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MORAVIAN, SCHWENKFELDER, AND AMERICAN LOG CONSTRUCTION

by Terry G. Jordan

For decades, scholars from a variety of disciplines have debated the European origins of Midland American log construction, a type initially implanted in the Delaware Valley and later typical of much of the forested eastern United States, including Pennsylvania. Both Scandinavian and Alemannic German antecedents were proposed, and subsequent research established that many form elements of the American style did,
indeed, derive from those regions. The debate entered a new phase when, in 1938, historian Thomas J. Wertenbaker first proposed that eastern Germans had also helped shape American log architecture. "From Saxony," he suggested, came an "attractive" and "peculiar" method of log construction (Fig. 1), import to colonial America primarily by the Moravian Brethren or Herrnhuters, religious descendants of Jan Hus. Geographer Fred Kniffen and folklorist Henry Glassie placed still greater emphasis on eastern German origin when, three decades later, they proposed that the primary source area of Midland log construction lay in "Moravia, Bohemia, and Silesia" rather than in Sweden, Switzerland, or southwestern Germany. Glassie, writing several years later, presented an even stronger statement of the thesis, declaring that only "in Bohemia, western Moravia, and Silesia" could "log construction of exactly the American type" be found (Fig. 2). To the Moravian Brethren he and Kniffen added the Schwenkfelders, Silesian pietists, as agents of diffusion.

The thesis proposed by Wertenbaker, Kniffen, and Glassie remained untested through field research, and none of the proponents of eastern German origin,
Fig. 3: Log wall with open chinks, thick two-sided hewing, and gently-splayed full-dovetail notching, on a haybarn in Moravian Valachia (field research district 6), now in the Valašské Muzeum v Přírodě (Valachian Open-Air Museum) at Rožnov pod Radhoštěm (Roznau), Moravia.
Fig. 4: The field research districts are: 1 = Upper Lausitz, 2 = Loučná headwaters, 3 = Lanškroun (Landskron) area, 4 = Lívice nad Orlicí (Lititz) area, 5 = Kineland-Moravian Gate, 6 = Moravian Valachie, 7 = Schwenkfelder source area, 8 = Lower Lausitz-Spreewald, 9 = Lausitzer Hills, 10 = Český Ráj (Bohemian Paradise), 11 = Karkonosze (Riesengebirge), 12 = Walbrzych (Waldenburg) area, 13 = Kotlina Kłodzka (Glatz Hill Land), 14 = Opole (Oppeln) area, 15 = Racibórz-Głubczyce (Ratibor-Leobschütz) area, 16 = Gliwice (Gleiwitz) area, 17 = northern Katowice (Kattowitz) district, 18 = Jawor- niki, 19 = Rajčanka Valley, and 20 = Varinka Valley. Sources for the distribution of log construction, in addition to field research, are Richter, "Die Wand," p. 61 and Matuszczak, Z Dziejów, p. 160.
so far as I can determine, ever inspected log buildings in the proposed source area. In an effort to remedy this deficiency, I spent the summer of 1982 in Czechoslovakia, Poland, and the German Democratic Republic accumulating field data. The present paper involves my testing of the eastern German origin hypothesis.

Perusal of pertinent secondary sources led me, at the outset, to revise and refine the thesis slightly. The potential source region, at the time of the migrations to America in the eighteenth century, constituted one of the most Slavicized parts of German-speaking Europe. Even German ethnographers of the Nazi era acknowledged that the log construction of Silesia and the Sudetenland had Slavic roots. In fact, the advent of Prussian rule had marked the decline of log building in areas such as Silesia, where Frederick the Great sought to lessen fire danger by restricting wooden construction. Moreover, substantial numbers of the Moravian Brethren who came to colonial America were ethnic Czechs rather than Germans. The eastern German methods of log carpentry, then, are largely Slavic (Fig. 3). Accordingly, the hypothesis to be tested is that Midland American log construction is derived in large part from a traditional eastern German western Slavic type brought to America by Moravian Brethren and Schwenkfelders from Silesia, Bohemia, Moravia, and Saxony; that the Brethren, in retreating from religious persecution, brought with them not only a Czech religious faith, but also a partially Slavic carpentry tradition.

Field Research Areas

The proposed agents of diffusion, the Brethren and Schwenkfelders, came originally from several small districts in Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia, where log construction was common. More specifically, the eastern German roots of the Moravian Brethren lay in
the Litice nad Orlicí (Lititz)-Litomyšl (Leitomischl)-
Lanškroun (Landskron) area in far northeastern Bohemian and the Fulnek (Fulneck)-Nový Jičín (Neuutschnein) district in northeastern Moravia, near the border of Czech Silesia. The latter district, straddling the strategic Moravian Gate near the headwaters of the Oder, was known to its German-speaking inhabitants as the Kuhländl (Czech Kravarsko), the “Kineland.” In the 1600s, following a traditional path of Hussite refugees, many Brethren fled from these regions to Silesia and other lands to the north seeking religious freedom. A century later another major migration brought Brethren to Herrnhut and nearby villages of Upper Lusatia, in the eastern part of the Kingdom of Saxony. An informal census taken at Herrnhut in 1756 revealed that 62 percent of the Brethren claimed Moravian origin, while the remaining 38 percent declared Bohemia to be their ancestral home. Also contributing heavily to the Herrnhut colony were the Silesian settlements of the earlier Moravian diaspora. Church records and epitaphs in Brethren parishes at Herrnhut in East Germany; at Bethlehem, Nazareth, and Lititz in Pennsylvania; and at Winston-Salem in North Carolina provide abundant data on the specific origins (Fig. 4). On the basis of these records, I selected five Brethren source regions in the Czech-Polish-East German borderland for intensive field research, including (1) the district of Litice nad Orlicí, (2) the Loučná headwaters around Litomyšl, (3) the Lanškroun region, (4) the Kineland or Moravian Gate, and (5) Upper Lusatia (Fig. 4). To these I added a sixth district, the northern part of Moravian Valachia, a hilly region bordering the Kineland on the south and a major log construction survival area (Figs. 3, 4). Fortunately, nearly all of the Brethren source areas proved to be rich in log architecture. Only the Kineland, where most of the surviving log structures are hidden by a sheath of masonry or plaster, was a disappointment (Fig. 5). Near Litomyšl, even a source village unpromisingly named Kamené Sedliště (Steinern Sedlitz), “Sedliště built of stone,” consists largely of log buildings (Fig. 6).
In Upper Lausitz, Herrnhut displays no visible log walls, but many nearby villages offer abundant examples.

The seventh district of intensive field research encompasses the source region of the Schwenkfelders, a Lower Silesian sect derived from the rolling plains between Lwówek Śląski (Lowenberg) and Złotoryja (Goldberg), in present-day southwestern Poland (Fig. 4). While not rich in log buildings, this Lower Silesian area has enough surviving specimens to permit analysis (Fig. 7). The Schwenkfelders, following the example of the Brethren, sought religious haven in Upper Lausitz before coming to America. One of their principal refuge villages, Berthelsdorf, lies scarcely a kilometer from Herrnhut in Saxony.

In addition to the seven districts of intensive study, I made less rigorous field surveys in thirteen other areas in Bohemia, Slovakia, Poland, and the German Democratic Republic (Fig. 4). While none of these areas served as major source regions of colonial American immigrants, all are peripheral to the Brethren or Schwenkfelder homelands and contain abundant log buildings. They could not safely be ignored. Altogether, then, my field research encompassed twenty separate districts in and around the primary eastern German source regions of colonial American settlers.

Settlements in Colonial America

The eastern Germans arrived late in the Teutonic migration to colonial America. Lutherans, Calvinists, Dunkers, Mennonites, and Amish, largely of Rhenish and Swiss origin, preceded the Moravians and Schwenkfelders, concentrating mainly in southeastern Pennsylvania. Individual eastern Germans, including Silesians, had arrived in the American colonies as early as the middle 1600s, but the Brethren and Schwenkfelders together constituted the first sizable group to immigrate from that region.

Schwenkfelders led the way, abandoning their temporary refuge in Upper Lausitz in the mid-1730s to settle in Pennsylvania. Forty families strong, they occupied several contiguous townships northwest of Philadelphia, centered in Montgomery County (Fig. 8). Their descendants, numbering about 4,000, remain con-
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centrated there today.20 The Schwenkfelders erected numerous log buildings in their new homeland, some of which survived into the modern era.

Following an abortive colonization attempt in Georgia, the Moravian Brethren, probably influenced by the Schwenkfelders, began migrating in strength to Pennsylvania in the 1740s. Bethlehem and Nazareth, founded in 1741, were the mother colonies. Lititz, Emmaus, and Lebanon were soon added to the list of major Pennsylvania Moravian settlements, and the rapidity of Brethren diffusion is suggested by the fact that, as early as 1752, they occupied at least thirty-five Pennsylvania sites with functioning schools (Fig. 8).21 A further scattering, including Indian missions, sent Brethren into eastern Ohio, New Jersey, and New York before 1790, and Moravian missionaries were active among other Germans as far south as the Shenandoah Valley and Piedmont of Virginia.22 In the 1750s and 1760s, a second major implantment, Wachovia, was made in the North Carolina Piedmont, where Salem became the principal settlement.23 The colonial Brethren, like their Schwenkfelder counterparts, initially built log structures in America.24 These buildings were the work of a relatively small number of professional and journeymen carpenters, many of whom were born in Moravia. They included Anton Seiffert and Josef Bulitschek of Bohemia; Melchoir Schmidt, Georg Schindler, Michael Muenster, David Kunz, Paul Fritsche, and Melchoir Coumad of Moravia; Friedrich Beyer and David Tanneberger from Silesia; Tobias Hirte from Saxony; Christian Triebel; and Martin Lick. Schindler, Schmidt, Fritsche, Kunz, and Tanneberger were all natives of the town of Suchdol nad Odrou (Zauchtel, Zauchenthal) in the Kineland; Hirte was an Upper Lausitzer from Eibau near Herrnhut; and Seiffert was born in Lipka north of Lanškroun.25 By and large, the Brethren constituted a higher socioeconomic group than the masses of colonial Germans, to the extent that "a majority of the group was of the craftsman class."26 In North Carolina, Salem's master workmen instituted a system of apprenticeship beginning at age twelve.27 These skills could have allowed the Moravians to exert a greater influence on colonial carpentry than their relatively small numbers and late arrival would suggest.

With this sketch of source regions and migrations as a background, I turn now to a description and analysis of the carpentry tradition of the Moravians and Schwenkfelders, comparing their eastern German practices with those of Midland America. An appropriate place to begin is with the techniques for shaping logs.

Log Shaping Techniques

In Midland American construction, three principal log shapes prevail: (1) round, (2) split or half-log, and (3) two-sided hewing, in which the curved surfaces are removed from the front and back of the log with ax and adze, leaving the natural rounded shape on the top and bottom (Fig. 9). Usually the hewing is sufficiently severe to produce a plank half or less as thick as tall. On Midland dwellings, two-sided planking is the prevalent log shape, but this method is not too common in northern Europe and is absent among the
Alpine and Alemannic Germans. As a result, speculation arose that two-sided hewing was eastern German in origin.

I found six log shapes to be common in the German-Slavic borderland, one of which is, indeed, two-sided hewing (Figs. 3, 6, 9). This latter shaping technique is far more common, particularly in Czechoslovakia, than in any other potential source region in Europe, and a Slavic link is strongly suggested by its concentration in Slovakia and on the Czech side of the prewar linguistic boundary in Bohemia and Moravia. Two-sided hewing is among the least refined techniques observed in the area, suggesting a considerable antiquity.

Clearly, the occurrence of two-sided hewing in the eastern source regions supports the Kniffen-Glassie-Wertenbaker thesis. Closer inspection, however, reveals some basic differences between the Midland and Slavic types. The Czech-Polish-East German technique produces a much thicker timber than is typical in America. Two-sided planking, the prevalent Midland hewn form, is absent altogether in the eastern source regions. In both Pennsylvania and North Carolina, most Moravian-built structures are clearly distinguishable from those of other groups by virtue of their thicker logs. The other five common Czech-Silesian-Saxon log shapes do not appear at all or are rare in the Midland tradition.

Another contrast is seen in the methods of hewing. The rather crude Midland technique, involving ax and adze, leaves irregular surfaces scarred by score marks. I observed no log walls in the course of my field research bearing such marks. Sawn logs
were known in the hill districts of east-central Europe prior to 1800, and even the earlier shaping methods employed there, involving ax, hatchet, broadax, and cutting knife, produced a relatively smooth surface. 28

**Chinks and Chinking**

Another distinctive aspect of Midland American construction is the practice of leaving open spaces, or chinks, between adjacent logs, rather than shaping the timbers to fit together lengthwise. After a filler of rocks or wood slats is inserted, the chinks are daubed and plastered to produce a tight wall. No entirely satisfactory Fenno-Scandian or Alpine-Alemannic prototype for chinked walls exists, suggesting a possible origin in the German-Slavic borderland. A cursory analysis of photographs of log buildings in Czechoslovakia, Silesia, and East Germany leads the casual observer to conclude that American-style chinking is common (Fig. 2). 29 The same striped visual effect—dark logs alternating with white plaster—catches the eye both there and in America (Fig. 7).

A close field inspection of log walls in the Slavic borderland reveals, however, that the techniques prevalent there exhibit major contrasts to American methods. First, chinking is by no means universal in the Czech-Polish-East German region. Many log walls are chinkless, consisting of squared timbers tightly fitted together (Figs. 5, 9d,e; 10, 11). Even where chinking does occur, it is rather different from the Midland type. In lowland Silesia, including the Schwenkfelder source villages, as well as in Saxon Upper Lausitz and parts of northern Bohemia, a technique best labelled “false chinking” is employed (Figs. 9a,b; 12). It involves hewn split logs, placed in the wall with the curved sides facing outward. On top and bottom, the split logs are flattened to fit snugly together, so that the chinking fills only the indentation left by the natural curvature of the logs on the exterior side (Figs. 9a,b; 12). 30 In many Saxon and Silesian houses, this indentation is left unchinked, clearly revealing the tight fit of the walls (Fig. 13).

In Moravia and parts of eastern Bohemia, a second
type of false chinking prevails, involving two-sided hewing (Figs. 6, 9e). Here, too, most logs touch, and the chinking merely fills an elongated indentation. If individual logs are sufficiently irregular in shape that open chinks appear in places, then a small round pole is sometimes used to stanch the gap (Fig. 14). Slats and rocks, the typical Midland fillers, are absent. Instead, a mud and straw daubing is held in place by small pegs inserted in the rounded surfaces of the logs (Fig. 6). This type of false chinking is virtually impossible to distinguish visually from true chinking if the daub and plaster are intact, but when the filler is removed, the difference is at once evident (Fig. 15).

True chinking, with cracks left between the logs, is most common in the hilly Silesian-Bohemian border district, but even there the technique differs from Midland American methods. The logs undergo four-sided hewing and are grooved to anchor the daub and plaster. Timbers are placed in the wall in such a manner as to leave chinks of only .4 to .6 inch (Fig. 9f). Wood plane shavings are driven into this narrow chink with a wedge at repeated intervals for several years, and only then is a plaster of oakum and lime mortar applied. In some Silesian districts, clay and moss provide the filler. 31

American-style chinks can be observed only on hay barns among the eastern Germans and western Slavs, where their purpose is to provide ventilation for drying the hay. Chinking, or filler in the cracks, is of course absent in such structures (Fig. 3).

Still, the eastern German-western Slavic methods of chinking and false chinking are more similar to Midland techniques than are any other known European types. Were no other evidence available, one would feel compelled to accept a Bohemian, Silesian, or Saxon prototype. It is known, however, that some sort of chinking occurred on certain log houses erected by Swedes and Finns along the Delaware River. 32 Since the Swedes settled in America almost a full century before the arrival of the eastern Germans, the case for Teutonic origin is weakened. The American-style wide chinking filled with solid material was perhaps a colonial Scandinavian adaptation to the use

Fig. 12: False chinking on an Umgebinde log and half-timber house in Zbylutów (Deutmannsdorf), a village in the Schwenkfelder source region in Lower Silesia, Poland (field research district 7). The split logs touch, as can be observed at the corners where the logs project, and the chinking evident on the walls merely fills the indentation caused by the natural curvature of the logs. The joints are double notched.
Fig. 13: The false chinking was left off of this house in Neukirch, a Brethren source village in the Lausitzer Hills, Saxony, in the German Democratic Republic (field research district 9), revealing the chinkless nature typical of Saxon and Lower Silesian log construction. The timbers are hewn half logs. Note the Umgebinde construction, also typical of the region.

of hardwoods, particularly oak, an adaptation that may have occurred before the arrival of the Brethren and Schwenkfelders. In this case, the eastern German influence was limited to reinforcement of an established trait.

**Corner Timbering**

Perhaps no other facet of log carpentry is potentially more revealing of antecedents than the method of joining timbers at the corners of structures. Scores of cornering techniques occur in Europe, some of which are closely identified with particular regions. In Midland America, by contrast, fewer than ten types are found and only five of these are common: saddle notching, two kinds of dovetailing, square notching, and the V notch.

Eastern Germans have been suggested as the agents of diffusion for several of the Midland notches. Kniffen and Glassie, without any European evidence, proposed that American V notching characterized by an inverted V-shaped joint, was introduced from Lower Silesia by the Schwenkfelders. That proposal must now be discarded as spurious, for V notching occurs nowhere in Silesia or the remainder of the German-Slavic borderland. Every surviving log building I inspected in the former Schwenkfelder villages displays double notching, a type absent altogether in Midland construction (Fig. 16). I can only conclude, on the basis of notching and other features of carpentry and design, that the Schwenkfelders made no contribution whatever to the Midland tradition.

A better case can be made for eastern German origin of the dovetailed notching forms. Full-dovetailing, in which both the top and bottom of the joint are splayed, is the prevalent type almost everywhere in Bohemia, Moravia, and Upper Silesia, where it is acknowledged to be a German rather than a Slavic type (Figs. 2, 3, 17). This type of dovetailing is also quite common in eastern Pennsylvania. By con-
Fig. 14: Log barn in Horní Sloupnice (Obersloupnitz), near Litomyšl in the Loučná headwaters region of northeastern Bohemia (field research district 2). Note the two-sided hewing, thick timbers, and open chinks, some of which are filled with poles and daubing. Umgebinde construction is rare this far to the east.

Fig. 15: Chinkless wall of a log house in Životice (Seitendorf), just south of Nový Jičín in the Kineland, eastern Moravia (field research district 5). Note the gently-splayed full-dovetailing, two-sided hewing, and thick logs.

Fig. 16: Double-notched, chinkless log outbuilding in the Schwenkfelder source village of Nowa Wieś Grodziska (Neudorf), Lower Silesia, Poland (field research district 7). Note the vertical boards in the gable.
trast, dovetailing is relatively rare in most of the Alemannic and Fenno-Scandian source regions of American colonists.

Half-dovetailing, a simpler form involving a splaying of only the top side of the log tongue, is by far the most common Midland variety of the notch. Long assumed to be an Americanism and attributed by some to the Scotch-Irish, half-dovetailing appears consistently as a minority type among the western Slavs (Fig. 17). I observed it, mainly on the Slavic side of the old linguistic border, in Bohemia, Slovakia, Upper Silesia, and the southern perimeter of the Kineland. The hill town of Stramberk (Stramberg) overlooking the Moravian Gate offers some notable examples, but perhaps the best specimen is a venerable log church near Częstochowa (Tschentochau) in Poland (Fig. 18). In eastern Bohemia, half-dovetailing usually appears as individual joints in walls otherwise full-dovetailed, though some entire walls of inverted half-dovetailing can be seen there (Fig. 19). While the spatial distribution of half-dovetailing in America, characterized by rarity in the eastern Pennsylvania hearth, might suggest that this notch has correctly been interpreted as an Americanism, I would cautiously add it to the list of Moravian introductions.

Both types of dovetailing in the German-Slavic borderland are more gently splayed than their Midland American counterparts, a difference perhaps attributable to greater log thickness in the European regions. Moravian dovetailing in Pennsylvania normally reveals the same gentle splaying seen in the Old World.

Square notching, also presumed by many to be
Fig. 19: Inverted half-dovetail notching on a chinked, white-washed log house in Letohrad (Geiersberg), near Lanskroun in northeastern Bohemia (field research district 3).

Fig. 18: Half-dovetail notching on the venerable log church at Koszęcin (Koschentin), located between Częstochowa and Katowice (Kattowitz) in Upper Silesia, Poland (field research district 17). Half-dovetailing, assumed by many to be an Americanism, occurs widely in the German-Slavic borderland. Note also the typical Upper Silesian chinkless construction.
Fig. 20: Slavic square notching on the 1770 town hall in Rožnov pod Radhoštěm, Moravian Valachia (field research district 6), now relocated to the open-air museum in the same town. The thick logs have undergone two-sided hewing, and false chinking can be seen.

Fig. 21: Half notching on an Umgebinde log house in Hirschfelde, Saxon Upper Lusatia, German Democratic Republic (field research district 1). Similar half notching, without Umgebinde, appears as a minor type in America.
an Americanism, since it is one of the simplest forms to fashion, is a very common type in some parts of Slovakia, Saxony, and Moravia, rivalling dovetailing for dominance in Upper Lausitz and western Slovakia (Figs. 17, 20). An even simpler form, the half notch, also occurs as a minor type in both Midland America and the Czech-Polish-East German region (Fig. 21). These simplified types were probably known to Moravian Brethren carpenters, but I find no evidence that they ever employed square or half notching on buildings erected in colonial America. As craftsmen, the Brethren perhaps regarded these inferior notching methods with contempt. In any case, the surviving Moravian log buildings in America, including the famous Gemeinhaus at Bethlehem, are full-dovetailed.

In this context, though, the absence in Midland America of the hook notch, companion to dovetailing through much of the eastern German lands, is noteworthy (Fig. 11). A complicated joint that would appeal to skilled craftsmen, the hook notch is particularly common in the Upper Lausitz source region. The failure to take root in America could be interpreted as a sign of minimal eastern German influence, but more likely it merely represents the simplification of European culture overseas.

The saddle notch, a primitive type applied mainly to logs left in the round, is rare and peripheral in the study area, almost certainly representing a remnant early Slavic type. I observed saddle notching only in Moravian Valachia and western Slovakia, where it occupies highland refuges (Fig. 17). The abundance of saddle notching in Switzerland, Sweden, and Finland, coupled with its rarity in the German-Slav borderland, suggests that the Midland form was not introduced by the Brethren.

Occasionally in the Midland tradition, log corners are secured by vertical slotted posts rather than notches, with the individual timbers tenoned to fit into the slot. Such cornerposting occurs widely if infrequently among the eastern Germans and is much more common in Alpine-Alemannic carpentry (Figs. 17, 22).

The evidence for eastern German influence on Midland cornering techniques, while far from convincing, suggests some links. The Brethren, by virtue of their almost unanimous allegiance to dovetailing in America, likely reinforced the use of similar notching in the Midland culture area, assisting in the rise...
Fig. 23: House in Moravian Valachia (field research district 6), now in the open-air museum in Rožnov pod Radhostěm. Valachian chinking is often concealed beneath thin wood strips, presenting the outward appearance of chinkless walls. Note the board gable, pent roof, “bellcast” profile, and cellar.

Fig. 24: Type A occurs in Silesia and Lausitz; type B in Bohemia, Upper Silesia and America; type C in Slovakia, eastern Moravia, and America; type D in Bohemia, Silesia, and America; type E only in America. Sources: field research; Schier, Hauslandschaften, of dovetailing to prominence, and provided the prototype for half-dovetailing. Introduced toward the end of the period of diffusion of log carpentry to colonial America, Moravian dovetailing influenced the more refined “log house” state of construction, as opposed to the earlier, cruder “cabin” phase, which bore a stronger Scandinavian imprint. The Delaware Swedes, to be sure, built some fine full-dovetailed structures before the arrival of the Moravians and also used square and half notching, but neither they nor the Alpine-Alemannic Germans had relied on dovetailing as their major form in Europe.

Gable and Roof

The great majority of surviving log structures in the Midland American culture region displays a raftered roof devoid of ridgepole. Gables are not enclosed by logs, but instead by boards affixed, usually vertically, to a framework of studs. In the Pennsylvania hearth of the Midland, small pent roofs often shelter the lower gable wall.41

Each of these American form elements is prevalent in the log construction areas of Bohemia, Moravia, Silesia, and Saxony (Figs. 2, 5, 10, 16, 22, 23).42 Only a few of the very oldest structures, clearly Slavic in
Fig. 25: A "continental," story-and-a-half log house in Koburk (Koburg), near Výprachtice (Weinersdorf) in the region of Lanskroun, northeastern Bohemia (field research district 3). Note the attached stall, a Frankish origin, have ridgepole-supported roofs, and in every field research district, Midland-style board gables prevail. The similarities extend to the pitch of the roof and the style of rafter support framework (Fig. 24).

The temptation to assign major formative influence to the Brethren and Schwenkfelders is great. However, in most major respects, the eastern German roof represents Frankish practices that also occur in the Palatinate and other Rhenish districts, the principal source region of the Pennsylvania "Dutch." Certain British forms are also very similar. The Midland raftered roof, with or without gable pent, is likely Rhenish and British in origin. Too, the very narrow wooden shingles, often rounded or grooved, found on eastern German and Slavic roofs differ in shape from those of America. An Alpine Germanic origin of the Midland shingling tradition seems much more likely.

The only American roof features confined largely to the eastern German lands would seem to be the board gable cover and the simplest framing support for rafters (Fig. 24c). These forms are so elementary that independent invention could explain their presence in America. In fact, board-covered gables appeared in Pennsylvania at least as early as 1686, a half-century before the arrival of the Brethren and Schwenkfelders.

Another difficulty in accepting an eastern German model for Midland roof form is the dominance in both Upper Lausitz and the Schwenkfelder source region of Umgebinde construction (Fig. 10). This term, meaning literally "bound up," describes a building in which the entire roof structure and, if present, upper story rest not upon the log walls but instead upon stilt-like vertical posts placed outside the logs (Figs. 1, 7, 11, 12, 13, 14, 21). While it is true that Umgebinde structures are rare or absent in the northeastern Moravian, Upper Silesian, and eastern Bohemian source regions, the technique prevailed among the Schwenkfelders and was certainly observed by the Brethren during their stay in Saxon Lausitz. In any case, the complete absence of Umgebinde construction in America weakens the argument for eastern German influence in the Midland building tradition, as does the rarity in America of the "saltbox" roof profile of the Silesian Schwenkfelders and the "bellcast" profile encountered widely in some of the Brethren source regions (Fig. 23).
Fig. 26: A two-story “continental” house with attached stall in the Schwenkfelder source village of Czapele (Hainwald) in Lower Silesia, Poland (field research district 7). This is the typical farmhouse of the region, and, if the stall were removed, would resemble certain Schwenkfelder dwellings in Pennsylvania.

House and Farmstead Types

No necessary connection exists between carpentry tradition and architectural style; log construction can be applied to a great variety of floorplans. Still, if eastern German houses and farmsteads could be proven ancestral to some Midland American types, then the case for a parallel diffusion of construction techniques would be strengthened.

At first glance, the Bohemian, Moravian, and Silesian source regions of the Brethren seem to offer viable prototypes for the central-chimney, side-gabled “continental” houses so common among the Pennsylvania Germans (Figs. 2, 25). Three- and four-room, story-and-a-half continental log houses similar to those prevalent among the colonial German-Americans occur widely in the Slavic-German borderland. Closer analysis reveals, however, that the houses in question represent a basic Frankish or Middle German type, found in half-timbered construction in the Rhenish lands. Too, the “continental” plan was being employed in Pennsylvania long before the arrival of the Brethren and Schwenkfelders. In addition, the continental log house of the Czech-Polish-East German borderland, following Frankish custom, often has the stall attached to the dwelling, an arrangement extremely rare in Midland America (Fig. 25). Indeed, the first house erected by the Moravian Brethren in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, is one of the very few in America to combine stall and human quarters under one roof. In the Schwenkfelder source region in Lower Silesia, as well as in Upper Lusatia, a massive two-story continental house with attached barn is the dominant type (Fig. 26). Compounding these dissimilarities is the prevalence of the Frankish courtyard farmstead in most eastern German source areas, including the Kineland, Loučná headwaters, Upper Lusatia, and Schwenkfelder source area. In America the Frankish courtyard plan, with structures tightly clustered to enclose three sides of a central farmyard, never occurs.

The story-and-a-half continental log house without attached stall and lacking the Frankish courtyard is most common in purely Slavic areas such as Moravian Valachia, and German ethnographers recognize it as distinctively non-Teutonic. It also occurs in the Lanškroun source region in eastern Bohemia and in Wendish Lower Lusatia. While it is tempting to declare the Midland continental house a successor to this Slavic type, chronology dictates otherwise.
Barn Form Elements

In the Midland tradition, the number of log barn types is relatively small. Among the distinctive form elements that occur frequently are (1) single-level barns consisting of one, two, or four log cribs; (2) multilevel double-crib barns, in which access to the upper floor is provided by a banked-ramp, producing what is normally called a "bank barn"; and (3) a cantilevered forebay projecting from one eave side on the upper level of some double-crib bank barns. The combination of bank, double-crib plan, and forebay produces the famous "Pennsylvania" barn.

Several features of eastern German barns and sheds are reminiscent of these Midland forms. The double-crib plan, in which two log cribs flank a central threshing floor, occurs widely through the Czech-Polish-East German borderland, in a variety of sizes and subtypes (Figs. 27, 28). The oldest forms, quite different from American plans and presumably Slavic in origin, are of hexagonal or octagonal shape, with recessed doors and hipped roofs (Fig. 29a, b). More typical are low, rectangular double-crib barns, generally built in stone or half-timbering rather than log, that are derived from the basic Frankish Grund-
scheuer, or "ground-level barn" (Fig. 27). Such Frankish barns occur in nearly all of the eastern German source regions, and generally have asymmetrical floorplans (Fig. 29). Some of these Frankish plans were introduced into Pennsylvania by Rhenish Germans decades before the Brethren and Schwenkfelders arrived, and there is no reason to attribute any formative influence to the eastern Germans. Moreover, log double-crib barns more closely akin to Midland American forms are found in both the Alpine and Fenno-Scandian areas. Certain Midland types, such as the doorless double-crib barn of the American South, do not occur among the eastern Germans.

Much less common in the eastern lands are banked entrances to multilevel storage structures. In Moravia, Slovakia, and Upper Silesia, the most Slavicized portions of the borderland, bank barns are absent altogether, and they are relatively rare in more Germanized areas, such as Upper Lausitz, Lower Silesia, and the northern Bohemian mountain fringe (Fig. 28). In almost every example observed, the banked structures contain house and barn under one roof, presenting a fundamental contrast to Midland American tradition.
A small minority of eastern European barns, particularly in Upper Lausitz, displays cantilevered projections similar to American forebays (Fig. 30). Close inspection revealed most of these to be "false" forebays, built to accommodate an enclosed walkway, called a
Galerie, rather than to provide extra storage space, as in America.⁶⁴ One of the few genuine forebays, in the Silesian Karkonosze (Riesengebirge), turned out to be an Alpine type, built in the early nineteenth century by immigrants from Austrian Tirol.⁶⁵ Glassie's suggestion that some American forebays derive from overhang inherent in eastern German Umgebinde construction must also be rejected, in view of precise Alpine prototypes.⁶⁶

The barns of the eastern Germans and western Slavs, then, while revealing some similarities to American forms, offer no satisfactory, or even needed, prototypes for Midland structures. The earlier immigrations of Swiss, Palatines, Swedes, and Finns brought the basic American log barns. Conclusion

I conclude that the case for eastern German influence in American log construction has been overstated by its proponents, who lacked field data and, in at least one instance, misinterpreted the secondary literature.⁶⁷ It is grossly inaccurate to describe the wooden architecture and carpentry of the German-Slavic borderland as being "exactly" like the Midland American type.⁶⁸ What appear at first glance to be striking similarities between designs and techniques of the two traditions prove, on close inspection, to be less compelling resemblances.
SELECTED DOUBLE-CRIB BARN PLANS

Fig. 29: The examples are: A and B = district of Votice (Wotitz), southern Bohemia; C = near Racibórz, Upper Silesia; D = Spreewald, Lower Lusatia; E = Vsetín (Wsetin) in Moravian Valachia; F = Gliwice area, Upper Silesia; G = Opole district, Upper Silesia; H = Čičmany, western Slovakia; and I = Wałbrzych district, Lower Silesia. Several of these barns are now in outdoor folk museums, including example D, at the Lehde/Lědy Wendish Freiland Museum near Lübbenau, German Democratic Republic; example E in the Vaňašíké Muzeum v Přírodě at Rožnov pod Radhoštěm, Moravia; and example G at Muzeum wsi Opolskiej at Bierkowice near Opole, Poland. Sources: field measurements; Palm, Haus und Hof, p. 59; Deutschmann, Lausitzer Holzbaukunst, p. 67 and Fig. 42; Hártel, Ländliche Baukultur, p. 21; and Baláš and Klíma, “Vesnické Stavby,” p. 164.
Fig. 30: Galerie forebay on a storage barn in the Opole district of Upper Silesia (field research district 14). The structure, now in the open-air Muzeum wsi Opole, finds no evidence whatever of Schwenkfelder influence. Their Lower Silesian carpentry and floor plans, characterized by double notching, Umgebinde construction, false chinking, and massive two-story house-stall combinations, possess almost no features in common with the Midland tradition. The small numbers and late arrival of the Schwenkfelders, coupled with their reluctance to seek converts in America or to spread beyond their tiny enclave in eastern Pennsylvania, no doubt contributed to the failure of this group to exert architectural influence.

The more numerous Moravian Brethren, the last German sect to arrive in colonial America, probably introduced half-dovetail notching and in other ways helped modestly to shape the final, or “house” stage of Midland log construction. Their contribution was apparently limited largely to refining, reinforcing, and encouraging certain form elements and practices that had been previously implanted by Fenno-Scandian and Alpine-Alemannic immigrants. We can see their influence, I believe, in the reinforcement of two-sided hewing, chinking, board gables, and the raftered roof, all of which had been introduced earlier as minority practices. Brethren craftsmen no doubt assisted the rise to dominance of dovetail notching, and it is possible, though unlikely, that they promoted the spread of square notching.

Even this limited claim for Brethren influence may be an exaggeration. At both Bethlehem in Pennsylvania and Wachovia in North Carolina, the Brethren found pre-existing log structures, and to the present day one can distinguish Moravian buildings from those erected by other groups in the North Carolina Piedmont.70 In spite of widespread missionary activity, the Brethren were singularly unsuccessful in winning converts to their faith in America, a failure that surely retarded diffusion of carpentry traits.71 Further weakening the likelihood of eastern German or western Slavic influence by way of the Brethren is the cosmopolitan nature of their membership. Tombstones at Herrnhut, Bethlehem, and Nazareth display an incredible diversity of eighteenth-century birthplaces,
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Probsthainer Spitzberg, a landmark in the Schwenkfelder source region.
My mother-in-law was a Breuning. She was born on September 6, 1886 and baptized Julia Matilda, the sixth child (of eight) of Gustav Friedrich and Christine (Schmidgall) Breuning. Her father died in 1892 and her mother in 1897, so not much was known of their origins except that Gustav was born in a town called Möhringen in Germany. The parents met in an unusual way; Gustav was the driver of a brewery wagon in Philadelphia and while making a delivery to a local tavern happened to mention that it was his birthday. The proprietor’s servant girl, Christine, was celebrating her birthday that day also; she was called out and introduced to Gustav and the match was made.

Among the few personal articles Gustav left behind was his *Wanderbuch* or travel permit, showing that he had traveled in France and Switzerland shortly before coming to America in 1865. He also left a small pocket Bible with the date 1807 and the initials “J.G.St.” inscribed on the cover. The front and back flyleaves were decorated with water-color paintings similar to the familiar Pennsylvania Dutch Fraktur art; these were signed with the same initials. Finally, there was an autograph album covering the period from 1859 to 1873, which was interesting to us chiefly because of the beautiful calligraphy of the old German script. As far as the content was concerned, it might as well have been written in Sanskrit.

This was the extent of our knowledge of our Breuning ancestors for nearly fifty years. Then shortly after World War II, Aunt Carrie Breuning, the youngest of the family, was working in an office in Philadelphia when a letter arrived there from a man in Germany requesting that they send him a Care package. He said that he had funds in the bank but could not draw them, and would pay for the package as soon as he was able. The office manager consigned the letter to the waste-basket but Aunt Carrie retrieved it and decided to send the package on her own. In due course she received a profuse letter of thanks and an offer to do a return favor if possible. She immediately wrote asking the man if he could get her some information on her family roots in Möhringen.
Mr. Isaac Wolf mayor of this town was born in 1661 on Sept. 24. His honored father was Jacob Wolf local schoolmaster and his mother was Magdalena, nee Grieb. After the death of his father, he was schoolmaster from 1684 to 1712 a total of 28 years, and then he served as mayor until his death, another 28 years. He had six children by his first wife Agatha, daughter of the mayor Georg Goh/ , and after she died on May 15, 1698 he married the young daughter of the local Pastor, Georg David Mauchart, Maria Elisabetha, who followed him in death on November 3, 1742. She bore him nine children, six of which her father lived to see. In the two marriages he had a total of eight sons and seven daughters, but six of the fifteen died in childhood. The nine of them who married, namely Jacob, Anna (Guenther), and Mrs. Magistrate Kraft from the first marriage, and Maria Margaretha (Staiger), Johann David, Maria Agatha (Entemann), Maria Judaeae (Weber), Isaac, and Abrahom, produced 64 grandchildren and 33 great-grandchildren for a total of 112 descendants during his lifetime. He was taken to meet his Savior Jesus Christ on March 3, 1741 at the age of 80.

Some months later, as a result of his efforts, a letter arrived from Otto W. Breuning of Mohringen (which turned out to be a suburb of Stuttgart). He told Aunt Carrie he was the son of her first cousin, also named Otto, that he had a brother Wilhelm who was married and had a family, and that a number of cousins still lived in the area. Otto enclosed a copy of the family register revealing that Gustav had been the youngest of sixteen children of Johann Michael and Katharina Dorothea (Straule) Breuning, and was the only member of the family to go to America. We also learned that Johann Michael Breuning had served the town as Schultheiss (mayor) for thirty-eight years. In addition, Otto sent a copy of a family group-photograph taken in 1850 showing Gustav at the age of five, with his six brothers and sisters surviving at that time (the rest died in infancy or at a young age). Now came the surprise: the register recorded the fact that Gustav had returned home in 1869 and married a fifteen year old girl from a neighboring town, and the couple had left for America several months later. Of course this girl was not my wife’s grandmother, and since we had found no record of her in the Philadelphia Archives, we were puzzled as to what had happened. Had she died aboard ship as so many unfortunates did in those days, or did she die shortly after reaching America? None of our research yielded any clues. We knew that the first child of Gustav’s second marriage was born in 1873, so there was a period of about three years in which to locate the missing child-bride. We seemed to have reached a dead-end on that line.

In 1967, after some years of off-and-on correspondence, Otto Breuning came to Philadelphia to visit his American cousins. During this visit he disclosed that while serving in the German army he had been captured in North Africa and had spent a few years in a prisoner-of-war camp in New Mexico; at that time he did not know he had relatives in the United States. At the time of his visit to Philadelphia, four of his father’s cousins were still living, and he addressed them as “aunt and uncle” as the Germans do with elderly

Translation of the Wolf plaque in the Heimat Museum-Stuttgart.

Portraits of Isaac and Elizabeth Wolf.
relatives. Nine years later, when my wife and I visited Möhringen as part of a three-and-a-half weeks tour of Germany, Otto was greatly saddened to hear that all of his “aunts and uncles” in America were no longer living. During this 1976 visit we met all the German Breunings and their cousins and were entertained in great style. We even saw the old farmhouse where Gustav was born in 1845, but it had passed out of the family and the current owners would not let us see the inside since, as Otto told us, they were afraid we might try to take it away from them.

While we were in town Otto gave us a copy of a book put out by one of the local banks. It is entitled Möhringen, the History of a Filder Community (the Filder is the fertile plateau to the south of Stuttgart on which the town is built). Among the features of this book is a list of all the mayors of the town from 1346 to 1949. It lists the term of Johann Michael Breuning from 1826 to 1864; his brother Johann Jakob Breuning from 1820 to 1826; and their father Michael Breuning from 1808 to 1819. These three served as mayor for 56 consecutive years. Also included was a picture of a plaque in the Heimat Museum in Stuttgart, which tells about the lives of Isaac Wolf (1661-1741) and his second wife Elisabetha (Mauchart, 1677-1742) who were my wife’s fifth great-grandparents. The inscription on the plaque notes that Isaac had fifteen children by his two wives and at the time of his death had 113 living descendants.

One of the paragraphs in the book dealing with emigration from Möhringen, mentioned that a number of families had gone to America in 1817 and settled in a place called “Bloomengrave” Pennsylvania. I looked for this place on a current map, but the closest I could find was Blooming Grove in the Poconos near Lake Wallenpaupack, and that did not seem to be a likely place for 19th century immigration. Then, in the summer of 1977, a letter was received by the church in Möhringen from the Dunkard Meeting House in Cogan Station, PA (former name Blooming Grove, nine miles north of Williamsport), asking that a representative be sent to help them celebrate their 150th anniversary. Here were the long- lost Möhringers. Pastor Traugott Scheytt was delegated to make the trip, and on July 15, 1978 he delivered an address to the Blooming Grove Historical Society, outlining the historical background of their ancestors’ emigration. On his return home he wrote a complete report of his trip dated September 24, entitled “Regarding the Descendants of Möhringen Emigration in America.” In it he mentioned all the familiar family names he had seen in the cemetery in Blooming Grove, and he deplored that fact that scarcely anyone in the congregation could speak or understand German. During our return visit to Möhringen in 1980 we met a young couple from Williamsport, Ernest and Barbara Hawk who also were visiting there, Barbara is a descendant of one of the original Blooming Grove families, and she was interested in locating relatives. Her husband did not have to go abroad to find his ancestors—Ernie is an American Indian!

Encouraged by the success of our Kleisz research (see “The Search for our German Ancestors” Spring 1982 issue of Pennsylvania Folklife), we commissioned a genealogist from Stuttgart to search the Breuning line. The result of this was the extension of the record back to a Hans Breining the Elder who was born in Plainingen about 1470. His great grandson Jerg, born in 1575, changed the spelling to Breuning. The family continued to live in Plainingen until Michael Breuning moved to Plattenhardt in the early 18th century. His son Michael, born in Plattenhardt in 1762, became mayor of Möhringen in 1808. Other early ancestors were Martin Mauchart, born in Esslingen in 1607 and his wife Sabina born about 1616 (last names of wives were often omitted in the early records), the grandparents of Elisabetha Wolf who was mentioned on the Heimat Museum plaque.

Now came the appearance of the “skeleton in the closet” that family researchers are constantly being warned about. The record lists one “Old David” Schedel, born October 23, 1702, who in 1728 married a 48 year old widow and lived with her until her death in 1756 at the age of 76. What happened next is recorded in the minutes of the Town Council: “Married in Möhringen about 1756, David Schedel widower, discharged member of the local law-court and adulterer with Anna-Maria, widow of the late Matthaus Schlecht, late citizen and day-laborer in Rohr. N.B. This pair of adulterers have been permitted to stay together through the grace of the authorities and present urgent circumstances, and on Wednesday at prayer-time shall be married in silence without any ceremony in order to prevent further trouble. It is decreed that a fine of three Florins shall be paid annually on St. Martins Day as an atonement, and they are never to ask for a remission of this fine.” (The fine was cancelled in 1769.) On August 13, 1756 a daughter, Catharina Barbara, was born to the Schedels. (Was this the “present urgent circumstances”?) At the age of 17 Catharina married 22 year old Jakob Straule, bore him five children and died in 1837 at the age of 81. She was my wife’s great-great-great grandmother, and it was her son Johann Georg Straule (J.G.St.) who painted the pictures in the little Bible and passed it along to his grandson Gustav. David Schedel died in 1771, but Anna-Maria survived him by 25 years and died in 1795, no doubt by then an honored member of the community. Some people may look upon these disclosures as something to be hushed up, but we take the view that they present our ancestors for what they were; not just names on some dusty old records, but real live people with all the failings humans are subject to.
As time went on we acquired enough skill to be able to decipher some of the writing in the old autograph album, and this gave us a new insight into the thoughts and feelings of our ancestors. The very first page was written by Gustav’s brother Wilhelm, who was 22 at the time. Dated Möhningen, 10 April, 1859 and signed “In memory of your confirmation From your true brother Wilhelm” it is in stark contrast to the “Roses are red, violets are blue” sentiments we are used to:

“Im Glück nicht jubeln, und im Sturm nicht zagen.
Das unvermeidliche mit Würde tragen,
Das Leben lieben und das Tod nicht scheuen,
Und fest an Gott und besser Zukunft glauben,
Heisst Leben heisst, dem Tod sein Bittend rauben”.

[Rejoice not in good times, nor fear the stormy ones.
Accept the unavoidable with dignity, do right and enjoy what is beautiful.
Love life and do not fear death,
Hold fast to God and believe in a better future.
Live life to the fullest and you will rob death of his power.]

Now to return to the mystery of the child-bride. Several years ago, while checking the 1870 Census records in Philadelphia, we found a listing for Gustav and his German in-laws at the same address. Now we knew that the girl’s parents had accompanied the couple to America—but what of the daughter? About the same time, Otto Breuning was making a search in the Möhningen town records and he found a reference indicating that the girl had returned to Germany and gone to her father’s home town where she took up with another man and bore him several children. Perhaps some words of explanation are in order to present a possible motive for her desertion. The records for the 1869 marriage state that Gustav was a citizen of the United States and the owner of a guest house. We do not know if he was a citizen at that time, but we are sure he did not own a guest house. This may have been a little “puffery” to impress his future wife and her parents. It must have been quite a disappointment for her to find that instead of a rich American, she was married to the driver of a brewery-wagon (which he still was when he died on the job of heat-stroke in July of 1892). Of course we shall never know, but it seems to be a logical explanation. For some reason the parents stayed behind in America; perhaps they could not afford the passage home. The Möhningen records indicate that the father committed suicide at the age of 84, but do not state where this happened. This last information concerning Gustav’s first wife and her family completed the Breuning story for us, and for the most part the endings were happy ones, as the Breuning family continues to flourish, both here and in Germany.
Groundhog (Grundsow) lodges have sprung up all over the eastern part of Pennsylvania. The first one in the East was naturally No. 1 (Nummer Ains) in the Allentown area. It was formed in 1933 by several influential men who were interested in the dialect. This happened after several new Pennsylvania German plays received favorable responses and drew packed houses; interest in the dialect was high. The men largely responsible for guiding Nummer Ains through the first couple of years were: Julius Lentz, William S. Troxell (Der Pumpernickle Bill from the Allentown Morning Call), Patsy Balliet, Milt Herber, Fred Heckman, Sam Brader, Harvey Hankee, Elmer Fehnel, Preston A. Barba, Mark Hoffman, Thomas Brendle, Charles Oswald, and Wilson Bilheimer.

After several planning sessions, the group decided to hold the first big lodge meeting February 2, 1934 in the Republican Club in Northampton. Approximately 275 persons were in attendance from Lehigh, Northampton, Bucks and Berks counties. The next year’s meeting (fersommling) had to be moved to larger quarters, to the basement of the Masonic Temple in Allentown where more than 600 attended. Two more moves became necessary, and when the Northampton Community Center was completed in 1954, the annual gathering took place there, with 740 in attendance. The hall, which has the largest facilities in the area, has become the permanent setting for the meetings.

Because of the success of these affairs, other areas in the surrounding communities started lodges. The Grundsow Lodge Register for 1953 showed that six more had been formed since the original one in 1934:

- Lodge #1 on da Lechaw, Allentown
- Lodge #2 on da Schibbach, Souderton
- Lodge #3 in Temple University, Fildelfy (now defunct)
- Lodge #4 on da Doheck, Quakertown
- Lodge #5 on da Schwador im Bind Bush (Pine Grove)
- Lodge #6 in Brodheadssville, Monroe Kounty
- Lodge #7 in East Greenville, Montgomery Kounty

In the last 30 years more have been added:

- Lodge #8 on da Lizzard Grick, Schuylkill Kounty
- Lodge #9 in Dublin, Bucks Kounty
- Lodge #10 in Shtroudsbarrick, Monroe Kounty
- Lodge #11 on da Fire Line, Carbon Kounty
- Lodge #12 on da Tulpenhocken Pawdt, Barricks Kounty
- Lodge #13 on da Inche Grick, Amous
- Lodge #14 on da Saakna Grick, Coopersbarrick
- Lodge #15 on Barricks Kounty, Kutztown
- Lodge #16 on Yahden, Lechaw Kounty (formed in 1972)
- Lodge #17 on Lebanon Kounty (formed in 1980)

All of the lodges have adjacent to their number the name of a river, stream, or creek, because the animal they honor prefers a home near water. Most banquets are held in the largest community firehouse in the lodge's area.

I have been a member of Lodge No. 1 ever since it started more than 50 years ago. I became involved because I had written several plays in the dialect for the then Jordan Reformed Sunday School of Walberts (of which I was president at the time). These plays were very successful and proved to be good money-
The program for Groundhog Lodge No. 1, Feb. 2, 1942. The play is "Election Evening in Brier Valley" where "‘the Groundhog and the Goose run against each other for weather prognosticator, and the Calendar Woman—well, wait and see.’"

Of course, Groundhog Day is very important to these lodge members; indeed, it is sometimes called "the Day" (der Daug) for Pennsylvania German weather prognosticators. In fact, the early part of the year becomes a time of great events in eastern Pennsylvania, as lodge meetings honor the mighty Grundsoe who informs his dedicated watchers when winter will end. The red-letter day is February 2nd; at this time the creature is supposed to peek out from his burrow for the first time since winter began. If he sees his shadow, he goes back into his home, and there will be six more weeks of winter. If he sees no shadow, then he is supposed to remain outside, and this means Spring is around the corner. The Grundsoe lodges meet once a year to celebrate this event, with a Pennsylvania Dutch program for men only.²

Not all lodges wait until February 2nd (or after) to meet; some lodges begin their festivities in January. For instance, newly formed Lodge No. 17 am em Union Kanaal (at the Union Canal) will meet in the American Legion Hall, Myerstown, on the third Friday of the first month. They will be followed by Kutztown No. 15, Milford Square No. 4, and Dublin No. 9, all of whom also meet in January. Despite these early
meetings, the groundhog will not venture out of his burrow until February 2nd, and on that night, the only valid weather forecast (Wedder Barichde) will be given officially to the 800 brothers (Brieder) of Grundsw Lodge No. 1 on da Lechaw (at the Lehigh) who have assembled at the Northampton Community Center. As stirring music is played, a ten-foot tall papier-mâché groundhog—wearing a make-believe silver crown—is wheeled into the room. Then—in a proclamation carefully worded to fit any weather conditions that can possibly exist—the prediction is made for the next six weeks.

After the big official day, the meetings of the rest of the lodges will follow, each having selected time in the following order: No. 11 at Trachsville, No. 2 at Souderton, No. 5 at Pine Grove, No. 6 at Brodheads ville, No. 14 at Coopersburg, No. 10 at Stroudsburg, No. 13 at Emmaus, No. 8 at Ashfield, No. 12 at Shartles ville. No. 16 um Yahden (at the Jordan) meets in Orefield about six weeks after the predictions of No. 1, usually the second week in March. The members then check the validity of the groundhog’s predictions, the six weeks being just about up. The last one to meet is No. 7 at East Greenville, usually the latter part of April.

Each lodge has a somewhat different way in which it presents its program, but on the whole the same format is followed by all. (Lodge No. 1 usually outdoes itself, compared with the smaller ones, because it receives more income from larger enrollment.) Every program (die Sprech Ordnung) has a moment of silence (Ruichy Minut); a group singing of “America” (naturally in the dialect, composed by one of our famous poets, John Birmelin); a pledging of allegiance to the flag of the United States; a reading of the minutes (Protokol) with a lot of humor injected; and an oath swearing ceremony which, like the rest of the night’s festivities, is not in English. The men stand, raise their hands—in a manner not unlike the way the groundhog holds its paws—and take the annual oath (Ferbinnerrei). Some of the promises may not always be printable.

At a proper point in the proceedings, the brother groundhogs (Brieder Grundsei) of No. 16 drink a toast of Blue Mountain tea (Bloobarringer Tee), or blue stem mint tea (Bloo Schtanglicher Balsum) to King Groundhog (der Koenich Grundso) because his predictions were great (even though they may not have been). We also sing folk songs in the dialect, and listen to a band made up of our own members. This combo has 8 or 9 musicians and is called The Sauerkraut Boys (Die SaueKraut Boowah). It plays only once a year, but it makes Lodge No. 16 unique: No other Grundsw lodge has its own band.

As previously mentioned, skits are created by the members of lodges 1 and 16. These pertain to local or world events that can evoke fun or, perhaps, historical events may be the focal point. In the early skits, much humor was created by poking fun at other weather prophets such as the Goose Bone Man (who feasted, at Thanksgiving, on one of his year-old goslings and used it’s breast-bone to predict the weather). In the same vein, the Calendar Woman, the woolly caterpillar, and others, received derisive comments about false predictions. At those gatherings where skits are not produced, singers, band music and speeches make up the entertainment. In the last couple of years, LeRoy Heffentrager and his five-piece band have been featured at most of the get-togethers.

Naturally everyone looks forward to the meal, and the menu (der Fuder Tzettle) is varied and always good. Usually two kinds of meat are served family style, with mashed potatoes (gchtumpda grumbiera) or even filling (filsel). At Lodge No. 16, for example, we have sauerkraut and pork as well as beef and mashed potatoes. The meal begins with fruit cocktail (G’snibb’ld Obsht)
or orange juice (Bree), and most of the lodges also serve lettuce with bacon dressing (Tzialwad mid Sida Shpeck Bree) and, of course, apple butter and cottage cheese (Schmea Kase un Lodwarik) are always on the table. There are relishes of all sorts and sometimes even tripe (kuttle Fleck). In the dinner line, pies such as raisin (Leicht Boy) or cherry crumb are served. Where good cooks are scarce, there’s ice cream (Gfrohna Rahm) followed by “goose wine” (water) and “belching” mints (Uff Schtoss Mints).

As enjoyable as the meal and entertainment are, the highlight of the evening is the festival speech (Fesht WON DIE HINKLE SHEEBICHA BAE HEN, GEBS'T 'N KALTER WINDER.

When the chickens have scaly legs it means a cold winter.

Rade), when the speaker tries to leave a worthwhile message with the listeners. During the delivery it is interspersed with humorous stories and anecdotes. Although some people’s first impression of Grundsew lodge speeches is that they are barnyard humor, I think it’s interesting that the best stories are not always verging on impropriety or indecency. With the exception of one or two, they could be told in church. If the speaker becomes too vulgar, he is not invited back.

The one person called the dean of speakers in the Pennsylvania German dialect was the Reverend Clarence R. Rahn of Berks County. Sometimes he appeared as a speaker at all the existing lodges in the course of the year’s festivities. This poet laureate upheld the traditions of his people; he was able to take simple everyday happenings and spin a story with a moral. Most were sermons with many humorous twists added. Once, for example, he spoke about the wheelbarrow (der Schuppkaich), pointing out that it is a kind of symbol of life; nothing happens until someone takes personal responsibility and pushes. Talking and promoting don’t move a wheelbarrow, he said, but it is very useful for hauling away old, worn-out ideas and bringing in new supplies of enthusiasm.

Following in the footsteps of the Rev. Rahn is Donald Breininger, a young accountant and good raconteur. One of his stories illustrates the kind of humor most appreciated. Speaking of the importance of education in the path of life—not only head knowledge, but also practical application—he told of a new machine installed at the local powder mill. It worked well for a while and then one day refused to perform. All the local “experts” took turns trying to make the machine run, but no luck. Reluctantly they contacted the factory for a repairman to come and get the gadget going again. A smartly dressed fellow arrived on the morning bus with his little black bag, and was ceremoniously ushered into the room where the stubborn equipment was located. He quickly examined the machine, then withdrew a large hammer from his bag and proceeded to go behind the object of his attention. He gave it one blow and the mechanism started immediately. However, when a bill for $150.00 “for service rendered” arrived, the boss thought the amount was rather high and asked for an itemized statement. It said: “For striking the machine—$1.00. For knowing where to strike—$149.00.”

Another person in demand as a speaker at lodge meetings is Sterling Zimmerman, a tavern operator and cattle dealer who, when giving humorous illustrations, leaves something nostalgic or worthwhile with his audiences, such as “Ess is Nimme Wies Als War” (It isn’t like it used to be). A generation or two ago, he said, a handshake sealed a deal, even a large one: today, both sides show up with a squad of lawyers, and even then things sometimes go wrong.

After three or more hours of festivity, some lodges close by singing Henry C. Detweiler’s version of Auld Lang Syne:

Weil mier all do beinanner shtain
Eb mier now gons ouseanner gain,
Farshprecha tsu halta ingrosse ehr hoch
Die liebe, die siess Muttershproch.
(While we are all standing here together,
Before we depart from each other,
We promise to praise highly
Our beloved, our dear mother tongue.)
This is followed by the chairman’s last words:

Liever Gott im Himmel Drin,
Loss uns Deitschewasmir Sin;
Und erhalt uns alle zeit
Unser Deitchie Freelich Keit.

**ENDNOTES**

1. I have used the vernacular spelling as it is recorded in the festival programs of the lodges.
2. Because only men are admitted to the Grundsow lodges, Fersommlings were organized to allow both women and men to attend. These gatherings are not plentiful, but every now and then a new Fersommling is formed.
THE LOUISIANA PASSPORT OF PENNSYLVANIA'S CHARLES SEALSFIELD

by Karl J.R. Arndt

Editor's Note: For those of our readers who may never have heard of Charles Sealsfield, I offer the following paragraphs taken from the Introduction to Charles Sealsfield: "The Greatest American Author" by Nanette M. Ashby, Ph.D. (Foreword by Karl J. R. Arndt, Ph.D.):

During the decade from 1833 to 1843 an unknown writer issued anonymously through his Swiss publishers a series of novels, written in German and addressed to the German people but composed of sketches depicting life in the various sections of the United States. The author's vivid descriptions of the forests and prairies, the plantations and frontier settlements of the new country, as well as his realistic portrayal of people and ways of living foreign to European experience, delighted the German public and won critical recognition, which became more flattering with the publication of each new book.

The author, however, remained unidentified. It was known that he was a resident of Switzerland and that he had formerly lived in America, but more particular information as to "der grosse Unbekannte" was not obtainable.

Twelve years after the publication of his first novel the author wrote for an edition of his collected works... a preface which gave an account of his literary career and his reluctant abandonment of the anonymity, which he declared had been maintained for the sake of obtaining judgment of his work on its merits alone. This was signed Charles Sealsfield. Neither the name nor the preface offered any clue as to the identity of the author... It was not until after his death in 1864 that the man who called himself Charles Sealsfield was discovered to be the German monk Carl Postl, who for political and social reasons had fled his Prague monastery in 1823.

Lessing's left-handed compliment to a great German poet who was determined to become the German Milton, and who reached those poetic heights, might be translated in an application to the subject of this article in this manner:

Wer wird nicht einen Klopfstock loben?
Dock wird ihn jeder lesen?—Nein
Wir wollen weniger erhoben
Und fleissiger gelesen sein.

Who would not praise the greatest American author Sealsfield?
But will everyone read him? No.
We prefer to be less extolled
But read with greater zeal.

I have made many attempts to publish an American edition of Sealsfield's works with all the genuine Americanisms of his German publications repatriated to their American soil, but I have never found a publisher who would risk his money on such an edition because his stockholders demanded good returns on their investments, which Sealsfield would not bring. Always I have been told: "His life is more interesting than his writings." To read him in German means to read a kind of digest of American newspapers of his time covering problems then of interest but weighted down with ponderous German philosophy, which only a German stomach can take in as a delight and digest properly because the Germans have a greater boredom tolerance for philosophy. I have checked many libraries here and abroad for holdings of his works as published in his time and have usually been surprised at the unspoiled virginity of the volumes. They have rarely
shown any evidence of encounters with passionate readers. When I visited his Zürich publisher after the late war, I still found uncut and unbound mint copies of his first editions which I could buy at the normal price to add to my collection. Such well-used copies as some of my editions are usually found in the libraries of scholars, who search them for publication material. His publisher and critic Schulthess let him in on this secret in these diplomatic words:

You wish quite frankly to know my views about your works as a bookseller. These are the same as they were 20 years ago, only confirmed by experience. Your writings are written for the educated and meditative public, and always enjoyable for the same. Those booksellers like Metzler, who believed they could sell large editions of the same, did not consider the matter, and confused it with popular writers 'Volksschriftsteller'.

Since the American public is not given to meditation or to the reading of books that please the educated German public, I am sure that even an enthusiastic American reader of Sealsfield would not get far with the media of the subject of Sealsfield's American works (unless one used the pirated rifacimenti that made him famous after his works had been bathed clean of their German philosophy in Scotland). However, a photographic and phono-genic person speaking on Sealsfield's adventurous life as a spy who never came in from the cold would get a hearing. In this spirit, I venture into print with the story of Sealsfield's passport. To understand this curious document, we must keep in mind that Charles Sealsfield had a past which, before his reincarnation as an Anglo-American, he had lived under the name of Karl Postl. He had been a devout and highly respected Roman Catholic priest in Prague, but he suddenly vanished from sight and managed to get out of Austria although the Austrian police did everything possible to capture him and bring him back to justice. Professor Castle documented the entire story of the intensive but futile police search for him in the *Der grosse Unbekannte*.

The first extant written sign of the Roman Catholic priest's life after his flight from Austria was sent to Goethe's publisher Cotta in Stuttgart from Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania under date of September 20, 1824. The letter is signed "Sidons" but states that this is not the author's real name and that Cotta will have no difficulty remembering his real name if he will recall the visit of the young man to whom he showed so much consideration upon his appearance at his home. He asks Cotta to write to him as Mr. Sidons with von Bonnhorst, Esq., in Pittsburgh, or with Dr. Eberle in Philadelphia. Both persons, whom he claimed as his friends, were prominent leaders in the German-American world of Pennsylvania at that time.

While his letter to Cotta was written in German, the next extant letter is addressed in English to His Serene Highness, Prince Metternich, from Wiesbaden on August 18, 1826. This letter again is written by a Mr. Sidons, and as an American he offers his services to Metternich as a confidential agent well-informed about the plans of elements that are in conflict with the political interests of Prince Metternich. The substance of his letter follows:

The undersigned begs leave to lay before You the following: He is informed from very good sources, that the revolutionary policy of Great Britain or rather of a powerful party with a popular minister at their head is even now principally directed against Austria whose growing influence seems to become obnoxious especially to the said party.

Among other measures which have been adopted, Englishmen as well as Germans, the latter from different countries, mostly however Hanoverians, are employed in Hungary, & several other provinces.

One of these emissaries the undersigned met with. The conversation of this gentleman, of course less restrained towards an American, showed plainly the purport of his mission. A variety of other plots have the same tendency.

Though not an European, the standing of the undersigned in society, his being conversant: besides his own: with other languages, : a thorough knowledge of America & England induce him to believe, his services in this respect could be highly useful to the interest of His Austrian Majesty & Your Serene Highness [I] may be, He presumes to say, the best & only means of giving satisfaction for the present, & granting important services for the future.

Will Your Highness [I] condescendingly will furnish me with any place & at any time, & to give most satisfactory proofs of his willingness to promote the interests above named.

He intends to leave Germany, as soon as he has recovered his health for England, where private affairs are most likely to keep him for some years from home.

This letter was sent to Metternich's representative von Neumann who was instructed to interview Sidons. On the verso of this letter the following was noted in ink: "Charles Sealsfield, Clergyman domiciled in Pennsylvania, passeport de la Louisiane, Mr. Bunsen Pfingstweide.” The Bunsen reference was the address where Sealsfield could be reached.

On August 28, 1826, Sidons, again in English, replied to a letter arranging an appointment with Metternich's representative Philipp von Neumann, that late receipt of the letter prevented keeping the suggested appointment but that he would meet von Neumann in Wiesbaden at the named hotel as soon as possible. On August 31, 1826, then, Philipp von Neumann sends Prince Metternich a full report (in French) of his meeting with Mr. Sidons. Von Neumann had addressed Sidons in English but at once noticed that he did not have a good command of this language and spoke with a heavy German accent. At first von Neumann carried on the interview as though he did not notice this, and questioned Sidons about the information that he wanted conveyed.
to Metternich. Sidons indicated he had information about English plans for starting a revolution in Hungary, but further questioning convinced von Neumann that he was dealing with an adventurer who was trying to make himself important in order to get money out of them. Because the information was so vague, von Neumann told Sidons he would be reimbursed generously if he could produce some positive evidence for his claims; evidence which would make it possible for them to take preventive measures. To this Sidons replied that as an American, he was in a position to get much information because people did not mistrust him; that he knew General Lafayette in America and had seen him again in Paris, where in his house he had heard things which would leave no doubt about the plans against Metternich’s lands.

Sidons then produced a passport issued to Charles Sealsfield by the Province of Louisiana; he said this was his real name. Von Neumann reported that “he is entered under this name as Protestant Minister born in Pennsylvania. I therefore remarked that by his accent he could be taken to be a German. He told me that his father was of German descent, that he was at the head of a German colony in Pennsylvania, and that that explained his German accent.” Sidons-Sealsfield went on to say that he would be returning to Paris in 4 or 5 weeks and would later go to England where he would look up the persons who could give him important information. He offered to put himself fully at their service if they would assure him of a sum per month or per year, but von Neumann refused to enter into such an agreement without more convincing evidence of its value. He suggested instead that since Sidons-Sealsfield would be going to Paris anyway, he could convey any important information to Baron von Binder there, or to the Austrian embassy in London; both would be informed of his identity. When von Neumann asked where he could be reached in Paris, Sidons-Sealsfield gave the name of Mr. Brown, the American minister there (Brown, he claimed, knew him); he gave Mr. Bunsen in Pfingstweide as his Frankfurt address. In a postscript von Neumann explained that he introduced himself to Sidons-Sealsfield as Mr. Weber, and that he did not disappoint him.

On September 7, 1826, Metternich sends a copy of von Neumann’s Sidons-Sealsfield interview to Baron Binder in Paris for his information, asking him to be cautious about this man who claims to be an American and to discover what he can about his past, his principles, etc. The letter is written in French and Baron Binder’s reply on September 24, 1826, is also in French; it says that he will act according to instructions should Sidons or Sealsfield present himself. In preparation for his arrival Baron Binder tried to gather what information he could and had asked the American minister Mr. Brown about Sidons-Sealsfield; he was informed that Brown did not know him. “This circumstance alone which destroys one of Sealsfield’s assertions, would strengthen the opinion that this is an adventurer who is either reporting false or unimportant information to get some money.” For that reason, Baron Binder believes he need not further assure Prince Metternich that he will use the greatest caution in dealing with Sealsfield. That ends the known information about Sealsfield’s passport and his willingness to serve Metternich as a spy against England, although as a Roman Catholic priest supposedly, according to scholars, he had fled Metternich’s Austria for the liberty of the United States.

Because it is so unusual that Louisiana should issue a passport for a Protestant Minister with an Anglo-American name such as Charles Sealsfield, and state that he is a citizen of the state of Pennsylvania, I went to considerable trouble to look into this matter and even obtained the friendly and interested cooperation of the State of Louisiana and its Department of State in my search. On December 9, 1982, I was informed by the Archives and Records service of the Secretary of State of the State of Louisiana:

We have pursued all of our available avenues of research, but could find no information which would lead us to believe that the State of Louisiana has ever issued passports; the Secretary of State’s legal department has confirmed for us that only the federal government has the authority to do so.

Further search with the Department of State of the United States on December 29, 1982 brought this enlightening reply from the Legislative and Diplomatic Branch of the Civil Archives Division of the U.S. National Archives:

The Department of State was not given sole authority to issue passports until 1856 and up until that time States and judicial authorities issued them as well.

Further search in the U.S. Archives, which contain U.S. Consular records as well, revealed no record of a passport being issued to Charles Sealsfield, but an examination of the excellent research study THE UNITED STATES PASSPORT PAST, PRESENT, FUTURE4 revealed how irregularly passports were issued in the time of Charles Sealsfield. This irregularity is confirmed by my own research in the records of Rapp’s Harmony Society, one of America’s and particularly Pennsylvania’s richest but comparatively unknown sources of original information for immigrants to America and their needs for identification. On the foundation of this extensive research and through acquaintance with the multicultural American of Sealsfield’s time, I present the following explanation of Sealsfield’s curious Louisiana passport:5

Karl Postl as a fugitive Roman Catholic priest wanted by the Austrian police, needed an American Passport that would give him full protection (after his Anglo-American reincarnation as Charles Sealsfield) against two very obvious personal characteristics: (1) His in-
delible character as a Roman Catholic priest, and (2) His heavy German accent. Although he first claimed such a politically influential man as von Bonh Horst of Pittsburgh as his friend, he could never have approached that man for the kind of passport he needed, neither would that do in the rest of fundamentalist German Lutheran Pennsylvania where the papacy was still considered an institution established by Satan. Claiming Pennsylvania citizenship and the Protestant ministry and the name of Charles Sealsfield was simply too big a lie for the "dumb but honest" Pennsylvania Dutchmen to accept. Louisiana was the answer.

The area below Baton Rouge to New Orleans on English and French maps at that time was marked and known as the German Coast of Louisiana, and his German accent could have been explained by those Louisiana Germans, but that area was Roman Catholic and as a fugitive Roman Catholic priest he could not have remained undiscovered. With the Louisiana purchase, however, most influential political offices in Louisiana had been taken over by Anglo-American Protestant carpet baggers from the North, particularly Yankees, who were always politically more interested and capable and, of course, less conscientious, than the Germans. There were a number of such Anglo-American political potentates in Louisiana who could, and would, have written such a deceitful passport as Charles Sealsfield presented to Metternich's representative. I would even venture the assertion that Sealsfield dictated the text of his passport himself. One need but read his later accounts of corrupt politics carried on by the Anglo-Americans in Louisiana in his various works covering the area. And he wrote about this corruption with delight, because as a great supporter of Andrew Jackson, politics was his joy, and that kind of politics without mistake was of Jackson's "To the victor belong the spoils" variety. Sealsfield's passport is a cleverly manufactured lie, obtained from some politician with a rubber conscience. Once he had broken his vows and lacked the courage to make an open confession of it while he lived, he had to lie to keep on living as Charles Sealsfield with the heavy German accent. His life then became the life of a man haunted by his past. That he suffered much under the lie that he lived is documented in the final confession inscribed on his tombstone when, for those who know, he united his former honest priestly life with his later fugitive Americanism in a common grave.6

This grave beside St. Niklaus church in Solothurn, Switzerland, is suitably marked by two large stone slabs; one bilingual and of religious autobiographical significance, the other in German and of political autobiographical significance. The first is the headstone leaning against the north wall of the church; it is inscribed:

The "CP" at the top of the stone is the anglicized form of his original name, Karl Postl; the first date given under the name "Charles Sealsfield" is the birthdate of Karl Postl, while the second date is the date of the death of Charles Sealsfield—the haunted Karl Postl. It is very significant that the two Scripture passages—so profound and concentrated in this fugitive priest's final confession to Him whom he had sworn to serve—are in English; open, yet concealed to the public. They should properly have been rendered in Latin or in Luther's German, for they are taken from Catholic prayer books chosen for persons facing the last agony of death, as Sealsfield-Postl faced it in his last hours of solitude before the dissolution of his physical existence.

The second large stone slab covers the remains of the body and is inscribed in German "Charles Sealsfield Bürger von Nord Amerika" (Citizen of North America). This speaks with the defiance of a free American citizen, and gives notice to the Austrian police: You cannot touch my body or my property, I am a citizen of North America. This was important because it did protect his testament from possible confiscation by the Austrian Government since he was a fugitive from its justice. Together these monuments are the summation of a great and lonely confession to a life lived under two identities.

ENDNOTES


6Ibid., p. 108.


6See my five volumes of DOCUMENTARY HISTORY OF GEORGE RAPP'S HARMONY SOCIETY as published by the Indiana Historical Society, Indianapolis and Harmony Society Press, Worcester, Mass. Also see the now standard reference work in 3 volumes by Arndt and Olson: THE GERMAN LANGUAGE PRESS OF THE AMERICAS. Saur Verlag, Munich.

6Volume 24 of the first complete edition of the works of Charles Sealsfield, Olms Verlag, Hildesheim, is scheduled to publish Sealsfield's hitherto unidentified contributions to the New York Morning Courier and Enquirer, as well as other of his unknown works, particularly such as document his ambition to oust James Fenimore Cooper in English as an American writer. The joy he took in politics and his boastful claims as a member of the secret council of Jackson will be further documented in a forthcoming article "Sealsfield's Relation to David Wardden," United States Consul, Paris, France.
“A GARDEN FOR THE FRIENDS OF GOD”: RELIGIOUS DIVERSITY IN THE OLEY VALLEY TO 1750

by Karen Guenther

When William Penn founded the province of Pennsylvania in the early 1680s, he deliberately created “an Holy Experiment” in which freedom of religion would serve as a cornerstone. This invitation of religious freedom, combined with the encouragement and protection of the colonial government and the desire of the early religious groups to maintain religious liberty and nonconformity, attracted many settlers and resulted in the rapid growth of the province. Penn’s plans for his colony, which differed significantly from the motivations for the establishment of many other colonies, led to the unique ethnic and religious diversity characteristic of Colonial Pennsylvania.

Immigrants from France, Germany, Sweden, Holland, Switzerland, and the British Isles came to the province during the Colonial Period. As a result of the diverse ethnic origins of the settlers, a multiplicity of religious groups settled in Pennsylvania, including Roman Catholics, Jews, Quakers, Anglicans, Presbyterians, Mennonites, Lutherans, Reformed, Dunkards, Amish, Schwenkfelders, and Moravians. Gottlieb Mittelberger, a traveler in the province in the early 1750s, noted that the religious diversity of the settlers was so great that “it is possible to meet in one house, among one family, members of four or five or six different sects.” Penn’s promise of freedom of worship also led to the immigration of a number of “unchurched” people, to the extent that Moravian Bishop August Gottlieb Spangenberg commented in his biography of Count Nicholas Ludwig von Zinzendorf that anyone who did not care for God and His word followed “the Pennsylvanian religion.”

An examination of the origins of the early settlers of present-day Berks County provides one of the best examples of the ethnic and religious diversity of Colonial Pennsylvania. The Oley Valley—a thirty square mile wide region in the central portion of eastern Berks County surrounded by hills and drained by the Monocacy and Manatawny creeks—was the first section to be settled. The first European immigrants, who came to the area in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, included German and Swedish Lutherans; French, Swiss, and German Reformed; English and Welsh Quakers; and German Dunkards, Mennonites, Amish, New Born, and Roman Catholics. As early as 1720, these settlers had petitioned the court at Philadelphia for the formation of a township in the region, but officials did not establish one until around 1740. This township included all or part of present-day Exeter, District, Rockland, Earl, Pike, and Oley townships.

Early “church people” (Reformed, Lutherans, and Roman Catholics) who settled in the Oley Valley faced the problem of a lack of available ministers. Because the government did not compel anyone to attend church, the few ministers who had settled in the colony had a difficult time financially. Mittelberger stated that “most preachers are engaged for the year, like the cowherds in Germany; and when any one fails to please his congregation, he is given notice and must put up with it . . .” Judging from the way church members treated some of the pastors, the traveler decided he would “rather be the humblest cowherd at home than be a preacher in Pennsylvania . . . [a region which is] heaven for farmers, paradise for artisans, and hell for officials and preachers.” The Reverend Henry Melchior Muhlenberg, patriarch of the Lutheran Church in North America, considered Oley to be a place “where practically all the inhabitants are scoffers and blasphemers . . . I have preached there several times for the sake of a Lot or two who live there, but the wanton sinners only scoffed and jeered at me.” He also recorded in his journal that:

One of our churchmen approached a rich scoffer in Oley [sic] Township and desired to borrow some money. The rich man said to the poor man, “Do you know who my God is?” The poor man replied, “No.” The rich man pointed to his manure pile outside the door and said, “There is my God; he gives me wheat and everything I need.” The poor man went away and refused to take anything.

The sectarians who settled in the Oley Valley did not experience this difficulty, as they preferred not to have a professional clergy. The actions of some of the preachers of the colony justified this preference. In fact, Mittelberger noted that one objectionable preacher in Oley Township, a man named Alexander, announced at a gathering of young farmers . . . with whom he had been carousing . . . that with his sermon he would so move the people standing in front of him that all of them would begin to cry, but at the very same time all of those standing behind him would start laughing. He wagered these same young farmers a considerable sum that he would be able to do this. And on a certain agreed day he appeared at a church-meeting, stationed himself in the midst of the assemblage, and began...
to preach with a great deal of power and emotion. When he saw that his listeners had become so moved that they began to cry, he put his hands behind him, pulled his coat-tails apart, and revealed through a pair of badly torn breaches his bare behind, which he scratched with one hand during this demonstration. At this those who were standing behind him could not help roaring with laughter; and so he won his bet.13

Despite the difficulties of obtaining a suitable pastor, the German church people did organize congregations in the Oley Valley during this period. Members of the French and German Reformed Churches, who followed the teachings of the Protestant reformers John Calvin, Ulrich Zwingli, and Philip Melanchthon, attended services at the Trappe from their arrival in the 1710s until the formal establishment of a congregation in the 1730s.14 As early as 1727, the Reverend George Michael Weiss preached and baptized children during a visit to Oley.15 Weiss again visited in 1729, administering communion and baptizing settlers and Indians in that year.16

After Weiss’s departure to Europe and New York, the Reverend John Philip Boehm, founder of the Reformed Church in Pennsylvania, occasionally conducted services in the area.17 In 1734, the congregation acquired land for a church building, and by 1735, it may have erected a small church.18 At the request of the congregation, Boehm again visited Oley on May 4, 1736, and administered the Lord’s Supper to thirty-nine communicants. He also came in November, 1736, with forty communicants at that time. In addition, in November, Boehm agreed to visit the congregation twice a year to administer communion and to baptize children.19

Shortly thereafter, however, the Reverend John Henry Goetschy, an unordained minister, succeeded in persuading part of the congregation to follow him. Consequently, when Boehm returned in the spring of 1737, he “found the congregation in a state of confusion.”20 Boehm retired from Oley and left the congregation to Goetschy, who preached there until 1739.21 In 1740, the congregation again had no minister, and its members pledged “Ten pounds of this country’s currency and Twenty bushels of oats” for this purpose.22 The Reverend Peter Henry Dorsius, whom the Holland fathers had sent to gather information about the conditions of the Reformed settlers in Pennsylvania, occasionally supplied the congregation during this year.23

No further record exists of the Reformed congregation until 1746, when the Reverend Michael Schlatter reported that the Reverend Frederick Casimir Mueller was serving “10 or 12 small congregations in and about Oley.”24 Schlatter conferred with Mueller in September, 1746, in Oley and proposed that Mueller abstain from administering the Lord’s Supper, performing marriages, and baptizing children until a Coetus ordained him and installed him as a regular minister. Mueller, however, continued to act as he had before, and Schlatter decided not to request ordination for him.25 Schlatter returned in 1747 and in 1748, but he failed in his attempts to “institute good order.”26 Because of the Oley congregation’s adherence to unordained pastors such as Mueller, the Coetus considered it “not yet ripe enough” for an ordained minister at its first meeting in 1747.27

German Lutherans, whose basic doctrine was salvation by faith alone, also established congregations in the Oley Valley during the first half of the eighteenth century. As early as 1731, the Reverend John Caspar Stoever performed baptisms in the vicinity.28 Stoever not only was the first Lutheran pastor to preach and administer the sacraments there, but he also formed at least the nucleus of a Lutheran congregation.29 During the 1740s, the Reverend Peter Brunnholtz and Henry Melchior Muhlenberg, pastors at Germantown, New Hanover, and Providence, occasionally provided services for the Lutherans of the area.30 This first Lutheran congregation, known as St. Joseph’s or Hill Church and located in present-day Pike Township, acquired fifty acres of land for a church and a school in 1741. By 1747, the congregation had erected a log church, and its members had added a log school house by 1750.31

Members of the Reformed Church and other religious groups in the area assisted their Lutheran neighbors in this undertaking. The Reformed, in particular, received several privileges from this, including the right to bury their dead in the Lutheran cemetery, to send their children to the Lutheran school at the same rate of tuition, and to use the church building for worship services when not in use. The Lutherans consented to the latter “only on [the] condition that the services be conducted by regularly ordained ministers. Tramps were interdicted.”32

German Roman Catholics were also among the early settlers of the Oley Valley. Members of this religious group did not begin to settle in Berks County until the early 1740s. The Reverend Theodore Schneider, a former rector at the University of Heidelberg, served as Jesuit missionary for the region that became eastern Berks County. Shortly after his arrival in 1741, he founded the mission at Goshenhoppen (now Bally) and erected a church there. He provided religious instruction for his parishioners and administered the sacraments to them.33 During the 1740s, he occasionally visited Oley and performed at least ten baptisms in the area.34 Schneider served as priest for the Catholics in eastern Berks County until his death in 1764.35 Descendants of the Anabaptist sects of central Europe, who believed in adult baptism and a return to Apostolic Christianity, also settled in the Oley Valley during the first half of the eighteenth century.36 Mennonites had settled in the area as early as 1714, with two representatives of their congregation, called Man-
attant, attending the conference of Mennonites held in 1727. In addition, Amish and spiritualistic Schwenkfelder immigrants purchased land in the region. Of all the German sects, though, the Dunkards had the greatest amount of activity during this period. In the early 1730s, members of this sect, who emphasized baptism by immersion, began to hold services in Oley under the direction of Elder Peter Becker of Germantown; shortly thereafter they erected a church. Throughout this period, the congregation had no resident minister, "but with the aid of ministers from other places, and through their own zealous, persevering efforts, and under God's blessing, they increased rapidly." The Dunkard congregation flourished for about ten years, before many of its members departed to other settlements in the early 1740s.

While the German church people and most sectarian settlers settled peacefully in the area, one sect, the New Born, met considerable opposition. Adherents of this sect, founded by Matthias Baumann, believed that through the "new birth" they became God and Christ Himself, and could no longer sin. They subscribed only to those Biblical passages that, taken out of context, appeared to favor their unusual tenets, and they considered the holy sacraments ridiculous.

Baumann, a Palatine immigrant who began preaching in Oley in 1719, apparently controlled a significant portion of the emotional settlers and "held such power over them that his followers forsook almost every other interest and relation in life to propagate this new-born cult." He promulgated his peculiar religious beliefs in his treatise Ein Ruf an die Nicht Wiedergeborenen, or "A Call to the Unregenerate." To demonstrate the authenticity of his beliefs and to show that he was in God's favor, he even offered to wade across the Delaware River. After Baumann's death in 1727, Martin Schenkel, whom Beohm considered one of the worst of the New Born and who spoke "such blasphemous words against our Saviour ... that the ears of a true Christian tingle and his heart must weep, when hearing them," became leader of the sect.

Soon after Baumann's death, opposition developed to the New Born and their beliefs. The Reverend George Michael Weiss published a pamphlet in 1729 "to counteract the influence" and to refute the principal heresies of this sect. In this work, written as a dialogue between a minister and a representative member of the sect, Weiss called the advocate of the "new birth" "a miserable earthly worm." In 1737, Moravian Bishop August Gottlieb Spangenberg preached a sermon in Oley based on I John 1:7-9 that indicated the fallacies in the sect's unevangelical doctrines and marked the beginning of the decline of their influence. Other German clergy in Pennsylvania called the group "a turbulent sect" and "the most terrible of men.

Another religious group that settled in the Oley Valley and created controversy was the Moravians. Followers of John Huss who were influenced by the pietistic Lutheran Count Nicholas Ludwig von Zinzendorf, they advocated missionary work among the Indians and supported a union of all German religious groups. As early as 1736, Henry Antes, a pious Reformed layman from Frederick Township in Philadelphia County who later became a Moravian minister, periodically conducted worship in private houses. Spangenberg visited Oley in 1737 to meet with the settlers to whom Antes was preaching. The main work of the Moravians, through, did not occur until the early 1740s.

In 1740, the religious revival known as the "Great Awakening" spread throughout the colony of Pennsylvania. George Whitefield, the English revivalist, visited Antes in that year and learned of the destitute religious condition of the German settlers of the colony, especially of those in Oley. At Whitefield's suggestion, in 1741, the Moravians sent three missionaries to preach to the area. Whitefield also recommended that the Reverend Andrew Eschenbach be sent as the first Moravian minister to settle in Oley.

At first, Eschenbach's preaching did not make much of an impression upon the residents. However, a "Great Awakening" soon occurred. The Oley Moravian Church record reported that "Eschenbach preached during the year with power and conviction. The entire township was in a state of excitement. One saw people in crowds on their way to hear the Gospel..." By the end of 1741, Eschenbach already had fifty-four followers, including German and French Reformed, Lutherans, and Mennonites.

In December, 1741, Henry Antes appealed to religious leaders of all denominations and sects to unite into one Protestant movement: "The Pennsylvania Congregation of God in the Spirit." Zinzendorf, who supported this proposal, planned a series of synods to achieve such an organization. At these synods, Zinzendorf attempted to avoid all points of doctrine that divided Christians and to emphasize the points upon which all agreed.

Members of practically all of the German Protestant religious groups met in Germantown on January 12, 1742, hoping "that with the Savior's blessing they could do away with the judging and condemning, gossiping, injuring and defaming" which had made Pennsylvania "the laughing-stock of the world." Zinzendorf held another synod on January 25 and 26, 1742, at which the delegates from Ephrata declared that they would no longer follow the decision of the synod. Lutheran, Reformed, and Mennonite delegates persuaded them to reconsider their actions, and they remained a part of the synod until the next meeting. This was the first indication of the dissension that would become more pronounced at future meetings.

The Third Synod met on February 21-23, 1742, on John De Türek's farm in Oley. Moravian leaders,
including Count Zinzendorf and Bishop David Nitschman, Indians, and persons from other Protestant denominations attended the meeting. At this time, the Synod ordained ministers and missionaries and elected trustees for the body. In addition, at this meeting, the Moravians baptized their first Indian converts by sprinkling. This form of baptism contradicted the beliefs of the Dunkards and resulted in their immediate departure. Consequently, the Moravian synod at Oley, which sought to keep the German settlers from subdividing excessively and hoped to have them work "harmoniously as one great church in America," was unable to achieve its goal because of the "many widely-differing and contradictory tenets [that needed] to be reconciled..." Nevertheless, the Moravians did succeed in organizing the adherents Andrew Eschenbach had gathered from several denominations in Oley into one undenominational congregation.

Zinzendorf conducted four more synods in 1742, but they only led to a self-justification of his ideas and a condemnation of all groups except the Moravians and the Quakers. Thus, rather than resulting in a union of Protestants in Pennsylvania, Zinzendorf's synods instead led to the emergence of a stubborn denominational consciousness, and differences between the religious groups became even more pronounced.

Because the lack of an effective church organization may have provided one of the reasons for the temporary success of the union movement in the Oley Valley and in southeastern Pennsylvania, Lutheran and Reformed officials in Europe soon realized the necessity for a colonial church organization. Thus, through the work of the Reverends John Philip Boehm, Henry Melchior Muhlenberg, and later Michael Schlatter, the Lutheran and Reformed churches in Pennsylvania had established formal organizations by the end of the decade. In addition, within a few years many of the settlers who had joined the union movement returned to their former congregations.

The failure of the Third Synod in 1742, did not result in the end of Moravian activity in Oley. Zinzendorf remained especially interested in the activity of this congregation, and on several occasions he expressed the hope that Oley would soon become a more important settlement for the Moravians than Bethlehem. Unfortunately, disorder quickly occurred while the congregation planned the erection of a building to serve as a church and a school. The people preferred to construct a log church, while their minister, Eschenbach, wanted to build a large two-story brick structure similar to the clergy house at Bethlehem. The minister indicated his displeasure of their preference in his sermons, and as a result he lost their support. Eschenbach became increasingly more stubborn as opposition increased, and finally, in 1743, in an effort to restore peace, Zinzendorf recalled him to Bethlehem and put Henry Antes in his place. Unfortunately, Antes remained in Frederick and only occasionally conducted services in Oley. Jacob Kuhn assisted him and took charge of the school until 1744. Other Moravian Arbeiter (workers) at Oley during this period included Abraham Meinung (1744), Johann Wolfgang Michlers (1745-1748), and Richard Utheleys (1749-1750).

The frequent change in pastors among the Moravians was especially unfortunate, because during the early 1740s, Dr. George De Benneville, a Huguenot physician and an independent preacher, settled in Oley. A highly educated and attractive speaker, De Benneville became a pioneer of the Universalist faith in America. Through a vision, he "had been converted to a belief that people could call on the Savior and submit to His love." Accordingly, any punishment that God decreed would happen on earth, and all souls would be saved. In the mid-1740s, De Benneville established a chapel in his home for his preaching, and he occasionally taught and preached in the Moravian school house.

By the late 1740s, the educational work of the Oley Moravians was considered to be of particular importance. At the school, which the congregation ironically had built to Eschenbach's specifications, the Brethren instructed and boarded children either free or for a slight fee. The support of the teacher came both from the congregation and from collected funds. Approximately twenty girls and seventeen boys attended this school. By 1748, the congregation had constructed a new building, as the original structure had become too small. Even though the school received acclaim and attracted students from other communities, it depended on support from the brethren at Bethlehem and had become too expensive to maintain by 1751. As a result, the Moravian school and congregation at Oley was short-lived, for by 1753, only fifteen people belonged to the church.

Not all of the religious groups in the region originated on the continent, for Quakers from England and Wales also settled in the Oley Valley during the eighteenth century. Members of the Society of Friends believed that God inspired all people directly through the "inner light" that led them to their pacifism, refusal to swear oaths, and simple lives. From the 1710s until 1737, the Oley Friends' Meeting was an Indulged Meeting, or one for worship only, established under the protection and with the consent of the Gwynedd Monthly Meeting. The Gwynedd Friends granted the Oley Friends a preparative meeting in 1725, and in that year the Oley Friends erected a small log meeting house near the northwestern limit of Amity Township. The Oley Friends built a larger meeting house in 1737, around the same time they received permission to establish a Monthly Meeting. This meeting met on the last Thursday of each month, and the location alternated between Oley and Maiden Creek.
The first Oley Monthly Meeting met on September 5, 1737. Early activity of this meeting consisted primarily of transferring members in and out of the meeting. In October, 1737, the Oley Friends made their first report to the Philadelphia Quarterly Meeting, commenting that the group maintained "a good Degree of Love and Unity"; that the meetings were well-attended; and "that where anything [appeared] to the Contrary care [was] taken to put the Discipline in Practice." In early 1742, the officials at Philadelphia divided Oley Township in such a way that the meeting house fell into Exeter Township. Consequently, the Oley Monthly Meeting became known as the Exeter Monthly Meeting. Throughout the period, Oley representatives attempted to enforce a social discipline by making complaints against their members for a variety of offenses. Among these were for excessive drinking, failing to pay debts on time, marrying outside of the faith, "committing fornication and refusing to marry the girl," and defacing "the Head of a grey Fox [in order to receive]... Pay for a Red one." Not all records of activity are as grim, however, as the minutes also include at least twenty-nine marriages among Oley Friends.

In conclusion, religious diversity was an obvious feature in the early settlement of the Oley Valley. During the first half of the eighteenth century, members of almost a dozen different religious groups lived in the region. Possibly because of this plurality of faiths, though, a significant increase in the number or size of congregations in the area did not occur. Only one group, the Quakers, had any sustained growth during this period. The German church people did not increase in number, and while the Lutherans and the Reformed did manage to organize congregations and erect churches, they did not obtain regular pastors and lost members to the Moravians. In addition, the sectarians did not fare well, as many Dunkards migrated to other settlements, the New Born disappeared, and the Amish, Mennonites, and Schwenkfelders remained numerically small. Even the growth of the Moravians, the most active participants in the "Great Awakening" that spread throughout Pennsylvania during the early 1740s, was short-lived. Consequently, the Oley Valley, "the haunt of the wildest and most unruly people and sects," served as the home for a variety of denominations and sects that characterized the distinct ethnic and religious diversity of Colonial Pennsylvania. Despite occasional dissent, by the middle of the eighteenth century members of the several religious groups had flocked to the area, thus fulfilling the proprietor's dream of establishing a "garden for the Friends of God" in the colony of Pennsylvania.
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Pennsylvania German Studies Courses
Ursinus College 1984

Each summer for the past ten years we have offered Folk Culture courses which carry college credit; we do so again in June-August 1984. Students at Ursinus College and others interested may enroll through: The Director, Summer School, Ursinus College, Collegeville, PA 19426. In recognition of the Schwenkfelder Anniversary in 1984, a special emphasis upon the Schwenkfelders and the Perkiomen Region will highlight Pennsylvania German courses at Ursinus College in SUMMER 1984.

Session B:
PG 310. THE PENNSYLVANIA GERMANS AND RELIGION June 18-July 9
MARTHA KRIEBEL
An examination of the varieties of religious denominations and institutions of these persons, attitudes toward religion, as well as the transition of 20th century religious forms. Three hours per day. Three semester hours.

Session C: At the Peter Wentz Farmstead.
PG 308. PENNSYLVANIA GERMAN CRAFTS ALBERT GAMON July 11-31
History and theory of eighteenth century occupational and domestic crafts of the Pennsylvania Germans. Three hours per day. Three semester hours.

In Session D:
PG 427. SEMINAR: The Perkiomen Region DR. PARSONS Aug. 6-10
A study of the geography, industry, and population of this unique area, in particular as described in The Perkiomen Region, one of the finest early regional histories. Three hours per day for one week. One semester hour.

NEW ISSUES: PENNA. DUTCH STUDIES

Paul Wieand's delightful book brings concise information to the reader who wishes to discover the old beliefs about healing plants and their properties. Short introduction by the Series editor.

REPRINT SERIES:
$12.50 + 2.50 post & hndlg. 21.5 x 28 cm.

Gleim's work, reprinted here intact in its original German-language edition, but reprinted two-pages-to-one, carries a very brief introduction in English by Parsons. Betty Gleim (1781-1827) broke trail as a feminist leader, sharing ideas and experiences with Mme. de Staël and other liberated ladies of the French court and of some German states. Written as a guide for young ladies, it is also a consolation to those no longer young. She wrote of life's exciting experiences, with feeling.

To order any of the above make checks payable to: Penna. German Program, and mail to: Wm. T. Parsons, Director, Penna. German Program, Ursinus College, Collegeville, PA 19426.
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.

FOR THE FOLK FESTIVAL BROCHURE WRITE TO:

Pennsylvania Folklife Society
College Blvd. & Vine, Kutztown, Pa. 19530