Eckert, 1980). However, as implied above, the choice of the minority code is to varying degrees associated with low status as the official language is with the more mobile members of the population.

Even more than in Western Europe, there is an intergenerational crisis. Also, the outlook is complicated both by the failure to achieve a standardized literary form and the absence of a feeling of ethnic autonomy. Except for the "plain people" the language cannot be considered an "ethnic marker." (Dorian, 1980). The Pennsylvania Germans developed a number of crafts in the past, but their present occupations, life style, and culture do not differ basically from those of other farmers and villagers of the Northeast. The language in itself is not enough to demarcate the population in the same way as some communities of unique Gaelic speakers, who are in fishing or crofting as well as in language.
Specifically in reference to language maintenance, the responses to the questionnaire are not encouraging, but neither do they constitute a death knell. Although most of this semi-rural sample showed a lack of commitment to the language, there were pockets of enthusiasm. Even among the younger population, several respondents expressed something more than passive concern. The question as to survival can be expressed as it was by Stewart (1968) in using the criteria of standardization, autonomy, historicity, and vitality. When applied to Pennsylvania German the profile is hardly one of optimism (Huffines, 1980), but one can apply the same report card to other minority languages with less than happy results. Even the scorn heaped on the language because of its focus on humor may miss the point; it is just this characteristic that gives the language a degree of vitality.

However, on the negative side, the evidence is formidable. First, there is the research bias which may make the data appear more favorable than they really are. Cooperative interviewees are only too eager to give the interviewer the answers he would like. Or as many subjects said, "I really haven't thought much about that question." If only he or she had.

Another disturbing aspect of the findings is whether the generational gap can be bridged. Will the young, whether in a church, lodge, or volunteer fire company hold on to the language once the members over age 50 pass from the scene? Even more problematic, will parents and teachers be motivated to shift the climate of socialization? If so, would it work? But to go beyond grass roots, findings of the study can again be compared with those from European minority language areas, in which the middle class functions in the official code, but still retains a loyalty to the minority language as part of a literary and cultural heritage. Although it is hazardous to compare samples, there appeared less of this tendency in the Pennsylvania German population. Clergymen, journalists, and educators are attempting to infuse life into Deitsch, but they remain a minority within their professions. Nor does the language have many adherents among the younger intelligentsia who could be sensitive to the issue of autonomy, as in Wales and Brittany. Some of these possible changes will have to occur if the decline of Pennsylvania German is to be reversed.

Profiles in Language Maintenance

Possibly as important as the statistical findings in analyzing the status of Pennsylvania German are the individual experiences which are reflected in several vignettes from the sample: — A 68 year old electrician recalls the day when neighbors traded newspapers in order to read the Deitsch column. At present his more verbal wife reads it to him. He spoke of several columnists and radio speakers he had known in his younger years, and laments the pace of the world that has brought havoc to a minority language. He speaks Deitsch with his older children but the younger ones know only English. Like most Pennsylvania German speakers he usually votes Democratic.

— A 69 year old retired crane operator makes tapes in Deitsch for his daughter in Colorado, attends the annual play at Huff's Church, regularly reads the column in the Patriot, enjoys a few friendships among the Mennonites, and moves back and forth between the two languages with friends and neighbors.

— A 47 year old woman had grown up in Reading, but after marriage she and her husband, a carpenter from Fleetwood, made their home in Mertztown. She acquired a limited knowledge of Deitsch from her husband, who seize every opportunity, she says, to use the language with his mother, who lives with them, as well as in social settings ranging from his work to card parties and the local tavern. However, none of the children can be induced to learn the language.

— A 60 year old woman finds herself speaking both languages every day. She uses Deitsch with her husband, in the Lutheran home for the aged in Topton, and with over half of her neighbors, but realizes that twenty years earlier she almost never used English. Yet when asked about teaching Pennsylvania German in the schools she replied "It's a lost cause." Like many others, she is conscious of her accent, and on one of her few visits outside the area (Niagara Falls) she recalls that a fellow tourist overhearing her accent exclaimed "Oh, you must be from Pennsylvania!"

— A 30 year old well driller grew up more in English than in Deitsch but still talks to his parents and parents-in-law in a mixture of both. He also speaks with his older neighbors, who often correct his mistakes. He wishes he knew Deitsch better, but sees no point in encouraging his children to learn the language.

— A 62 year old furniture dealer finds his knowledge most useful for business with the older population, especially farmers. Pennsylvania German has also enriched his travels in Germany and Austria, and he seldom misses the Fersamlinge. Only his oldest child speaks Deitsch well, but his youngest son acquired the language from the cleaning woman and baby sitter.

— A 46 year old nurse apparently in order to overhear her parents' conversation never let them know that she was absorbing Deitsch as she grew up. Her husband speaks only English, but today she speaks Deitsch with her parents and with one elderly neighbor. She regrets the changes in Kutztown since her childhood when Pennsylvania German was almost the only language. If she encounters someone on the street who speaks to her in a strong accent, more often than not she goes into Deitsch. She is proud of knowing the language and follows the column in both the Morning Call and the Patriot, and claims that she speaks it better than when she was young.
—A recently retired 58 year old bachelor, who graduated from Muhlenberg College, never learned Deitsch very well, but enjoys its humor. On the whole, he feels that because of its questionable status, Pennsylvania German was more of a disadvantage to him than an advantage. He noticed that when Bethlehem Steel workers used Pennsylvania German among themselves they were made to feel uncomfortable. Whatever his ambivalence about the language, he would never live other than in Germansville, his native village.

—A 35 year old electrician living in a trailer camp regrets he doesn’t speak Pennsylvania German as well as his older siblings do, and feels ill-at-ease with people who speak better than he does. His father was an Hungarian immigrant who married a Pennsylvania German and then learned the language.

ENDNOTES

1For those of our readers who may not be familiar with the origin and meaning of this term, I include the following quotation from Ferguson’s article in Word 15, pp. 325-26: “In recent years there has been a renewed interest in studying the development and characteristics of standardized languages, and it is in following this line of interest that the present study seeks to examine carefully one particular kind of standardization where two varieties of a language exist side by side throughout the community, with each having a definite role to play. The term ‘diglossia’ is introduced here, modeled on the French dièse, which has been applied to this situation, since there seems to be no word in regular use for this in English; other languages of Europe generally use the word for ‘bilingualism’ in this special sense as well.”—NKG

2One might speculate as to whether PG might have had a better chance if French had become the dominant language of North America. Or for that matter, would PG have had a kinder fate if the migration had taken place from, say, Lower Saxony instead of the middle Rhine, i.e., if another version of High German had been the language? Or what would the effect have been if a variety of dialects had arrived, or if the area settled by Germans had been even larger than it was?

3The percentages are based on those who responded, i.e., unmarried persons are ignored in regard to items regarding spouse or children.

4Per cents are based on the subjects who responded, the few nonresponses are ignored.

5Names of villages have been altered to protect anonymity.
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GERMANIC EUROPEAN ORIGINS AND GEOGRAPHICAL HISTORY OF THE SOUTHEASTERN PENNSYLVANIA SCHWENKFELDERS

By Lee C. Hopple

This is the third in a series of articles examining the Germanic European (Figs. 1, 2) origins and spatial experiences of one of the four predominant religious bodies formerly comprising the Southeastern Pennsylvania Plain Dutch Community. The Schwenkfelders of southeastern Pennsylvania are the descendants of a Protestant religious movement called Schwenckfeldianism which began in the early sixteenth century Germanic Europe (Figs. 1, 2). Because they shared a number of commonalities, Schwenckfeldianism was, and still is, frequently but mistakenly confused with Anabaptism, another Protestant movement which arose at the same time in a different section of Germanic Europe (Figs. 1, 2).
Introduction

Classified exclusively according to numbers of adherents, Schwenckfeldianism is one of the least significant movements of the sixteenth century Protestant Reformation, and Schwenckfelders are the least numerous of the original major Plain Dutch peoples. The founder of this movement, Caspar Schwenckfeld, became one of the leading proponents of Protestantism in northeastern Germanic Europe (Figs. 1, 2) almost from the beginning of the Reformation. However, Schwenckfeld gradually formulated a number of religious beliefs sharply contrasting with orthodox Lutheran and, for that matter, most other forms of Protestant thought. This incongruity of religious beliefs evolved over a period of some half-dozen years and produced an irreparable rift between Schwenckfeld and Luther which culminated in the establishment of the Schwenckfeldian movement in the mid-1520's.

Despite its emanating from the central core of the Reformation—Lutheranism, Schwenckfeldianism evolved separately from the mainstreams of Protestantism, both territorially and religiously. The movement germinated and developed in Silesia in eastern Germanic Europe (Fig. 2) geographically remote from the principal centers of Protestant activity in the southern and western extremities of that ethnically homogeneous region (Figs. 1, 2). Moreover, since Schwenckfeld's precepts hardly, if at all, resembled conventional early sixteenth century Protestant doctrine, they invoked brutally unrelenting persecution by the intolerant established churches. The interrelationships of location, wrathful oppression, and other factors, prevented the movement from attracting large numbers of converts. Astonishingly however, this unusually small religious group survived more than two centuries of incessant persecution until, when finally confronted with the prospect of annihilation, the remnants of the faith emigrated to southeastern Pennsylvania.

An understanding of the origins and geographical history of the Schwenckfelders in Europe along with an appreciation of Caspar Schwenckfeld's contributions to Protestant history (while in perpetual jeopardy of, and almost constantly fleeing to avoid, martyrdom for over three decades) influenced the writer's organization.
of this article, which consists of three major parts. The first examines Schwenckfeld's formative years along with the origins and spatial experiences of Schwenckfeldianism to the time of Schwenckfeld's exile from his homeland; the next traces the geographical experiences of Schwenckfeld's life in exile; the last surveys the spatial history of the Schwenckfelders from the time of the founder's exile to the time of migration to Pennsylvania. The author also provides a concise summary and some concluding remarks. To graphically illustrate over two centuries of spatial history in Germanic Europe required the inclusion of thirteen maps. Important comments concerning the maps, some spellings, and several religious words and terms are included in the endnotes.

**Origins and Geographical History of Schwenckfeldianism in Northern Germanic Europe to the Beginning of Schwenckfeld's Exile**

News of the initiation of the Protestant Reformation at Wittenberg, Saxony (Figs. 2, 3A) in October 1517, when Martin Luther presented his "Ninety-Five Theses" at Castle Church, which was to destroy the status quo of most of Germanic Europe (Fig. 1), reverberated across the continent in less than a decade, and diffused eastward to neighboring Silesia, (Figs. 2, 3A) the homeland of Caspar Schwenckfeld, by early 1518. Before the end of the year, Schwenckfeld accepted the Reformation and soon became the leading exponent of Protestantism in Silesia. Fervently espousing Lutheranism for some six years, Schwenckfeld established a movement in the mid-1520's which resulted in his permanent exile from Silesia.

**Geographical History of Schwenckfeld's Formative Years in Northern Germanic Europe**

Caspar Schwenckfeld was born in 1489 or 90 at Ossig near Luben in north-east-central Silesia just west of the Oder River (Fig. 3A). His parents were descendants of a noble family of ancient German lineage that may have resided in Silesia from the beginning of the thirteenth century—and perhaps even earlier.

Because of this noble heritage, Schwenckfeld was
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destined to live the life of an aristocrat. He probably received his elementary schooling in Liegnitz and his university preparatory training in Liegnitz. He is known to have studied at the universities of Cologne, Frankfurt on the Oder, and possibly at Erfurt (Fig. 3A). Apparently Schwenckfeld was pursuing a law degree for he was thoroughly read in canon law and the church fathers, including the Greeks, and he also displayed some knowledge of the Rhenish Mystics. Although there is no indication he ever completed his studies and earned a degree, in 1511, at age 21 or 22, Schwenckfeld assumed the life of a Silesian courtier, serving first at Oels, then at Brieg, and finally at Liegnitz (Fig. 3A).

Schwenckfeld never engaged in the rigors of systematic theology, nor does it appear that he devoted much attention to religious subjects prior to the Reformation. Therefore, unless it was due to his interest in canon law, it seems rather unusual that Schwenckfeld’s attention was immediately riveted on the Reformation and, because of his status in life, that he should focus on Luther’s struggle against the abuses of the indulgencies. Recognizing these abusive practices and blaming them for wretched living conditions in Silesia, Schwenckfeld became an ardent Lutheran, committing his life to the Reformation. Almost concurrent with his religious conversion, Schwenckfeld entered the service of Friedrich II, Duke of Liegnitz (Fig. 3A). Thus, 1518 was a hallmark year in the early life of Caspar Schwenckfeld.

Abject poverty, practically universal ignorance, and deep superstition typified peasant life everywhere in Germanic Europe including Silesia (Figs. 1, 2, 3A). Few, if any, aristocrats were more cognizant of these conditions than this Silesian courtier. Perhaps because of Luther’s struggle against them, Schwenckfeld became acutely sensitive to the abuses of the indulgencies and concluded that these reprehensible practices were largely responsible for the horrendous living conditions of the Silesian peasantry. The young nobleman firmly believed that the omnipotent Roman Catholic Church, which originated and insisted on perpetuating the indulgencies, was exclusively responsible for the deplorable way of life as well as for the scarcity of Bibles and for the general sterility of religious life in his native land. He perceived the Reformation as signaling the end of Germanic Europe’s static, church-dominated mode of existence and the opening of a new, more enlightened and affluent age.

For these and other reasons also, Schwenckfeld became the leading advocate of Lutheranism in Silesia and a devout Protestant for the remainder of his life. He espoused the precepts of the Reformation with youthful vigor, enthusiasm, and exceptional clarity. The Silesian reformer made a passionate plea for total submission to Protestantism, insisting that permanent and meaningful religious, sociocultural, economic, and other changes depended upon complete consummation of the Reformation.

Dissatisfied with his early accomplishments, it was with great anticipation and high expectations that the Silesian courtier decided to launch a career as a lay-minister in 1522 to accelerate the Reformation. Travelling extensively, Schwenckfeld taught and preached the tenets of Protestantism with exceptional eloquence, simplicity, and credibility. In the vernacular, he attempted to focus attention on the lamentable existence of the peasantry and convince the impoverished that the Reformation, namely Lutheranism, offered the only hope for improvement. Schwenckfeld hoped to organize an educated lay-ministry that would lead Bible study brotherhoods, read and discuss the Scriptures among themselves and with the illiterate peasants, explain the precepts of Protestantism, and hasten the acceptance of Lutheranism in Silesia (Figs. 2, 3A). Employing the scholar’s language, he spoke with educated men and the nobility hoping to convert them and have them serve as lay-ministers.

The Silesian reformer was relatively successful in this latter endeavor. He convinced the Duke of Liegnitz to accept Lutheranism in 1522. An examination of Figure 3B suggests that Schwenckfeld centered most of his attention in the area between Liegnitz and the Oder River. For in 1523, after resigning his position at the court in Liegnitz, he persuaded some of the most respected and capable men in the cities of Liegnitz, Luben, Ossig, Raudten, Steinau, Wohlau, and Neisse farther to the south (Fig. 3B), as well as in several smaller communities, to accept Lutheranism. Some of these men became lay-ministers and began spreading the Reformation across large sections of Silesia (Figs. 2, 3A, B).

A relatively obscure reformer beyond Silesia, Schwenckfeld began attracting considerable attention in neighboring Saxony (Figs. 2, 3) and other sections of Germanic Europe (Fig. 1) in 1524 when he published several treatises calling attention to, and accusing the Roman Church for, the abominable servile conditions generally prevailing across Germanic Europe. These works were reviewed by the Roman hierarchy with contemptuous rage, and by the Wittenberg (Fig. 3B) reformers with chagrin and trepidation. The Lutherans anticipated a violent reaction against Schwenckfeld by the Catholic Church and feared it might engulf them also. Reverberations by the papal authorities were indeed soon forthcoming, and will be discussed subsequently.

As the years rolled by, Schwenckfeld’s effervescent advocacy of Lutheranism gradually lost its original vitality, and by 1525 he was becoming exceedingly depressed by what he considered the narrow scope within which Luther decided to direct the Reformation. Schwenckfeld’s discouragement with the parent move-
ment lead to personal conflict with Luther which, in turn, resulted in schism. To understand the causes and results of Schwenckfeld’s anguish, it is essential to return to 1518.

Origins of Schwenckfeldianism in Silesia

When the Wittenberg (Fig. 3A) Reformation reached Silesia, Schwenckfeld examined and endorsed all the precepts of Lutheranism. However, Schwenckfeldianism began taking shape soon after the Silesian nobleman’s conversion, despite his enthusiastic acceptance of Lutheranism. Exactly why is uncertain; perhaps because of his interest in canon law Schwenckfeld began a systematic study of the bible and the church fathers. His study aroused many serious questions about the Scriptures, Lutheranism, and the meaning and purpose of the Protestant Reformation. Continual study and personal interpretation of the Scriptures—remembering he was neither a theologian nor a clergyman—progressively brought him to the conclusion that to achieve the true religious and other purposes of the Reformation required a complete restoration of the ancient Apostolic Church. Alleging there were significant differences between the word of God and man’s interpretation of the Scriptures, he suggested it was necessary to compare Scripture with Scripture to derive correct interpretations. For example, he raised the question of whether Christ was in the elements of the Eucharist or in heaven, declaring that the physical presence of Christ in the elements is not taught anywhere in the Scriptures. He posed a number of additional questions, but it was that pertaining to the Eucharist which eventually led him to organize a new religious movement.

Schwenckfeld then reexamined the beliefs and practices of Lutheranism, comparing them to his translation of the meaning of the Scriptures. He first theorized, and subsequently concluded, that Lutheran-ism had grown sterile, meaningless, and was no longer in cadence with the original objectives of the Reformation, but was simply perpetuating the dogma of the Church against which it had revolted in the first place. His criticism of Lutheranism centered around its emphasis on doctrine and ritual. He was particularly distressed with Luther’s interpretation of the Eucharist. According to Schwenckfeld, the Scriptures do not state that the Eucharist—or any ritual—necessarily results in salvation. As stated above, the presence of the elements in the Eucharist was the primary cause of his consternation. Sufﬁce to say, for purposes of this article, Schwenckfeld objected to Luther’s doctrine of the “real presence.”

During the early 1520’s Schwenckfeld gradually changed Lutheran emphasis from justification by faith to justification through faith, yet strongly upholding—which he did throughout his life—that true knowledge and understanding is Eucharistically based. However, while changing the doctrine of forensic justiﬁcation to that of progressive sanctification, he concluded that participation in the Eucharist represented inward, divine, spiritual nourishment. The Silesian reformer’s conception of the meaning of the Eucharist—along with a growing commitment to the restored Apostolic Church idea—provided the rationale by which he deduced and forcefully proclaimed that the true Church was spiritual and invisible, and that it consisted of the entire community of “God’s children,” rather than of a visible physical structure comprised of a group of adherents periodically reenacting a set of doctrinally prescribed rituals. This conception of the Church, which was strongly inﬂuenced by Valentine Crutradt, included a number of additional but less consequential beliefs that were well formulated in Schwenckfeld’s mind before 1525 and systematically organized by him soon thereafter.

Schwenckfeld’s considerable anguish over what he felt to be the Wittenberg (Fig. 3A) reformer’s overemphasis of doctrine and ritual induced him to write Luther in 1525 explaining his interpretation of the Eucharist and a number of other beliefs. Expecting but receiving no reply, Schwenckfeld set out for Wittenberg (Fig. 3B) in November, 1525, to confer with the “great reformer”; he arrived there on December 1. Following several disappointing meetings during which Luther consistently caucused his associates but refrained from providing any definite responses, Schwenckfeld remorsefully returned to Silesia on December 4. He travelled twice more to Wittenberg (Fig. 3B) but to no avail. After the third and final visit, he received an impolite rebuff of his views from Luther. In a state of considerable despair and seeing little opportunity of resolving their diﬀerences, Schwenckfeld arrived at a momentous decision in 1526.

Schwenckfeld refused to partake of the Eucharist and advocated its general suspension throughout Silesia until such a time as a “correct” uniform interpretation could be agreed upon. Suspension of, and abstention from, the Eucharist was soon termed the “Stillstand.” This action obviously resulted in Schwenckfeld’s leading the Silesian Reformation down a religious road separate from Lutheranism, which became known as the “Royal Road” or the “Middle Way.” Thus, 1526 is generally regarded as the year during which the Schwenckfeldian Movement was officially established. Although by 1527 Schwenckfeld had irrevocably broken with Luther, he evidently respected and revered the Wittenberg reformer to the end of his life.

As should be relatively clear from the foregoing discussion, Schwenckfeld’s religious beliefs evolved between 1518 and 1525; he continued reﬁning his religious system until his death. In addition to his interpretation of the Scriptures, the major inﬂuences on Schwenckfeld’s understanding of the objective of the Reformation and his consequent religious precepts
seems to have been a devout belief in the interrelationship between religious reform, economic and socio-cultural improvement, and the powerful influence of Valentine Crautwald.

The reader's understanding of Schwenckfeldism will be greatly enhanced by recalling Schwenckfeld's contention that original Apostolic Christianity was devoid of formal doctrine and ritual, denomination or sect, or physical church structure, all of which logically led him to the conclusion that the sacraments had absolutely nothing whatever to do with salvation. These beliefs caused the founder of Schwenckfeldianism to staunchly proclaim that salvation could be attained only through the revelation of God in Christ, and personal recognition of the entrance and work of Christ in the soul. Accordingly, he contended that grace, salvation, and true Christian understanding could be realized only through this "divine revelation." 12 It appears reasonable and logical therefore, that Schwenckfeld would equate the Reformation with the restoration of Apostolic Christianity.13 As mentioned above, all the foregoing beliefs had largely crystallized between 1524 and 1525. They were more systematically promulgated between 1525 and 1527 and are forthwith summarized by the writer without personal interpretation.14

By about 1527 Schwenckfeld had generally completed constructing15 an ironic and evangelical, mystical pietistic, spiritualistic theology which was inherently concerned with what is called Eucharistic Christology.16 The cardinal principles of Eucharistic Christology are total acceptance of the "Internal Word" and absolute rejection of the "External Word."17 This tenet suggests that salvation is a supernatural event emanating directly from the historical Christ. According to the architect of this religious system, true Christian salvation merely entails recognizing—and genuinely accepting—the living, crucified, risen, glorified God man. Only through this invisible supernatural experience is man redeemed, deified, and immortalized, becoming one with Christ through eternity. Oneness with Christ involves understanding that the essential word of God is internal, eternal, and spiritual. Another of the salient beliefs is that no man-made edifice can bring salvation and grace; instead, the true Church is invisible, comprising the entire spiritual community. The sole requisite to membership in the spiritual invisible Church is to know, accept, and comprehend the trinity of the eternal Christ.18 Since the Church is spiritual, it is nameless; thus, there can be no sects or denominations.19

Although Schwenckfeld is unquestionably one of the leading thinkers and major figures in the Radical Reformation, his religious system sets him apart from the Spiritualists, Anabaptists, Rationalists, Separatists, and similar movements with which he was, and sometimes still is, mistakenly identified because of the relationship of these various movements as well as of Schwenckfeldianism to the Radical Reformation.20

Probably earlier but certainly by 1527, little more than a year after seceding from Lutheranism, Schwenckfeld appears to have lost contact with all the mainstream forces of the Reformation, including the Radical Reformation. One needs only to examine and compare the fundamental precepts of his Eucharistic Christology with the tenets of Anabaptism to reach this conclusion.21 Consequently, working somewhat in isolation from the major Protestant movements caused much misunderstanding, animosity, and deliberate misrepresentation of Schwenckfeld's motives. These factors probably precipitated Schwenckfeld's "voluntary exile."22 Just how important the role Schwenckfeld's religious position, with respect to the Reformation as a whole, played in creating the environment which resulted in his exile is difficult, if not impossible, to ascertain. The major events which placed Schwenckfeld in a position from which he was unable to extricate himself and, thus, became an exile are forthwith reviewed.

In 1526 Ferdinand, King of Bohemia and sovereign in Silesia (Figs. 2, 3), by faith a devout Catholic, decided to destroy the Reformation in his domains. Ferdinand embarked upon a course of action specifically designed to annihilate Schwenckfeldianism since he vehemently deplored all forms of Spiritualism. However, war with the Turks delayed enforcement of a decree to destroy the Silesian (Fig. 3) movement. Then the Wittenberg reformers became concerned for their security, since they feared that repercussions of Ferdinand's decree might eventually envelop Saxony (Figs. 2, 3A); they became so apprehensive that they began applying pressure on Schwenckfeld to reaffirm Lutheranism. Almost simultaneously and unfortunately for Schwenckfeld, several of his manuscripts were imprudently published in Germanic Switzerland (Figs. 1, 2) without his authorization. These publications were maliciously misinterpreted by his adversaries and generally misunderstood by many of his associates. This rather unfortunate incident focused even more attention on the Silesian reformer and his movement, and also embarrassed his protector, Friedrich II. Schwenckfeld's public apologies for the publications by the Swiss Germans could not alleviate the situation, and to prevent further troubles befalling Friedrich II as well as to salvage the Silesian movement, its founder left his native land in 1529 never to return.23 Catholicism's bitter hatred, Lutheranism's deep animosity, the notoriety spreading across Germanic Europe emanating from the indiscreet decision by the Swiss Germans (Figs. 1, 2) to publish his manuscripts, the embarrassing position in which these publications placed Duke Friedrich II, and other factors were responsible for Schwenckfeld's "voluntary exile."24 This hostile environment was to a large degree engendered by a deliberate misrepresentation of Schwenckfeld's religious principles by his opponents and further
compounded by a basic misunderstanding of his beliefs by some of his less informed supporters as stated above. 19

The author of the Silesian Reformation departed from his native land on February 15, 1529. 60 Fortunately, the movement was firmly established by that date and was destined to grow and flourish in the decades ahead.

**Geographical History of Schwenckfeldianism in Silesia to 1529**

Those educated personalities comprising the Bible study brotherhood—along with Schwenckfeld, of course—conducted frequent meetings in Liegnitz. Moreover, they, as lay-ministers, conducted Bible reading and study meetings in Lüben, Neisse, Raudten, Steinau, Wohlau (Fig. 3B), and other cities and villages. The lay-ministers developed Lutheran congregations in the above mentioned cities during the period 1523 to 1525 and undoubtedly in other communities also. 61

The power of Schwenckfeld’s mind prevailed a second time, for the highly capable men whom he persuaded to accept Lutheranism readily adopted his Eucharistic Christological beliefs as they developed. Thus, the lay-ministers converted large segments of their Lutheran congregations and also some non-Lutherans to Schwenckfeldianism between 1526 and 1529. Evidently, when the Silesian reformer left his homeland, there were significant Schwenckfeldian groups in Liegnitz, Lüben, Neisse, Ossig, Raudten, Steinau, and Wohlau (Fig. 3C). These groups seem to have been organized by 1527. If not by 1527, then by the end of the next year there were a number of adherents in Breslau, Goldberg, Jauer (Fig. 3C), and possibly in other towns. Consequently by the end of 1528, Schwenckfeldianism was firmly established in Silesia. 62

When he left his native land on February 15, 1529, the author of the Silesian Reformation was certain of his destination. He had been corresponding with a number of prominent reformers in Strassburg, Alsace (Figs. 2, 4), for some time. The Strassburg reformers were aware of Schwenckfeld’s plight and, apparently impressed with his religious tenets, evidently invited him to that city. 63
Geographical History of Schwenckfeld's Exile in Southern Germanic Europe

Caspar Schwenckfeld's exile encompassed approximately thirty-two years and was distinguished by an almost endless deluge of tumultuous events. Few Christian men so dedicated to peace ever have been confronted by such a vast array of formidable enemies. Formidable in the sense that they generally occupied prestigious clerical and/or secular positions. The tempestuous malevolence of his opponents produced a ceaseless barrage of assaults first to discredit, then to destroy, the Silesian pilgrim. This rancorous attitude toward Schwenckfeld was precipitated as much by personal jealousy and other factors as it was by his religious precepts. But few men have possessed more physical and mental courage and dedication than the founder of the Silesian reform movement, and he survived more than three decades under extremely adverse conditions. Even the casual observer is awed by the volume of Schwenckfeld's scholarly achievements and meritorious contributions to religious history while expending so much time and energy to survive. Practically always in incessant flight, and nearly always travelling under the bleakest circumstances in quest of refuge to avoid persecution and possible martyrdom, the former Silesian nobleman proved redoubtable. On occasion he was afforded the opportunity to defend himself publicly, and his public exposures were always sufficiently effective so as to result in his being put to flight. Fortunately Schwenckfeld found asylum in several places of primary and secondary importance, and he travelled in relatively defineable circuits around many of these havens: as already implied, the first was Strassburg, Alsace (Figs. 2, 4).

Schwenckfeld's Exile in Strassburg, 1529-33

Caspar Schwenckfeld arrived in Strassburg, Alsace (Figs. 2, 4), sometime around mid-May, 1529;44 he was welcomed to the "City of Hope" by several of his former correspondents. Interestingly, the Strassburg magistrates abolished the Mass in February, 1529.45 Whether the Mass was abolished before Schwenckfeld left Silesia or if he knew of the imminence of the event from his correspondents is not known with certainty, at least not to this writer.

Abolition of the Mass is known as the Magisterial Reformation.46 How many of Schwenckfeld's former correspondents participated in this reform activity is unclear. What is certain is that for some years Strassburg was recognized as a city of tolerance and became a haven for independent thinkers. No doubt Schwenckfeld arrived there filled with hope that the theologians of the city would accept his Eucharistic theology. Unfortunately for him that was not to happen,47 but he did spend several relatively productive years in Strassburg (Fig. 4) where he continued refining his religious system, conducted a steady correspondence with the Silesian Brotherhood, and pursued a number of other activities.48

He preached, lectured, and participated in disputations on a number of religious topics, including baptism. His preaching won many friends among the clergy, city officials, and the general population. While in Strassburg, Schwenckfeld published several books and composed two catechisms. Still he found time to continue his activities as a lay-evangelist and visited Hagenau, Landau, Speyer,49 and Rappoltswiler (Fig. 4) in 1529. Consequently, a substantial Schwenckfeldian community developed in the Strassburg area (Fig. 4) which was to persist for about a century.50

 Estrangement between Schwenckfeld and the magisterial reformers suddenly erupted in 1530 and rapidly intensified. Alienation began at the Marburg (Fig. 4) Colloquy which was convened to rectify the differences between Luther and Zwingli. The Strassburg reformers in attendance discovered that Luther abhorred Schwenckfeldianism even more than he detested Zwinglianism,51 and they foresaw certain defeat of the Reformation by Catholicism if the disunity among the ranks of the Protestant leaders long continued. Consequently, many of the "broad-minded, freethinking," Strassburg reformers sacrificed their beliefs and accepted orthodox Lutheran dogma in support of ecclesiastical order. Schwenckfeld, however, remained steadfast, refusing to compromise his religious principles. In 1530, presumably at the request of the Strassburg reformers, he participated in a disputations in defense of his beliefs. His admirable performance was viewed with coolness and skepticism, and following the disputations, his freedom of movement gradually became increasingly restricted and his safety increasingly precarious.

Martin Bucher, a former admirer, began plotting against the Silesian exile.52 Bucher prepared a formula to resolve the Lutheran-Zwinglian conflict, and Schwenckfeld was called to debate him by the Synod of Strassburg in 1533. Much to the dismay and chagrin of the Strassburg reformers, Bucher was unable to refute Schwenckfeld's cogent arguments. During 1533 a number of events—Zwingli's untimely death in 1531, Calvin's forced departure from France in 1533, the rise of Militant Spiritualism at Munster, the hostility of the Strassburg reformers resulting from a number of factors, and the movement toward ecclesiastical order—all combined to seriously jeopardize Schwenckfeld's safety, and upon the advice of a friend, he left Strassburg in September, 1733.53 To say that Schwenckfeld's life was rather unsettled for the next year would be a gross understatement. From Strassburg he travelled to Augsburg by way of Hagenau (Fig. 4).
Schwenckfeld's Exile Around Augsburg, 1533-34

Schwenckfeld made arrangements for the printing of a book upon his arrival in Augsburg (Fig. 5). Then, for security purposes following a somewhat circuitous route, he visited preachers and civil authorities travelling northwest to Landau and Speyer, southeast to Stetten, northeast to König, southeast to Ulm, and back to Augsburg (Figs. 4, 5).

The author of the Silesian Reformation resided with a sympathetic preacher in Augsburg. While resting from the aforementioned journey, he prepared a treatise on the "Edification of Conscience." Early in 1534 he embarked on another missionary expedition proceeding southeast to Mindelheim and Kempten, west to Isny, northeast to Memmingen, and due east to Ulm before returning to Augsburg (Figure 5). On this journey he succeeded in satisfying the civil authorities but again incurred the jealous enmity of the clergy. After this latter excursion, he studied Hebrew for a short time and then left Augsburg (Fig. 5).

From Augsburg Schwenckfeld went to Memmingen and then to Ulm (Fig. 5) where he conferred with all the preachers in the presence of the civil authorities. Following this conference in summer 1534, he journeyed to Strasbourg via Stetten and König (Figs. 4, 5). Imperiled, he soon left Strasbourg travelling through Speyer, Frankfurt on the Main, and Stetten, then returning to Ulm where he remained for approximately five years.

Schwenckfeld's Exile in Ulm, 1534-39

Martin Bucer's concordia movement was gaining momentum throughout the south German states of Alsace, Baden, Württemberg, and Bavaria as well as in Moravia and the Palatinate (Fig. 2) by the time Schwenckfeld arrived in Ulm (Fig. 6) in late summer or early autumn 1534. Between 1534 and 1536 the concordia movement precipitated a number of edicts, summons, threats, condemnations, and complaints against Schwenckfeld which seriously imperiled his safety in Ulm. He participated in several disputations to defend his position. In 1535 the Silesian exile visited Marburg and
Augsburg and then returned to Ulm (Fig. 5, 6), where he rejected the Wittenberg Concordia and appealed to the Council of Ulm for a hearing in 1536. Following this appeal, he visited friends in a clockwise circuit going through Stetten, Königen, Kirchheim, and Geislingen (Figs. 4, 6).

During the period 1534-36, in addition to continuing a steady flow of correspondence with friends in Silesia, he somehow managed the time to publish about a dozen important books as well as to further refine his Eucharistic religious precepts. A book—summarizing his contention that Christ, following his glorification and ascension, departed all earthly creaturely limitations and is in the heavenly state, divine, eternal, and coequal with God—absolutely contradicted the prevailing Protestant assertion that Christ ascended bodily into heaven.

This question became a matter of grave concern and intense discussion, resulting in a raging conflict between the preachers of Ulm and the founder of the Silesian movement. During the period 1537-39 Schwenckfeld's books were examined by the Ulm clergy and the exiled man participated in several public debates. Steadfastly refusing to accept the Wittenberg (Figs. 3, 6) Concordia articles, Schwenckfeld was, in effect, expelled from Ulm. Thereafter his life was in extreme peril.77

Schwenckfeld's Exile Around Esslingen, 1539-42

The Silesian exile left Ulm (Fig. 6) in September, 1539,74 going first to Augsburg and from there to Esslingen (Figs. 5, 6). Schwenckfeld, now in a more vulnerable situation than ever, was forced to survive as a vagabond, travelling incognito, and frequently seeking refuge and concealment in remote places. His freedom, if not his life, was in such extreme jeopardy that he travelled under an assumed name, mostly at night and usually during inclement weather, hiding in forests, stables, cellars, and other inhospitable nooks and crannies.79 For a time after he and his teachings were condemned by the Schmalkalken (Fig. 7) theologians in 1540, he lived in the forests around Esslingen (Fig. 7) where he wrote a multitude of letters. Some-
time in 1540 he moved to the safety of a monastery at Kempten (Fig. 5) where he wrote his greatest book and confession, *Vom Fleische Christi.* During most of 1541 he was sheltered by a sympathetic family at Wageg (Fig. 7), a few miles from Kempten. Following some amicable correspondence, Schwenckfeld was invited to Justingen (Fig. 7) in 1542, and he resided in Justingen (castle) under the beneficient protection of Philip von Hesse until 1547.

**Schwenckfeld’s Exile in Justingen, 1542-47**

During his residency in Justingen (Fig. 8) Schwenckfeld wrote more than four dozen books and approximately two hundred letters on religious subjects. Fortunately, because of Philip von Hesse, the Silesian was invulnerable to the numerous assaults by his enemies; unfortunately however, his final attempt to reach accord with Luther was rejected. Despite his prolific writing and studying, Schwenckfeld conserved an abundance of time for missionary activities, and between 1542 and 1545 he embarked on an exceedingly ambitious evangelistic venture. Although he followed a seemingly aimless path, each step of the journey was, in reality, a spontaneous reaction to the imminence of personal danger. The 1542-45 journey begins by travelling northwest to Baden, Landau, and Speyer (Figs. 4, 8); southeast to Cannstatt and Esslingen (Figs. 7, 8); southwest to Stetten and northeast to König (Figs. 5, 8); southeast to Kirchheim, Blaubeuren, and Kaufbeuren (Figs. 6, 8); southwest to Kempten and northwest to Memmingen before returning to Justingen (Figs. 5, 8). Later in 1545 he journeyed to Wageg and Isny (Figs. 5, 7, 8).

In 1546 Emperor Charles V declared war on the German Protestant princes and gradually defeated them. Philip von Hesse was arrested and the Imperial Army occupied Ulm (Fig. 6), confiscating Justingen castle. Once again Schwenckfeld was forced to flee, and this time he hastily migrated to Esslingen (Fig. 9) where he remained until 1550. Using an assumed name—his whereabouts known only to a few close friends and his enemies imprisoned or forced into exile by Emperor Charles V—Schwenckfeld lived in relative safety.
Schwenckfeld's Exile in Esslingen, 1547-50

While in Esslingen Schwenckfeld wrote several treatises and continued corresponding with the Silesians and friends in other territories. During his respite in Esslingen, the author of Eucharistic Christology completed three evangelistic missions: the first to Speyer in 1547; the next to Nürnberg, Ulm, and Augsburg (Figs. 4, 5, 9) in 1549; and the last to Justingen, Oepfingen, Ulm, and Wageg (Figs. 4, 5, 7, 9) in 1550. Then beginning in 1550 Schwenckfeld's adversaries began returning to their former positions and he subsequently was compelled to leave Esslingen" (Fig. 9).

Schwenckfeld's Exile in Southern Germanic Europe, 1550-61

Restoration of the German Protestant princes to their former offices, beginning about 1550, culminated with the signing of the Peace of Augsburg in 1555. Because the returning princes and clergymen intended to obliterate all forms of religious nonconformity in their territories," Schwenckfeld's personal situation again became extremely precarious," and during the period 1550 through 1555 he was compelled to remain in hiding for prolonged periods. This interval provided Schwenckfeld with an opportunity to publish three books, all of which were furiously attacked by his assailants, and numerous mandates, edicts, and condemnations calling for his arrest were issued. By 1557 the Diet of Naumburg, the Nürnberg Edict, the Peace of Augsburg, the Weimar Convention, and the Worms decree (Figs. 5, 9, 10) had all been directed against Schwenckfeld and the nonconformists; the Silesian nonetheless consistently defended his doctrines. Then, in 1558 censorship proceedings were issued against Schwenckfeld after he published a criticism which suggested—among other things—that the Reformation was creating a Protestant papacy. This publication resulted in anxious agitation in a number of cities." The above mentioned tumultuous events restricted Schwenckfeld's activities and forced him to hide, to travel secretly, and to find lodging in the most remote places; it further impaired his already failing health.
That Schwenckfeld, a man now in his sixties, should be in seriously declining health will come as no surprise to the reader, particularly considering the circumstances surrounding his life. His state of health, his travels, and his places of refuge from 1550 to 1558 are mysteriously vague and poorly documented. However, in 1558 he appeared in Leider (Fig. 10) partially recovered from what was evidently a rather prolonged illness and, with his health somewhat restored, he again completed several journeys, visiting Strassburg and Heidelberg in 1558, and Memmingen and Ulm in 1559 (Figs. 4, 5, 10). During a second visit to Memmingen he became critically ill and returned to Ulm in 1561 where he was sheltered and nursed by a friendly family. Unfortunately, his health, now beyond repair, continued to decline throughout the year until finally Caspar Schwenckfeld completed his life's work in Ulm (Fig. 10) on December 10, 1561.99

Geographical History of the Schwenckfelders in Northern Germanic Europe

When Caspar Schwenckfeld withdrew from his native land, there were Schwenckfeldian congregations in at least ten Silesian communities (Fig. 3C). Despite his absence from Silesia, and despite the ravages of relentless persecution, the Schwenckfeldian Movement grew and flourished for approximately a half century. Then for the next one and a half centuries, the ranks of the Schwenckfelders were so decimated that to avoid total annihilation, most of the surviving members of the movement migrated to Pennsylvania.
The major center of religious ferment, at least during the middle half of the sixteenth century, was in western and southern Germanic Europe (Figs. 1, 2). Although acting separately, both Lutherans and Roman Catholics were primarily committed to obliterating Militant Spiritualism, Anabaptism, Zwinglianism (and subsequently Calvinism also) while simultaneously attempting to destroy one another.

Then with Luther's passing, the Schmalkaldic Wars (1546-1555) erupted with great violence as Lutheranism and Catholicism contested for both clerical and secular hegemony in Germanic Europe. This brutal religious conflict terminated with the Peace of Augsburg (1555) which officially recognized both churches and outlawed all others. The Peace of Augsburg, in essence, legalized persecution, but it did not end the feud between Lutheranism and Catholicism. Indeed, the two state churches, albeit less violently and somewhat more aperiodically, continued their struggle for suzerainty in Germanic Europe for another generation. Then beginning about 1580 and continuing for nearly four decades, hostilities between the official churches subsided.

It is entirely possible that because of the Schwenckfelders' isolation and sparse population, the major churches may have considered them a minor problem which could be eliminated at any time. Consequently, the main thrust of Lutheran and Catholic belligerence was directed west and south to destroy the larger, more threatening nonconformist groups. Although they experienced the same ruthlessly repressive measures inflicted upon all nonconformist groups, the Schwenckfelders were probably persecuted less frequently until about 1580.

For the reasons outlined in the preceding paragraphs of this section, together with Schwenckfeld's prolific deluge of correspondence with the Silesians and the evangelistic commitment of the lay-ministers, there was a noticeable growth in membership and territorial diffusion of the movement across a relatively large section of Silesia. Consequently, by 1580 the Schwenckfeldian congregations existing at the beginning of the
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founder’s exile (Fig. 3C) had increased substantially in membership, and smaller but flourishing congregations had been firmly established in Goldberg, Harpersdorf, and a number of villages surrounding these two communities (Fig. 11A). It is estimated that there were between 4,000 and 4,500 Schwenckfelders in Silesia in 1580.97

Beginning in the 1580’s the frequency and ferocity of repressive measures inflicted upon the Schwenckfelders increased sharply. The cruelties perpetrated against them almost reached barbaric proportions during the Thirty Years War (1618-1648). This long three-decade holocaust totally obliterated all the Schwenckfeldian groups across southern Germanic Europe. The Peace of Westphalia (1648), which concluded the Thirty Years War, extended the provisions of the Peace of Augsburg to include Calvinism. Henceforth, the outlawed non-conformist religious groups were now subjected to the tyranny of three powerful state churches. Acts of oppression may have been less barbaric after 1648, but persecution remained relentless and exceedingly brutal. Hence, the number of Schwenckfelders in Silesia declined from over 4,000 in 1580 to less than 1,500 at the end of the seventeenth century88 (Figs. 3C, 11A). This decrease amounted to about 225 per decade between 1580 and 1800.

These devastating persecutions substantially altered the geography of Schwenckfeldianism in Silesia by the opening decade of the eighteenth century. The large congregations in the major cities (Fig. 11A) were readily accessible to the tyrannical oppressors. The adherents who survived or had not converted to a state religion joined their brethren in the smaller congregations in and near Goldberg and Harpersdorf (Fig. 11A). Others became ruralists moving farther south and inter­spersing widely with non-Schwenckfelders in the area bounded by Goldberg, Harpersdorf, Hirchberg, and Landschut99 (Fig. 11A). Hence, between the 1580’s and the first decade of the eighteenth century Schwenckfeldianism dramatically diminished in population and contracted in territorial extent (Figs. 3C, 11A). Much worse was yet to come!

The tempo of persecutions accelerated, and methods of repression became nearly as savage during the first quarter of the eighteenth century as during the Thirty Years War. The peaceful, hardworking, frugal, law-abiding, taxpaying, and deeply religious Schwenckfelders were cast into dungeons, chained to galley-rower benches until they expired, were placed in the front lines during wars to be slaughtered, and were subjected to many other inhumane acts. For example, their books were destroyed, children were forcefully baptized against the will of parents, marriage within the faith was prohibited, Christian burial was denied, and women were placed in the stocks for refusing to present babies for infant Lutheran baptism, among other cruelties. Although these methods had been commonly employed since the late seventeenth century, they were more forcefully and malevolently applied during the early eighteenth century.98

All the Schwenckfelders, the villagers as well as the ruralites, remained incognito, associating more with nonmembers than among themselves. They were unable to develop a religious organization since it was difficult to safely conduct worship services. Hence, youth possessed little knowledge of Schwenckfeldian doctrine and a growing indifference toward the faith gradually emerged. Thus, by the second decade of the eighteenth century Schwenckfeldianism was faced with the prospect of total disintegration,99 and in 1721 living conditions were so unbearable that the Schwenckfelders sent a delegation of several senior members to plead before the imperial court for mercy and toleration. During the next four years, this delegation presented nearly a score of petitions at a substantial cost. Finally, the commission was ordered to cease petitioning and return home. This order was followed by a threat amounting to abduction of children and life imprisonment for adults in forced labor camps if the ultimatum were not obeyed.

Now their only hope of survival lay in disposal of property and migration; unfortunately, both were forbidden. Early in 1526 the Schwenckfelders initiated confidential negotiations with the authorities in Saxony (Figs. 2, 3, 11A) to grant temporary asylum until they could accumulate sufficient resources to undertake an ambitious plan to migrate to Pennsylvania. Refuge was granted and the Schwenckfelders quickly completed preparations to migrate to Saxony.

**Schwenckfelder Migrations in Germanic Europe**

There was a surviving nucleus of but 519 Schwenckfelders remaining in Silesia (Fig. 11B) when the emigration to Saxony (Figs. 2, 3, 11B) commenced in 1726,102 compared with some 1,500 adherents at the dawn of the century. These statistics indicate an average population decrease of approximately 390 per decade as compared with about 225 a decade during the period 1580 to 1700. Even taking into account religious conversion, it seems evident that atrocities inflicted on the Schwenckfelders in the eighteenth century must have been considerably harsher than in earlier times.

It is estimated that in 1726, well over 400 members of this surviving nucleus fled westward across the Silesian border to eastern Saxony (Figs. 11A, 11B). They were forced to leave stealthily at night, and they traveled in small groups of families from the remaining small congregations. Many of those choosing to remain in Silesia converted to Lutheranism or soon died; thus, the religious and spatial experiences of the Schwenckfelders in their homeland almost ended two centuries to the year after Caspar Schwenckfeld instituted the “Stillstand.”103
In Saxony, most of the Schwenckfelders established homes in and around Gorlitz and some in and near Bertelsdorf (Fig. 11B). Since they were without funds, Dutch Mennonites provided the necessary relief to purchase property, build homes, and even to construct a small meetinghouse for worship services in Bertelsdorf (Figure 11B). They soon obtained employment and, exercising frugality to the point of privation, began saving to finance their proposed plan to emigrate to Pennsylvania. Religious events beyond their control forced the Schwenckfelders to implement their migration plan prematurely however, and even with the sale of property and other possessions to supplement their savings their funds were insufficient to undertake the transatlantic journey. Fortunately, beneficent Dutch Mennonites furnished the necessary aid.

The religious turmoil that precipitated the Schwenckfelder's departure was brought about by Count Zinzendorf. In 1722, Zinzendorf, in search of religious freedom, established a Moravian community at Herrnhut (Figs. 2, 11B). When he subsequently attempted to organize a unified Pietistic Lutheran Church encompassing all the nonconformist bodies in Saxony (including the Schwenckfelders) his activities caused the imperial authorities to demand the return of the Moravians to their homeland. Although the Schwenckfelders objected to Zinzendorf's activities, the Jesuits also called for their return to Silesia (Figure 11). Under great pressure from neighboring states, the authorities advised the Schwenckfelders on April 4, 1734, that they could no longer be protected and would be granted one year to leave Saxony (Fig. 11B). Despite their economic plight (which was to become exceedingly desperate in the days ahead) the Schwenckfelders began leaving Saxony on April 20, 1734 for America.

Since even in Saxony the Schwenckfelders were forbidden from emigrating as a single body, they began their journey by travelling in small groups. The first destination was Pirna on the Elbe River in southern Saxony (Figs. 4, 11B) where those deciding to emigrate were to meet and embark for Pennsylvania. By April 28 all the adherents choosing to emigrate, a total of 181, had assembled and set sail for Hamburg-Altona. Along the way they stopped at a number of towns for a few hours or overnight to replenish supplies. Most important among these communities were Strahlen,
Dornitz, Wittenberg, Dessau, Barby, Schönbeck, Magdeburg, Burta, Jurchs, Tangermunde, Standau, Lentzen, Hizaker, Boithenburg, and Lauenburg (Fig. 12); in Saxony, Brandenburg, and Hanover (Figs. 2, 12). They arrived in Hamburg on May 16 and disembarked the following day in Altona where their vessels were to be outfitted for the trip to their next destination, the Netherlands (Fig. 12). Philanthropic Dutch Mennonites equipped three small vessels and provided other necessities for the destitute Schwenckfelders during the eleven day wait in Altona.

The Schwenckfelder migrants left Hamburg-Altona for the Netherlands on May 28. Sailing along the coast of Hanover and Oldenberg (Fig. 2), the ships were scattered by hazardous weather conditions and docked separately at Amsterdam (Fig. 12) between June 4 and June 6. They then proceeded to Haarlem (Fig. 12) where they remained for fifteen days of rest and recuperation. Once again the charitable Mennonites supported the impoverished Schwenckfelders; they not only provided food, clothing, and shelter during the stay in Haarlem, they also supplied the ship which was to carry them across the Atlantic, and they even established a relief fund for their use in Pennsylvania.

On June 19 the Schwenckfelders left Haarlem for Rotterdam (Fig. 12) where, on June 21 they boarded the ship St. Andrew. The St. Andrew lifted anchor on June 28, but because of numerous navigational problems and inclement weather she was unable to leave Dutch coastal waters until July 11. Throughout this troublesome three-week period, the humanitarian Mennonites again contributed more than ample sustenance. The St. Andrew finally docked safely at Plymouth, England (Fig. 12), on July 17, and remained there for twelve days while the vessel was stocked and conditioned for the transatlantic voyage. Then, on July 29, the Silesian migrants left Plymouth and were on their way to the New World. After a three months voyage distinguished by crowding, hunger, thirst, illness, and the death of ten persons, the St. Andrew docked at Philadelphia on October 22, 1734. The Schwenckfelder immigrants proceeded to town hall, took the necessary oaths of allegiance, and moved into the hinterlands, becoming one of the four principal religious groups originally comprising the Southeastern Pennsylvania Plain Dutch Community.
In addition to the main migration of 1734 just described, five additional migrations between 1731 and 1737 included 38 more persons deciding to emigrate to the New World; three of these persons died en route. Altogether, 219 Schwenckfelders left their European homelands, but only 206 arrived in Pennsylvania. Of the approximately 300 persons electing to remain in Silesia or Saxony (Fig. 11), most joined the Lutheran Church, while others succumbed to war, famine, disease, or time. The last known European Schwenckfelder was laid to rest in 1826, terminating the sect’s religious and spatial history on that continent. Fortunately, they flourished economically, if not numerically, in Pennsylvania. Unfortunately, at least in this writer’s opinion, they have been fully assimilated into contemporary American society.

**SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS**

**Summary**

Caspar Schwenckfeld, a Silesian (Figs. 2, 3) nobleman of ethnic German (Figs. 1, 2) heritage, developed a rather unorthodox religious system defined as Eucharistic Christology, which he established in the area just west of the Oder River in Silesia (Fig. 3) in 1526. The unusual principles of Schwenckfeldianism, which the movement emanating from this religious system was soon called, were foreign to, and well in advance of, the religious mentality. Probably because of its unconventional precepts which were difficult to understand and accept, the movement did not attract large numbers of converts. Thus, historically, the movement was never numerically large nor did it ever develop in a formal context beyond the borders of Silesia (Figs. 1, 2, 3).

When the Protestant Reformation erupted at Wittenberg (Fig. 3) and engulfed Germanic Europe (Figs. 1, 2) Schwenckfeld became particularly sensitive to the wretched life of the peasants. Believing the Roman Catholic Church to be responsible for the deplorable conditions of the masses, he became an ardent supporter of Protestantism, convinced that the Reformation represented the dawn of a new, improved way of life. Soon disillusioned by Lutheranism, he seceded from the Wittenberg Reformation and founded Schwenckfeldianism when he instituted the “Stillstand” in 1526. Thus, he was condemned by the Roman and Lutheran Churches for his statements and actions. Under considerable duress from both churches, and desiring to protect his friends and associates and preserve the movement, he left Silesia (Figs. 2, 3) in 1529 never to return. Schwenckfeld spent the next 32 years as a vagabond in southern Germanic Europe (Figure 1). He continually traversed Alsace, Baden, Wurtemberg, Bavaria, and the Palatinate (Figs. 1, 2) in order to avoid arrest, fines, imprisonment, torture, and possible death resulting from threats included in the many edicts and decrees calling for his incarceration. During this long period of almost constant movement, he visited many south German cities (Figs. 4-10) seeking refuge. He frequently travelled an inner, rectangularly shaped circuit bounded by Strassburg, Speyer, Augsburg, Kempten, Lsny, and Stetten (Fig. 13); he visited some of the cities in this region several times. The Silesian exile also journeyed farther north and east from time to time, and this larger, more pentagonally shaped zone extended to Frankfurt, Nürnberg, and Leeder (Fig. 13). Schwenckfeld organized a number of small communities in some of the cities bounded by the inner circuit which survived until the Thirty Years War.

The small numerical size and the location of the movement seems to have been a distinct advantage, at least in the early years. Silesia, located at the eastern end of Germanic Europe, was far from the major centers of religious ferment in the Rhine and Danube River areas (Figs. 1, 2, 4), and the primary attention of the larger “official” churches was probably focused on destroying the major nonconformist bodies in those areas. This westward orientation may have resulted in less frequent, less severe persecution by Catholic and Lutheran forces than otherwise would have appertained. Regardless, Schwenckfeldianism continued to grow for about half a century after its founding (Fig. 3).

By the last quarter of the sixteenth century however, the explosive growth and expansion of most other nonconformist groups was brought under control and persecution of the Schwenckfelders increased in frequency and intensity. The savage, unrelenting persecutions initiated against the Schwenckfelders in the late sixteenth century reached inhumane, almost barbaric proportions by the early decades of the eighteenth century. Decline of the Schwenckfelder population from more than 4,000 to just over 500 between 1580 and 1726 is ample evidence of these atrocities. The survivors abandoned the original congregations and fled to the hinterland areas to find shelter and safety (Figs. 3, 11) in the early years of the eighteenth century.

Faced with the distinct possibility of the movement’s annihilation, a large number of Schwenckfelders migrated to Saxony (Fig. 11) in 1726. The leader of another nonconformist group, recently emigrating to Saxony, precipitated such religious turmoil that the Schwenckfelders, who were not involved in these activities, were ordered to leave Saxony. In 1734, with the assistance of Dutch Mennonites, 181 Schwenckfelders emigrated from Saxony to Pennsylvania; most others returned to Silesia (Fig. 11). Between 1731 and 1737 another 38 adherents emigrated from Silesia to Pennsylvania. Altogether, 206 survived the arduous journey.

Among those choosing the remain in Europe, most
converted to Lutheranism, some were persecuted, and a few succumbed to that irresistible nemesis—time. Finally in 1826, precisely three centuries after its founding, the geographical history of Schwenckfeldianism came to a conclusion in Germanic Europe (Figs. 1, 11, 12).

Conclusions

Although it might be debated by many, this writer is convinced Caspar Schwenckfeld was one of the true religious giants of the sixteenth century. One is astonished by the prodigious quantity of significant, exceedingly scholarly literature—of which some is only presently being appreciated—published by him while devoting so much time and energy to safety and security. One is equally amazed by the fact that so few studies of Schwenckfeld have been completed by theologians, in particular, or academicians, in general. It has been said that the number of studies of Schwenckfeld is inversely proportional to the man's importance.144

Perhaps the paucity of studies is directly related to the size of the Schwenckfeldian Movement and to the fact that he was held in such scornful contempt by so many peers. Because of the sparsity of literature other than that by Schwenckfelders, some of the factual contents as presented by this geographer also may be debatable. Despite all efforts to the contrary, it is humanly impossible for Schwenkfelder scholars to be absolutely objective. Thus, there are differences in presentation and interpretation by Schwenkfelder and non-Schwenkfelder investigators of the Silesian reformer and his movement.

Considering that Schwenckfeld was able to directly guide development of the movement for only three years after its founding, and considering the constant venomous attempts to disgrace him throughout his long precarious life in exile, and remembering also the minute size and insignificant territorial extent of the movement—the staying power of Schwenckfeldianism proved remarkable. It was only after two centuries of withstanding virulent, withering persecution that the movement faced the very definite prospect of extinction, and even then, a substantial fraction of the remnants of Schwenckfeldianism possessed the strength and fortitude to transfer to Pennsylvania, where the movement survived. Thus, among the original Plain Dutch peoples, Schwenckfeldianism is the preeminent example of the virtual impossibility of destroying an innocent group of people.

In this geographer's opinion some of Schwenckfeld's precepts—e.g., the spiritual, invisible, nameless church devoid of ritual and doctrine and guided by a lay-cergy—were so unrealistic as to contradict human nature, and in fact, the Schwenkfelders now worship in church buildings, employ a professional clergy, and accept adult faith baptism and other formalities. They have long since abandoned many of the movement's original principles, and the degree to which this dilution contributed to their total assimilation into American life is impossible to ascertain. What is certain however, is that today (even though it has only about 2,750111 baptized members) the Schwenkfelder Church flourishes.
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Religious Words and Terms


Spellings

Consistency in spellings, particularly of place-names, is nearly always a problem in studies encompassing so much time and space. Occasionally, discrepancies even occur in the spelling of proper names.

The writer has attempted to preserve the original Germanic spellings. In all cases where there is disagreement, the author used the following procedure: When the various sources dispute a spelling, if the Schwenkfelders uniformly agree, their version is used. If the
Schwenkfelders also disagree among themselves, then the contemporary spelling is used. When referring to the movement and its founder in Europe, the original Germanic spelling is employed; when referring to him and the movement in Pennsylvania, the Americanized spelling is used. The only exception to this procedure is titles of references. The primary spelling sources used in this geographical analysis are: Howard W. Kriebel, The Schwenkfelders in Pennsylvania: A Historical Sketch, (Lancaster, Pa.: 1904); Littell, The MacMillan Atlas History of Christianity; Selina G. Schultz, Caspar Schwenckfeld von Ossig: A Course of Study; Williams, The Radical Reformation; and F.E. Mayer, The Religious Bodies of America. Several other Schwenkfelder and non-Schwenkfelder studies were used as secondary sources in cases of disagreement.

Map Notes and Sources

Map Notes

Several interrelated factors: time, space, map scale, number of place-names, and publication limitations posed some insurmountable cartographic problems. The two paramount problems being the impossibility of including the number of maps which would be needed to show, sequentially, all the provincial boundary changes through the three centuries encompassed by this report; and the degree of generalization which always results from including such a vast amount of territory on extremely small-scale maps.

Boundaries shown on Figure 2 are used throughout the study. In order to include all places of significance while using legibly sized symbols and letters causes cities to appear slightly misplaced and boundaries to appear imprecise. Employment of legibly sized symbols and letters precluded including all place-locations on any one map. Thus, places shown on one map, unless absolutely necessary, are located but not named on subsequent maps. Also to avoid cluttering, the use of lines to show the general direction of movement is minimized.

Map Sources

Anonymous map dated 1748, available in Schwenkfelder Library. (Figures 3 and 11)
Erb, Peter C., Dr., Associate Director, Schwenkfelder Library, Department of English, Wilfrid Laurier University, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada: Telephone interviews, March 5 and March 8, 1982. (Figure 5)
Littell, Franklin H. The MacMillan Atlas History of Christianity. (Figures 1, 2, and 3)
McNally, Francis. McNally’s System of Geography. Chicago: A.S. Barnes and Company, 1875 (Figures 4 through 11)
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Coat of Arms of Caspar von Schwenckfeld
(Courtesy of The Schwenkfelder Library, Pennsburg, PA)
Once again we are pleased to announce the appearance of a new book that will be of unusual interest to many of our readers: C. Richard Beam’s PENNSYLVANIA GERMAN DICTIONARY: English to Pennsylvania Dutch, Schaefferstown, PA: Historic Schaefferstown, Inc., 1982. Beam’s new work—the first Pennsylvania Dutch dictionary to be published in over 30 years—contains approximately 10,000 English terms for which one or more equivalents are presented in Pennsylvania German. In making his compilation, Beam consulted previously published Pennsylvania German dictionaries and word lists and as a result, numerous dialect words which were known earlier in the century have been included. This dictionary, therefore, is one that should be of interest to native speakers as well as to those encountering the dialect for the first time. An Associate Professor of German at Millersville State College in Millersville, PA, Beam spent 5 years on this project, and the results are well worth it; authoritative, attractive, interesting, and easy to read, Professor Beam’s book is everything a good dictionary should be.

The preceding mention of Professor Beam and his work brings to mind the Society for German-American Studies, since Beam is chairman of the membership committee for that group. The SGAS is an organization which seeks to “promote interest in the study of history, linguistics, folklore, genealogy, literature, theater, music and other creative art forms as they apply to the cross-cultural relations between German-speaking lands and the Americas.” Membership is open to any individual, society, or organization with interests in these areas. Anyone interested in joining should contact Professor Beam at 406 Spring Drive, Millersville, PA 17551.

We also want to alert our readers to the availability of a film by Pat Ferrero about an important folk tradition—Quilts in Women’s Lives. Winner of several awards (including BEST OF FESTIVAL, National Educational Film Festival) the film presents a series of portraits of traditional quilters and provides insight into the spirit of these women who are the basis for this continuing tradition of quilting. For those interested, more information can be obtained from: New Day Films, P.O. Box 315, Franklin Lakes, NJ 07417.

From our readers we have two requests for information. The first is from long-time contributor to PENNSYLVANIA FOLKLIFE Henry J. Kauffman who wants information about butter prints and molds. He would like to know who made them, and how, when, and where they were made and used. Henry’s address is 1704 Millersville Pike, Lancaster, PA 17603.

The second request is from Nada Gray, head of the Oral Traditions Project of the Union County Historical Society, Second and St. Louis Sts., Lewisburg, PA 17837. Ms. Grey would like information about 19th century craft traditions of women at holiday time (especially Christmas and Easter) for a book that is to be published by Christmas of 1983. Both will appreciate any help that you can give them.

As this is written, the end of the year is rapidly approaching. 1982 has been a busy year, and for the Pennsylvania German Studies Program here at Ursinus College, a most successful one. Ursinus continues to offer a unique opportunity to earn a minor in Pennsylvania German studies, and Program Director William T. Parsons reports a record enrollment in the Spring Term. During that term twenty students—ranging from majors and minors in History through German and Physics majors—registered for a course in Arts and Crafts in FolkCulture Context. Summer Seminar classes at the college included four weeks of dialect use in Sprichwerdt and Pennsylvaanisch un Pfälzisch G’dichte, taught by Marie K. Graeff and Dr. Parsons. Those one-week, one-credit Seminars were also parlayed into three-credit courses by some who had used the available modular schedule. In summary, Day, Summer, and Evening sessions of the Pennsylvania German Studies Program are now thriving on the Collegeville campus. Only the experiment in college-credit classes at the Kutztown Festival has fared badly, and Director Parsons has regretfully decided that no further courses will be offered there.
In reviewing the events of the past several months we want to make brief mention of visits to the area by some of our German friends. Between 25 July and 12 August 1982, the South Moravian Choir of Stuttgart, under the direction of Widmar Hader with arrangements by Martin Röslar, toured from Bethlehem, Nazareth and Ephrata, PA to Baltimore, MD and Washington, D.C. During most of their visit they operated out of a home base on the Ursinus College campus, and we hope to have a proper article on their unit and their trip in the Spring 1983 issue of Pennsylvanica FOLKLIFE. Also visiting southeastern Pennsylvania in July were Herman Jäger and son of Bad Bergzabern, Pfalz. They were busy making arrangements for an April, 1983 visit of folk singers from the Pfalz; more information about this at a later date also. Finally and most recently, film producer Herr Doktor Koch of Munich and his historical advisor from the Heimatstelle Pfalz Roland Paul, spent an afternoon with us photographing Fraktur in the archives of the Pennsylvania Folklife Society. Their visit was part of a photographic tour through southeastern Pennsylvania to gather footage for Koch's documentary: Germantown 1683/1983, for Rhineeland television-Südwest Deutsches Rundfunk.

Other folks in Pennsylvania Dutch country have been busy this year also, and in eastern Berks County the Huffs Church Players presented Paul R. Wieand's Die Hochzich om Kreitzwaig Schtor (The Marriage at the Crossroads Store), to the delight of capacity audiences virtually every performance. Director Carl Arner, Schtoriemaeschter Clarence G. Reitnauer, and Pianoschpieler Kay Kriebel drew particular applause. Bob Reinhard and Dolores Funk played the bashful couple, Lloyd Diehl's stuttering kept the audience alternately in suspense and stitches, and newcomer Heather Reinhard was especially convincing in a supporting role.

Also in Berks County Die Dritt Pennsylvanisch-Deitsch Versammlung von West Baerricks Kaunty met at the Tulpehocken High School in Bernville on 25 September 1982. Directors and officers planned the event, among them, Gerald Labe, Marie K. Graeff, Erika Brossman, Charles Hemmig and many others. Stella Matthews and Ernie Bechtel were featured dialect speakers. Die Dolpheck Sänger Chor led folk singing.

To celebrate the 300th Anniversary of German settlement in America, the Philadelphia Museum of Art has organized a special exhibit: The Pennsylvania Germans: A Celebration of their Arts 1683-1850. The Museum of Art and the Winterthur Museum, Delaware have selected and organized this special gathering of folk and formal art. Some 330 objects—many on loan from other institutions or private collectors—are on display. This is the finest of art exhibits about the Pennsylvania Germans ever to be assembled, and well worth a special trip to see. The exhibit will remain on view in Philadelphia until 9 January 1983. Other locations and dates are: Museum of Fine Arts, Houston, 15 March-15 May 1983; Fine Arts Museum of San Francisco, 2 July-3 September 1983; Art Institute of Chicago, 10 December-29 January 1984.

A scholarly Symposium—Palatines/Americans 1683/1983—is now being planned as our part in the worldwide celebration of initial German settlement in Pennsylvania (6 October 1683). The Symposium is scheduled for 23, 24, 25 September 1983 at Ursinus College, Collegeville, PA. It is sponsored by the Pennsylvania German Program of Ursinus College and by the Heimatstelle Pfalz of Kaiserslautern, Pfalz, although eventual responsibility is with the host institution. Initial planning envisages a modest celebration, largely through the presentation of scholarly papers and beiträge, with folk music concerts and related displays of art and folk cultural items. Organized visits to related programs and Pennsylvania German events nearby are also anticipated. Names and topics of specific participants will be announced in due time; meanwhile, any questions and/or suggestions may be forwarded to: Prof. William T. Parsons, Ursinus College, Collegeville, PA 19426, USA.
The Festival and its Sponsorship

The Kutztown Folk Festival is sponsored by the Pennsylvania Folklife Society, a nonprofit educational corporation affiliated with URSINUS COLLEGE, Collegeville, Pennsylvania. The Society's purposes are threefold: First, the demonstrating and displaying of the lore and folkways of the Pennsylvania Dutch through the annual Kutztown Folk Festival; second, the collecting, studying, archiving and publishing the lore of the Dutch Country and Pennsylvania through the publication of PENNSYLVANIA FOLKLIFE Magazine; and third, using the proceeds for scholarships and general educational purposes at URSINUS COLLEGE.