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INTRODUCTION

The Swedes at Fort Christina began the first successful colony in the Delaware Valley in 1631, but it wasn’t until 1650 that enough flax, hemp and sheep were raised to lessen the colony’s dependence on imports, often purchased from English ships when Swedish supplies were delayed. Although little is known about this Swedish textile production, it is likely the colonists, perhaps with Indian help, experimented with local plants, barks, and nuts to find out what colors were available. Most of their dyeing was for coarse woolens called wadmal, similar to duffel.

By the time of the arrival of the English settlers under William Penn, many Swedish farmers were prospering. “Their clothing was plain, domestic linen being worn in the summer and domestic woolens, kerseys and linseys in winter, with some calicoes and cottons of imported stock. The domestic cloth was good in quality but badly dyed. For finer occasions, plush, and sometimes satin, were used.”

Penn knew that Pennsylvania’s temperate climate and rich soil were perfect for European plants, and he encouraged his colonists to bring seed with them. He planned his Pennsylvania estate to be a model of what could be grown here. In *Some Account of the Province of Pennsylvania in America*, written mainly to encourage immigration, he mentions the land is thought to be capable of producing woad, madder and potash—two primary dye plants and a major mordant. Neither woad nor madder is listed in the inventory of Penn’s garden, but it is possible they were grouped, along with many other plants, under the generic term “herbs.”

Thomas Budd was another early Quaker who urged the cultivation of dye plants: “I question not but that Mather [sic], Woad and other plants and Roots for Dye use might be raised.”

The textiles for these dyes remained primarily linen and wool. Philadelphia’s sheep were kept in a common fold in the town liberties. By 1690, William Bradford was able to write Penn in England that “the Woollen manufacturies have made a beginning here, and we have got a Publick flock of sheep, and a shepherd or two to attend them.” Indeed, one manufactory hired carders and spinners, as well as three weavers. (Nevertheless, the English, in general, preferred, with the mother country’s encouragement, to import textiles rather than make their own.)

Linen production was the province of the German immigrants, for those that arrived with Daniel Pastorius to settle Germantown were mainly professional linen weavers. Within two years of their arrival, Penn was writing proudly of the cloth they were turning out. The Palatinate, where much of the German immigration originated (it was the home of Bethlehem’s first dyer), had been growing flax for centuries, but it was also famous for its woad, and in addition to flax seed, the settlers probably brought dye seed as well. So, while it’s likely the German colonists raised woad for their blue dye—particularly since imported indigo was costly—its use is not mentioned in any period source until Bethlehem’s own dye house inventory of 1763. Again, as with the earlier Swedes, little is known about dyeing from this period except that Philadelphia had three dyers by 1690. But as the German immigration increased, so did the need for professional dyers, especially in the village called Bethlehem.
Bethlehem in 1755: 1) second dye house; 2) grist and fulling mill; 3) farm quadrangle — barns, stable and farmhouse; 4) linseed oil mill; 5) Single Brothers' house; contained brass foundry, silk cocoonery and linen weaver; 6) waterworks; 7) tawer (mineral salts tanner) and bark tannery; 8) horse stable, blacksmith, nailsmith, stocking weaver, pottery, wheelwright, hattery; 9) joiners, spinning wheels, carpentry; 10) Childrens' house; 11) apothecary; 12) Married Brethren's house, Married Sisters' house; 13) Gemeinhaus, Bell house, Single Sisters' house; 14) springhouse and dairy; 15) store.

"That such a diversity of industries should have been carried on at so early a time in the history of the village is indeed worthy of remark. . . . The existence of this array of established trades must indeed have seemed phenomenal to those who visited this inland settlement, then but in its teens; it was nevertheless a part of the plan . . . pre-arranged by the authorities of the Church, and which had for its aim the establishment at Bethlehem of a centre of gospel work and of a line of diversified remunerative industries which should support missionary, educational and charitable enterprises of the Church."

(Picture and quotation from the Rau Collection, Moravian Archives, Bethlehem, Pa.)
THE DYERS AND DYE HOUSES OF 18th CENTURY BETHLEHEM

Dyeing was only one of the crafts which contributed to the communal economy of Bethlehem, for the settlement was planned to be a pilgrim town where Moravian missionaries could live and work between the times they were called to the wilderness to preach to the Indians. Each craft and industry, then, was part of the general economy, with any profits retained in the name of the Moravian church. In effect, each craftsman was “to work for the economy without wages, and be content with what the economy could provide” in the way of food, clothing and shelter. The communal nature of the town meant that each person contributed to the benefit of all, and with the exception of a few items like glass, salt and gun powder, the community was self-supporting. Bethlehem’s residents grew their own food, built their own homes (there were separate buildings for the married couples and for the Single Brothers and the Single Sisters), and wove and dyed their own clothing.

Dyeing in Bethlehem probably began as soon as there was linen and wool from the first harvest in 1742. At this time the Single Sisters, already in charge of spinning and weaving, did the dyeing as well. It is unlikely that many imported dyestuffs were purchased before professional dyeing started, for it was difficult to meet survival needs, let alone have anything left over to trade with, and they probably depended on local dye plants and what they could grow from seeds brought with them from Europe. Woad, madder and dyer's weed would supply blue, red, and yellow and their combinations, with local nuts, barks and roots supplying brown. For mordants to set the dyes, tannin, potash and urine were available.

The quality of the Single Sisters’ dyeing should not be underrated. Even without the imported woods and exotic substances later used, they could easily have made the variety of colors and shadings familiar in Europe for either single color yardage, or for checks or stripes. Indeed, even after professional dyeing was available, the Single Sisters used it only for blue dyeing, still doing other colors themselves. They did not easily give up the work traditionally entrusted to them, and still wove for their own use after professional weaving began in the Single Brothers’ House. But as the production of flax and wool increased beyond community needs, the Sisters were inundated by vast amounts of yardage and skeins which needed to be dyed; this in addition to their regular tasks—spinning, weaving, cooking, laundry and field work. Bethlehem was moving beyond self-sufficiency to profit-making production and someone was needed to dye full time.

Matthias Weiss, the man who became Bethlehem’s first professional dyer, was born on February 15, 1709, in Michlhausen, Alsace, and was taught the craft by his father. In 1741 Weiss went to the Moravian settlement of Herrnhaag and joined the Moravian Church. Two years later he married Margaret Catherine Firnhaber, the daughter of a Frankfurt notary. They were to have three children: two sons, John and Matthias; and one daughter, Catherine.

In the same year they were married Matthias and Margaret were sent to America as part of the Moravian Church’s “Second Sea Congregation.” Skilled craftsmen like Weiss were sent to Bethlehem as part of a plan to set the community on a sound economic footing; a plan made “feasible by the importation of colonies of young men and women, chosen for the purpose and more or less fitted and equipped for engaging in industrial pursuits.” However, because of crowded conditions in Bethlehem, Weiss and his new bride ended up in the nearby Moravian community of Nazareth, where they lived for three years.

While living in Nazareth, Weiss was involved with planning and constructing the first Bethlehem dye house and, because his task was to set up dyeing on a professional basis, he would have supplemented whatever dye plants the Single Sisters were growing with seed brought over himself. In his “spare time” he would have helped with other construction and possibly with weaving as well. In fact, even when he moved to Bethlehem Weiss did more than dye cloth. As in Nazareth, he helped with new construction and harvesting, and in 1747 he was asked to enclose the town spring with a fence to keep away domestic animals and fowl. Also, he was consulted about the apparatus necessary for distilling peach brandy, and he and Joseph Powell were appointed to clean the spring “in the light of the moon, said to be the best time by men who possessed Pennsylvania knowledge.”

The move to Bethlehem took place in 1746, when the first dye house was ready and Weiss began its operation. Little is currently known about this building—it was likely one of the temporary log structures built along the mill race for its water supply. It lacked the family quarters of the third dye house, so Weiss and his wife would have lived with the other married couples. Their three children might have stayed in the Bethlehem nursery to be raised by the Single Sisters and Brothers assigned to that task. While there are no inventories from this operation, the equipment and dyestuffs Weiss used here would not have differed greatly from those he used later on, and they will be described in the section on the second dye house. Dyeing was a craft passed from master to apprentice, and was little changed from the Renaissance through the mid-nineteenth century. Weiss taught his apprentices the same skills his father had taught him, skills that could have come down through the family for generations.

In Bethlehem, Weiss’s first year’s dyeing assignment included three hundred pounds of blue yarn (flax thread) for the stocking weavers to weave into checks and stripes. Blue dyeing remained Weiss’s specialty, but he also dyed one hundred and seventy pounds of wool other colors. These large amounts indicate why the basically home dyeing of the Single Sisters was no longer adequate to meet the demand. As Bethlehem’s productivity moved into surplus, the increasingly profitable textile industries necessitated a larger dye house, and that was built (of stone) in 1752. A permanent structure had probably been planned from the first, and the log dye house would then have been used for other purposes. Red and white leather dyeing was done in
March 1769.

Matthias Weitz set out dyeing. (Courtesy of the Moravian Archives, Bethlehem, Pa.)

Daybook of the Bethlehem dye house showing the amount of dyeing done each day there. (Courtesy of the Moravian Archives, Bethlehem, Pa.)
two log buildings along the race in the 1750s, and one of these buildings could have been the 1746 dye house.

This 1752 stone structure was not a separate building but an addition to an already existing fulling and grist mill complex. The fulling mill itself was a recent stone replacement for the first, temporary one; it had a tile roof and floor to prevent fires. It is possible that dyeing was done in one room of the fulling mill before the dye section was completed. When finished, the new addition extended beyond the front wall of the fulling mill by five feet.

Concerning this second dye house, a diary entry of February 9, 1752 states: "The Dyer's kettle was set and the house to be finished today." This kettle would have been set in a large furnace probably much like the one described in 1798 by American dyer Asa Ellis: "The [kettle] should be set in a brick furnace, because that will heat your copper sooner. The top of the furnace, which encloses the [kettle] ought to be six inches thick, so that you may plank the brick work, and nail the lip of the copper to the plank and plaster [plaster] of the furnace."

At the time this second dye house was built Weiss does not seem to have had an apprentice, for it was noted that "more should learn the trades of... dyer [and] fulling miller, so that these industries will not be stopped by the death or sickness of the present incumbents." This seems to have been carried out and a later list of Bethlehem's craftsmen listed Bernhard Muller as a second dyer (though it was Weiss's son John who carried on the business after his father's retirement). Weiss and his wife lived nearby the new dye house, with the other families connected with the fulling and grist mill. This was a great convenience for when a vat of blue dye was made, it required round-the-clock vigil to make sure the proper fermentation was taking place. After the economy changed in 1761, Weiss paid twelve pounds yearly rent for his living quarters.

In 1756 Mary Catherine Weiss died. Described as "not of the robust type, " she seems to have been unsuited for the harshness of Bethlehem's early years. Weiss "left her loss very keenly," and soon left for the new Moravian settlement at Bethabara in North Carolina; his children remained behind. The dye house continued operating after he left, probably with Muller in charge. The Moravian's North Carolina diaries mention the widow's arrival: "The dyer Weiss has come from Bethlehem and Yorktown in his wagon." Bethlehem historian Elizabeth Myers describes the situation at Bethabara: "His arrival must have been rather a burden to them, for a conference was held to consider the establishment of the business. They found they had no dyestuffs and would have to send... to get them, so Brother Weiss was told to earn his bread by helping with the weaving temporarily which he did quite well." Nevertheless, Weiss returned to Bethlehem the next year, said to be dissatisfied with conditions in the new settlement. On his return he remarried, and had two sons by his new wife.

Since detailed records were kept on all of Bethlehem's industries and sent to the church authorities in Herrnhut, Germany, Weiss kept ledgers, daybooks and yearly inventories for his dye business. The ledgers listed every account—

Interior of a German dye house, ca. 1695; Bethlehem's would have looked much the same, for dyeing was a craft little changed from the Renaissance through the mid-nineteenth century. (Courtesy of the Sidney M. Edelstein Collection, Hebrew University of Jerusalem.)

Moravian and non-Moravian—of those who had cloth dyed. The daybooks listed the amounts and types of textiles dyed, and the inventories listed the tools and equipment of the business. The following inventory is from 1758. It is similar to the inventories of much later American dye houses, and probably similar to the inventories of German dye houses of the period as well:

Tools in the Dye House, September 1758.
1 large copper kettle
1 middle copper kettle
1 small copper kettle
1 lead blue kettle
1 scale
1 cutting knife
1 axe
1 mallet
2 iron pestles
1 lantern
1 old copper kettle
1 iron kettle to cook potash
1 barrel to dye yarn
1 lye barrel
1 iron
2 water barrels
As already noted, the largest kettle (and also possibly the smaller ones) was set in a furnace. The copper kettles were used for dyeing which required the use of simmering or boiling liquids at temperatures that could ruin lead kettles. Copper was preferred for hot dyeing because it helped to give a bright color to textiles, unlike iron which greyed, or "saddened," them. Although the list includes "I lead blue kettle," the use of lead kettles for blue dyeing was unusual. An early nineteenth century American dyer, Elijah Bemiss, criticized the use of lead, saying "it is expensive and liable to melt and burst." Blue dyeing was generally done in large wooden vats that often held hundreds of gallons of liquid. The wood, like lead, is inert and doesn't affect the delicate chemical processes of reduction and fermentation.

Concerning the other items of Weiss's inventory, the scale, the knife and the pestles were used to measure, to cut and to grind the correct amount of dyestuffs for a particular recipe. The lye barrel and iron kettle were used in the production of potash, probably from wood ash. (Potash was an important alkali in the blue dye process). The saw, the axe, the mallet and the push cart were used to obtain wood to keep the furnace going—this was apprentice and helper work. Blue dyeing maintains its fermentation process only within a narrow temperature range. If the vat cools off or heats up the dye process is often destroyed. It was also necessary to add lime, madder or potash to sustain fermentation—indicated by bubbles rising to the surface of the liquid—so the lantern would have been used when the vats were checked through the night. Needless to say, a master dyer required years of apprenticeship in order to learn how to make such dye recipes work consistently.

Returning to the inventory, Weiss's winding machine was no doubt similar in form and function to a winder described by the aforementioned Asa Ellis: "It is made of a piece of timber two inches square and long enough to cross the copper, with a crank at one end, and four slats or posts, that are incerted [sic] in the shaft before mentioned. The reel, thus formed, should be about a yard in circumference. On this, the cloth in the copper is to be turned, while colouring, to preserve it from spotting." And, finally, the "barrel with hand colors" may be the "600 pairs of patterns" mentioned later in the 1772 inventory. Perhaps these were color samples.

The textiles dyed by Weiss with this equipment were stored in an attic room above the dye house. In this room would be bolts of cloth and skeins of yarn in every stage of processing: those just brought in; those scoured (if necessary); or mordanted; or dyed and drying; or dried and waiting to be picked up. When dyed, the linen yardage was ready to be cut and sewn, while the woolens had to be fulled and finished; the wool clothiers worked in another room of the fulling mill. Of course Weiss had to know in just which stage of the dyeing process each bolt and skein was: no easy task.

The fulling mill and dye house burned in 1758. Both were rebuilt ("A new fulling mill is to be built and a committee appointed for the purpose") and this time the dye house was in line with the fulling and grist mills; the structure was now a true rectangle. Fire was obviously a major hazard, and when the stables of the village inn were destroyed by a lightning fire on July 20, 1761, it was thought time to take decisive action. On the following day a group of twenty-two citizens, including Matthias Weiss, pledged a total of twenty pounds toward the purchase of a fire engine: "We the subscribers do hereby mutually for each one of us promise and engage to pay unto . . . the several sums of money unto each of our names written in order in purchase a Fire Engine or Engines, Buckets and other Implements necessary for extinguishing Fire for the use of the United Brethren residing in this place. Dated the 21st July, 1761." Though Weiss pledged one of the smallest amounts it does show that he had some disposable income, unlike much of the community.
Ledger F of the Diaconat of Bethlehem showing the construction records of Bethlehem's third and last dye house in 1771. (Courtesy of the Moravian Archives.)
Weiss, who dyed for the residents of the upper farms around Nazareth as well as for the Moravians in Bethlehem, was one of only four blue dyers in the entire Lehigh Valley. Through its non-Moravian trade, the dye house was a major source of community income, and the community’s economy badly needed profit-making industries; the late 1750s and early 1760s were a time of major economic upheaval for the Moravian Church in general, and for Bethlehem in particular. In Germany, among the Moravians, capitalism as an intellectual idea was replacing what was basically a Medieval communalism; it was hoped that people working for themselves would produce more, with the increased profits going to the church. In Bethlehem, the local economy was still self-sustaining and was, in fact, a model of prosperity: “Nobody, who owns the best plantation, could be better off.”23 The problem was that Bethlehem wasn’t producing enough cash to help pay off the debt of the international Moravian Church. In short, Bethlehem was not providing what church leaders felt it was capable of providing.

Yet more than money was at stake in Bethlehem. The evangelical fervor of the early years there had settled into a satisfied prosperity, and a communal system “can only flourish as long as the enthusiasm prevails.”22 But that enthusiasm was waning, for the amount of work that barely sustained a family in Germany made them wealthy in Bethlehem, and “as soon as a person realizes that he is getting to be well off, then usually the desire ceases, to give and to aid, where it is needed.”21 At a time when prosperous American farmers wore their wealth as solid gold buttons, Moravians were still living sacrifice, and many among them thought it was no longer necessary. The evangelical spirit had converted all of the willing local Indians, so now it was time for everyday living, and Bethlehem had not been designed for everyday living. It was time to become simply another Germanic village.

These spiritual and economic factors brought about the gradual dissolution of Bethlehem’s general economy. Craftsmen were allowed to decide if they would work for themselves or continue to work for the town: “Brother Richter, the tailor, shall be allowed to choose whether he will continue his services as formerly, or conduct his own private business.”24 However, land and important buildings and industries, including the dyeing business, remained under church control for many years. Since Weiss could not own the dye house or its equipment, he contracted to operate it for a salary and a share of the profits.

**

A third dye house was built in Bethlehem in 1771, as this diary extract from June 3 of that year indicates: “A new dyeing establishment is to be built this summer.”25 Since labor was no longer free, the town had to pay for its construction, and a month later, on July 12, it was noted that “Brother Denke reports he will have to borrow money to pay for the completion of the dye house.”26 The decision to build may have been made because the former site was needed for storage or for work space by the fulling mill. This 1771 structure was one of Bethlehem’s first buildings with an English, Georgian-style roof. It lacks the steep peak and dormers of the town’s earlier Germanic architecture, but retains the characteristic Moravian brickwork over the doorways and windows.
The new dye house was situated just a few yards west of its previous site in the grist and fulling mill complex. It was actually two adjacent structures, a large, house-style, two story stone building and a one story stone, side building where the actual dyeing took place. This new facility was basically the same size as the 1751 dye house, about six hundred square feet, and keeping the work site in this side area no doubt made the family living quarters next door more bearable. But the large stone building provided more than living quarters, and Weiss and his family would not have had the entire two story structure (as well as the two attic floors) to themselves. The first floor may have been kept for textile storage, with the family living above and paying rent for the rooms they occupied. In this case there would have been fireplaces attached to the central chimney on both floors. The floor plan was the common four-over-four-room style, and both first floor rooms on the west side of the building had connecting doorways to the annex; these doorways flanked the west wall chimney and furnace. The annex’s north wall had a smaller chimney and fireplace, used for heating the dye house itself.

The first inventory for this newest dye house shows a significant increase in equipment, probably from increased profitability. Weiss was now using three large copper pots for blue dyeing, probably knowing some way to counteract the “bad effect” Bemiss said copper had with blue. He also had a brass pot for blue dyeing, three iron plungers used to stir the pots, an indigo mill (used to grind the indigo lumps into powder), and a gold scale which may have been a finer measure than his other two scales. Listed too is an old great chest, mentioned also in several earlier inventories, which was probably used to store dyestuffs.

The 1772 inventory describes this equipment as being “those things, which in the name of Nathaniel Seidel, are entrusted to Matthias Weiss, dyer in Bethlehem and to his usage.” Seidel represented the town and acted, in effect, as Weiss’s employer. The inventory ends by including “For retroactive salary and his part in the profits: 51 pounds, four shillings, one and one-half pence.” A note reminds that “Weiss will take care of everything for Seidel.” Weiss was now a private individual contracting his services to the town which still owned all the dyeing equipment.

In the 1770s Weiss was again involved with North Carolina. As the Moravian’s master dyer, he was consulted about red and blue dyeing in the Church’s settlements there. He sent a supply of madder plants south, and Salem’s Bishop Graff acknowledged receiving the same in 1774. Weiss also traveled to Salem to help establish its dye business on a professional basis. The relationship would prove to have beneficial effects for Bethlehem, since Salem was warm enough to grow indigo while Bethlehem had to import it, probably from the West Indies, through the port of Philadelphia. As Salem increased its indigo production, wagon loads were shipped to its Pennsylvania sister community.
Within two years of his arrival Weiss had trained Salem dyers to continue the business, and he then returned to Bethlehem. He remained there until his death, continuing to serve the community in a variety of ways; in 1790, he served on the town council. In 1791 his second wife died, and in the following year, Matthias Weiss retired. His Germanic dye knowledge had been the basis for the industry throughout the Moravian settlements in America, and he was highly respected and "celebrated far and wide as a dyer." Following family tradition, John Weiss succeeded his father in the trade. He assumed the position of master dyer based on the conditions listed in a contract drawn up with the town (as represented by Johannes Schropp) which still owned the dye house and its equipment. The contract shows the care the town still took for its industries; care that they should be supplied with business while still maintaining fair, regulated prices. Weiss was paid a yearly salary, and the wages for his apprentices and laborers—and his business expenses—were paid out of business accounts; he was expected to continue the yearly inventories and expense ledgers begun by his father. The town continued to show concern, not only for its industries, but for its individual members as well, and it provided John with a stipend to help him care for his retired father. Matthias Weiss died in 1795 at the age of eighty-six, and was buried in Bethlehem's first cemetery, God's Acre.

Little is known about John Weiss who was born in Bethlehem in 1748, and who was later described as "a very corpulent man." What is known is that business conditions were not the same for John as they had been for his father. Indeed, even during Matthias's last years economic conditions were changing. The Industrial Revolution was underway in America, with Eli Whitney's cotton gin cleaning the raw fiber cheaply grown with slave labor, and Samuel Slater's Rhode Island cotton mill spinning and weaving it mechanically. By the turn of the nineteenth century, factory-made cotton was probably available locally at lower prices than Bethlehem's homespun linen. A survey of Bethlehem's textile production during these years shows a steady decline in woven yardage. As early as 1768 there were only two linen weavers left in the community, and they worked for themselves. A source from that year says "more linen is asked to be woven than can be provided with present help." To supplement the homespun, additional linen had to be purchased; Bethlehem was no longer self-sufficient.

With fewer textiles to dye, the dye house became less and less profitable; by 1806 there were yearly deficits. Naturally this made the craft less attractive as a vocation, and John Weiss was the last dyer in his family. He died in 1814 and, like his father before him, was buried in God's Acre.

After John Weiss's death the fulling and dye works were combined under the management of Matthew Eggert. Born in 1763, Eggert was assistant warden of Lititz and then of Bethlehem until 1808, when he was made head of the boys' school; in 1814 he took over the fulling and dye operations. Christian Eggert, Matthew's brother, had been Bethlehem's fulling miller in the early 1700s, although he only operated the fulling mill in the winter. (Since Christian was primarily a tanner, that may have been the only time he had available.) Nonetheless, through his brother, Matthew Eggert probably knew more about fulling than dyeing, and when a young German dyer named Lewis Doster visited Bethlehem, Eggert asked him to stay and assist with the dyeing. Doster declined, "the limitations and restrictions of Bethlehem not being in accord with his ambitions and enterprising spirit." Doster had been born in Niederhofen, Württemberg, on July 26, 1796; like Matthias Weiss, he had been trained in the German dye craft. He arrived in Philadelphia in 1817, and in 1820 he worked in a woolen mill in Burlington, New Jersey. When the mill failed after a year Doster lost all his wages, and in 1822 he started a silk dyeing business in Philadelphia at 49 N. 7th Street.

In Bethlehem, Eggert, in poor health after a twelve year "struggle with disheartening results, pecuniarily considered," announced that he was bankrupt. It seems likely that Eggert was in touch with Doster around this time (perhaps concerning the blue dyeing process which he was trying to continue), for Doster returned to Bethlehem in 1826, "rented the fulling mill and dye house and infused new life into these waning enterprises." He also married Eggert's daughter, Pauline Louisa; Eggert himself died in 1831, and he too was buried in God's Acre.

In 1827 Doster paid $181.65 for the fulling and dye equipment, and contracted to rent both mills for $170.00 a
Sheila Doster (courtesy of the Moravian Archives) and his Monocacy Woolen Mills (below, courtesy of Historic Bethlehem, Inc.); the dye house operations were moved here by 1850.

year for five years. In 1836 he leased the sawmill and six acres of land on Sand Island, located below the town on the Lehigh River, for $230.00 a year; in 1843 he bought the site. He had already moved the fulling and dye equipment into the former sawmill, a move discussed in Bethlehem as early as 1820. Doster, who had been living on Water Street, moved into the sawmiller's house in 1837, enlarging and repainting it. He also built an addition to the mill to house machinery to card, spin and weave cloth on power looms. He produced woolen cloth, yarns, blankets, flannels and brown linsey-woolsey. These products were especially popular in the mining regions of eastern Pennsylvania where "their substantial character and good weaving earned for them an enviable reputation." 35

By 1850 Lewis Doster owned an extensive cloth factory known as the Monocacy Woolen Mills, located near the present Lehigh Canal lock on Sand Island. It prospered until his death in 1860, when his sons took over the business, now called the Moravian Woolen Mills. It was described as "the largest, most complete and best arranged woolen mill in this part of the state." 36 The firm acquired government contracts for coats and blankets during the Civil War, but a fire destroyed the mill in 1862. When a new mill, built opposite the old site, was destroyed in a flood the firm rebuilt again, and once more the business was destroyed by a flood; this one in 1865. The brothers then sold the machinery, and a dyeing tradition in Bethlehem—a tradition that stretched from Matthias and John Weiss to Matthew Eggert to Lewis Doster and to Doster's sons—was over.

Although the closing of the Moravian Woolen Mills marked the end of an era in Bethlehem, some evidences of the dye trade still remained: the third dye house was still standing and was in use as a residence. In fact, Matthias Weiss's grandson, the silversmith and musician, Jedediah
Weiss, lived there for a time, and the building continued to be used as a residence until after 1900. A photograph from that time shows two doors side by side. The main house had probably been turned into two apartments, with the side annex providing a third unit.

Later, this former dye house was used by the mill next door as a storage building. Its interior was gutted and massive wooden posts were installed to support a rebuilt second floor. (These posts can still be seen.) But as the mill became less profitable, this additional storage space was no longer needed, and the building may have been vacant and in poor condition for some time by the 1930s, when the western walls were removed for their stone during a WPA project. Fortunately that project was completed before the old dye house was completely taken apart. The east wall remains almost completely intact, and the front and back walls retain their window and door openings. Also, the outline of the chimney used for the dye furnace is still visible on the interior wall, as are the two doorways on either side which led into the dyeroom. Except for the interior wall the dye room itself was taken down to the foundation. The site is currently part of the eighteenth century industrial area managed by Historic Bethlehem, Inc.

**TEXTILES DYED IN BETHLEHEM**

From 1846, when master weavers arrived in Bethlehem, until the time of Lewis Doster, a period of more than a century, the variety of textiles that were dyed in the town remained basically unchanged: wool, cotton, linen and silk were the fibers colored. Hemp was also produced in Bethle-
hem, but it was commonly used for rope, twine or extremely coarse work aprons that didn’t require dyeing. The Haidt collection of paintings (in the Moravian Archives) gives an excellent idea of the dye work that would have been done in the community. Paintings of early Moravian settlers show the men and women wearing coffee-brown woollens dyed from black walnuts and then fulled, which gives the fabric a solid, felted appearance. The paintings also show the men’s white linen shirts, which most of the German settlers, including the Moravians, preferred.⁸⁷

Getting the linen for those shirts white was a time-consuming process. In order to bleach linen—fabric or yarn—it was necessary to first boil it for two hours in a solution of wood-ash lye strong enough to float an egg. Then it would be laid on the grass (fabric) or hung on a pole (yarn) and watered every day for four to six weeks. During this time the linen could be reboiled or dipped in the lye bath again to speed up the process. Finally, to make the linen as white as possible it was soaked in sour milk and set out to dry. The finished product had a silvery-white hue.

Linen fabric that was to be dyed would be bleached along with material that was to be used for white shirts and sheets. Checked linen would also have the colored threads bleached first and then dyed. In 1746 a bleach house was erected on Sand Island. Dogs kept other animals off the textiles, and the fabric was cared for by various members of the community. “One of the many travelers coming to Bethlehem, up the river road on the stagecoach, observed an elderly man watering the linen spread out upon the grass. The man was going carefully up and down between the rows of materials, not missing an inch. The traveler went to the Sun Inn, and being an official, the Bishop called on him in the evening. Lo, and behold! He was the man who had been watering the linen in the morning! Bethlehem’s revolutionary bishop, John Ettwein.”¹⁸

Although wool and cotton were popular in eighteenth century Bethlehem, the demand for them was nowhere near as great as the demand for linen, and the community had twice as many linen as wool weavers. In the summer months it was common for residents to be dressed entirely in linen, and all of their bedding would be made from it. As early as 1747, 3,308 yards of linen were produced in Bethlehem in one year, and there are continuous references to blue linen yarn and fabric being dyed at the dye house. (Red and brown linen was also dyed, but on a smaller scale than blue; it is little wonder that the master dyer was called a blue dyer.) The Bethlehem diary gives an example of how much linen was produced during the year of 1757:

4,754 yards of linen
660 yards of flax
1,772 yards of tow
119 yards of tow spun by children
76 yards of hemp
177 yards of cotton
169 yards of worsted
95 yards of worsted spun by children
185 yards of woof
241 yards of stocking wool
76 yards of twine spun by elder brothers and sisters

Striped linen was popular in the eighteenth century and was used to make breeches, waistcoats, petticoats, short gowns, bed ticks, kerchiefs and aprons. The yarn would be

A by-product of the indigo pots at the dye house was a chalky scum which formed at the top of the pot. It was carefully skimmed off to make ink, and to use as a base for paint. A linen grain bag made in Bethlehem (now in a private collection) has “Bethlehem” and the name of the owner printed in indigo ink which is still deep blue after two hundred years.
Account book of the Bethlehem dye house showing the amount of dyeing done for "Gnadenthal," a Moravian farm located about ten miles north of Bethlehem; it covers the years 1776-78. (Courtesy of the Moravian Archives.)
dyed and then taken to the weaver who created the striped pattern by weaving it with either bleached or unbleached linen threads. Of two striped pieces found in the Lehigh Valley, one has a pattern of four brown and two unbleached threads, while the other has two brown and two unbleached threads. Changeable linen, which has a warp of one color and a weft of another, was also probably made in Bethlehem as pieces of it, too, have been found in the area.

In addition to striped linen, blue, red and brown checked linens were also woven, and there were combinations of dark and light blue checks, and blue and brown checks as well. Most of the surviving bed linens from the eighteenth century are in a checked or striped pattern. Blue checked linen, made from dark blue and well-bleached yarn, was highly prized. The Bethlehem dye house had three hundred pounds of blue yarn on hand in May of 1772 to be made into “check’d” fabric. In 1764 there is a note that “linen printing should begin. The forms came from Europe many years ago. Weiss could yet this summer make a small beginning.”

Besides being made into a variety of fabrics such as fine, clear, flaxen and coarse, linen was often mixed with cotton to make fustian, with wool to make linsey-woolsey and with hemp to produce hemp linen. In these combinations linen was almost always used as the warp, and the other fiber as the filler. Linsey-woolsey, or half-linen, was a coarse fabric that had the warmth of wool and the added strength and shape-retention qualities of linen. It was either dyed after it was woven so the fabric would have a uniform color, or woven with dyed wool. Three hundred yards of linsey-woolsey were dyed in the dye house in Bethlehem in 1772. It would usually be made into breeches, petticoats and coats. Surviving examples of linsey-woolsey are very rare, but there is one fine piece in the collection of the Lehigh County Historical Society; it has a striped pattern of two red, and four blue, wool threads. The linen in this particular piece was also dyed blue in order to make the stripes appear more solid.

Another fiber of great importance in Bethlehem was wool, which was dyed “in the wool” (unspun), as spun yarn and sometimes after it was woven as piece dyeing. Matthias Weiss usually dyed wool after it came from the weaver’s, if it was to be a solid color. His inventory of 1763 lists 363 yards of wool, 61 yards of another wool, and only 35 pounds of wool yarn. Matthias started his dyeing trade in 1746 with “300 pounds of blue yarn [and] 170 pounds of red, brown, and [bottle] green woolens.” The green was produced by first dyeing the wool blue, and then top dyeing it yellow. A silver color cloth was also made which was very unusual.

After 1749, when master weavers George Frederick, John Hirst, Joseph Haley and William Dixon arrived in Bethlehem, worsted wool was produced. It was dyed, usually brown or blue, and made into men’s coats. Worsted wool was difficult to make because the fibers had to be drawn through wool combs instead of being carded. This allowed
the fibers to be put parallel to each other, and gave a finer, stronger thread than carding did. Woven into a twill pattern, worsted was considered the finest and most expensive wool fabric and the coats made from it were probably reserved for the town’s leaders. Incidentally, shallow, a fine wool fabric, was made to line these costly garments—a more common coat lining was plain linen.

Another durable wool fabric was flannel, specifically red flannel, which was heavily fulled for warmth and to make it more comfortable to wear against the skin. Made from carded wool in either a plain or twill weave (which was nearly obscured by the heavy nap on both sides of the material), it was used for breeches and petticoats. The twill weave gave strength, and if being used for breeches, would help them retain their shape. A fabric similar to flannel is drugget, which was produced in Bethlehem from the earliest days. Drugget too was all wool and was often woven in a twill pattern, but it was less closely woven and of a lighter weight than flannel; it was used for coats, shortgowns, and petticoats. Drugget was a common European fabric and many of the Moravian colonists may have come to Bethlehem wearing it. Camlet, a water resistant wool cloth used especially for outerwear, was woven (plain or twill) and dyed to make some of the capes and cloaks which were popular items of wearing apparel in the community. Depending on the season, capes could be coarsely and heavily fulled for warmth, or made to show off a twill made from finely spun wool. Red capes were popularly worn by women in the winter.

A woolen cloth not produced in Bethlehem was broadcloth. The weavers in England specialized in making this fabric, and to protect their market in the colonies petitioned the king to keep it from being made overseas. (Bishop Spangenberg, in a memorandum of 1753, mentions this prohibition and continues to write to Zinzendorf in England as to the “lawfulness” of textile production in Bethlehem.) Broadcloth, a common, solid colored, plain weave, lightweight fabric intended to be worn most of the year, was in great demand in the colonies. It was, literally, a “broad cloth” for it was woven on double-width looms that required two people to manage the shuttle; the size of the loom made it possible to turn out great quantities of material in a short period of time. In Bethlehem, a woolen fabric which resembled broadcloth, kersey, was made in its place. Kersey, made in a twill weave, was of cheaper quality than broadcloth, but it kept out the cold and rain and so was widely used in greatcoats.

As the years passed, dyeing cotton yarn became a standard part of Matthias Weiss’s work in Bethlehem. In 1776 he dyed 65 pounds of dark blue cotton, 3 pounds of light blue cotton, and, for the Deaconess of the Single Sisters, an additional 125 pounds of dark blue cotton. The best cotton came from St. Thomas and Barbados in the West Indies, and it was prepared for spinning by the Single Sisters, who removed the seeds and carded it. Though they continued to dye much of their own fabric, the Single Sisters had all their blue dyeing done by the professionals at the dye house. And, although specific reference is made only to dyeing light blue, blue, and dark blue cotton cloth, it would have been possible to obtain a variety of colors on cotton with the dyestuffs on hand at the dye house.

As already mentioned, fustian was a fabric made with a linen warp and a cotton weft; it was used to make bed ticks, jackets and petticoats. The cotton yarn was dyed first and then woven. A fustian tick in a private collection has walnut brown, light indigo blue and white cotton stripes twelve inches wide. The cotton is very loosely spun and almost hides the linen warp; it gives the material the appearance of being made entirely of cotton.

The fourth of the fibers dyed in Bethlehem, silk, was being produced in the community by the mid-1750s. “The silkworm culture has been carried on since 1752 in the attic of the Bethlehem Brethren’s House under the supervision of Joseph Huberland.” Although the same commentator also noted that “two brethren who were of no use in other things” were occupied in feeding the silkworms, that observation was somewhat misleading. Far from being incompetent, the “two brethren” were actually trained musicians who were held in such high esteem that they were given tasks that would not injure their hands and affect their ability to make music.

By the end of 1752 silkworm culture was also established in the Moravian settlement at Christian Springs (called Nolamo Hink, “silkworm land,” by the Indians), and, in Bethlehem, the industry was enlarged twice—in 1753 and 1758; and a new cocoonery was started in Nazareth. It was all part of an effort to make the business an important one, for in 1755 it had been decided (by lot) that “the silkworm industry is not to be regarded as a secondary matter.” In 1754 a visitor commenting on that industry described “silkworms, of various sizes, some just hatched, others full grown, and near to their spinning. Two Brethren were attending to them who...feed them on mulberry leaves continually. They expect to realize 20 pounds for the year’s product.” In 1771 Joanna Ettwein, wife of John Ettwein, was awarded a premium of ten pounds by the Society for the Culture of Silk, located in Philadelphia, for the greatest quantity of cocoons above twenty thousand. Her reeled silk was considered to be of exceptional value, and sold by the pound for twenty to twenty-five shillings.

The silk thus produced in Bethlehem was dyed a variety of colors, and records show it was made into ribbons for women’s hats and into handkerchiefs. Although silk was in demand in the colonies—it was used to make expensive coats and linings, for waistcoats and for a variety of women’s clothing—the local industry never became profitable, since Bethlehem’s silk was higher priced and often of a lower quality than European imports. So, although the cocoonyrty continued in operation into the 1800s, the industry slowly declined until the worms were grown in only a few private homes. James Whittmore, for example, raised them in 1836-37 on his property at 65 North Church Street; but by the 1840s silkworm culture disappeared from Bethlehem altogether. A lasting reminder of that era are the mulberry trees around town, said to be descended from the trees originally planted to feed the silkworms.
In this discussion of textile production in Bethlehem, it should be remembered that self-sufficiency—always the community's goal—had a moral as well as a practical dimension. Although some fabric was purchased from traveling peddlars, it was stressed that everyone should use only what cloth could be produced by the local economy: "The members are not to depart from our simple ways by buying too expensive dress materials." It did take some time to achieve the desired goal, however. In 1748, for instance, even though 2,762 yards of linen, 546 yards of linsey-woolsey and 150 pairs of stockings were made, wool production was still low, and the lament was that "we must buy much woolen material and at high prices although we dress plainly." But, by the 1750s, Bethlehem was becoming more prosperous, and by 1751 was finally able to meet all its clothing needs.

From self-sufficiency it was but a short step to surplus, and in 1753 a store was consecrated to sell textiles to anyone outside the colony. The store was built on Ladengasse, or Market Street, and by 1758 its inventories listed 30 different items for sale. Those items included most of the textiles listed above, as well as stockings, mitts (fingerless gloves for women) and beardskins. Some items were purchased in New York and Philadelphia for resale in the Bethlehem store, which regulated its prices according to selling costs in Philadelphia; generally their prices were kept somewhat lower than prices in the city. In 1763 another store was built, this one in the Nazareth Barony near the Rose Inn. It was "built of unhewn logs a few rods south of the inn, and was a convenient trading place for the vicinity and for hunters and Indians who brought furs in exchange for the goods they wanted."

One of the more popular items sold at these Moravian stores was stroud, a heavy wool fabric used to make blankets. Sold dyed red or blue, it was made from thickly spun wool woven in a plain tabby pattern and heavily fulled. Linen shirts were another popular item, especially in demand among the local Indians who would trade three "bucks" (buckskins) for them. For another three buckskins they could buy enough stroud to make a blanket, and to complete their outfit, they would purchase a pair of stockings which would cost them one more "buck." A visitor to Bethlehem wrote of seeing one Indian wearing a white shirt with a red collar, a pair of blue and red stockings (actually used as leggings since they no longer had feet in them), and a coat and a hat with silver lace; his only traditional piece of clothing was a skin breech clout. Incidentally, although the store located near the Rose Inn was moved to Nazareth in 1772, the original building still stands and is now used as a private residence.

BETHLEHEM DYESTUFFS

There were two distinct types of dyeing done in the American colonies in the eighteenth century. The first was home dyeing: the family or village would gather whatever ingredients could be found in the woods, and with the help of local Indians or whatever knowledge of home dyeing was remembered from Old World experiences, would create simple dyes to color the yarn produced and often woven at home. It is this type of dyeing that used goldenrod for yellow, Queen Anne's lace for green, and achieved an endless variety of in-between colors by using other plants, barks and nuts. Home dyeing had major disadvantages: many of the dyestuffs used could only be found at certain times of the year, so the dye work had to be planned around their availability; home recipes often gave different shades of color with each batch of dye produced; and the color that was achieved soon faded out. It was this type of home dyeing that was done in the Single Sisters' House in Bethlehem.

The second type of dyeing, professional dyeing, came intact from Europe brought by master craftsmen whose complicated recipes insured permanent, even coloring on long bolts of cloth. It was, of course, this type of dyeing that was done in Bethlehem's dye house from the time of Matthias Weiss. As already noted, the ingredients that Weiss used were listed in the ledger book and inventories of the dye house; the following describes the dyestuffs:

1. Indigo was the most commonly used substance for blue dyeing; it dyed linen, wool, cotton and silk equally well. It arrived in Bethlehem in dry chunks that could be kept indefinitely. To test its quality, the dyer would drop a bit of it on a coal red-hot from the fireplace: "If the indigo is good, it will melt or rather fry out like wax, and a beautiful crimson will arise from it."
2. Woad was used in the indigo vats to help darken the color when the Bethlehem dye house first began its operation. In the seventeenth century it was the major European blue dye plant—and had been since the Middle Ages. Its finished properties are identical to indigo in chemical composition, and are released in a fermentation vat that allows it to color fabric. Compared with indigo, woad is extremely difficult to process into a useable powder; it is also more difficult than indigo to dye with. Weiss purchased woad locally, and probably grew it as well, for he did use it for a few years; but mention of it soon disappears and it was dropped altogether as a dyestuff.

3. Madder (Crapp) was the red dye plant commonly used by professional dyers as it was easy to grow and process, and it gave a consistently uniform color to fabrics. When the plant was five years old, the roots were dug up and their center, crimson-colored matter scooped out, this gave the deepest red color. The remaining part of the root gives an orange-red hue. The plant was grown in Bethlehem, although most of the madder used came from Philadelphia in large wooden tubs. Once the roots were processed they would last indefinitely.

4. Logwood (Campeachy wood) was imported from Honduras and arrived in large slabs that had to be chipped and soaked before they could be used. It gives a violet color which is not permanent, and a softer hue when mixed with other colors. A black dye for staining hats was made by mixing logwood, galls and vitriol; that mixture also made a good black ink.

5. Brazilwood, not surprisingly, was imported from Brazil; it is actually a general term used for several different trees which grow in South America that give a red dye. Its color did not last as long as the color obtained from madder, but it was used at the dye house because it was cheap and readily available. Madder cost three times as much as Brazilwood, mainly because of the expense of gathering and separating good color from the tiny madder roots. On the other hand, all of the heartwood of the various Brazilwood trees could be used. Two different names are given in the ledger book for types of Brazilwood: redwood and red pressel (bois de Bresil); both were processed in the same manner—by grinding up the wood, placing it in a sack and immersing it in water until the dye was released. Mixed with logwood, it produced a violet hue; and it was also used to brighten madder scarlets.

6. Dyers' weed was grown in Bethlehem and was also purchased from local farmers (Jonathan Lane and John Duffield were two who often sold dyestuffs to Weiss). It dyed linen yellow (yellow linen stockings were much in demand) by 1800 dyers' weed was slowly being replaced by weld, another yellow dye plant.

7. Fustic (dyers' mulberry), a dyewood imported from the West Indies, was ground up or "chipped" at the dye house to insure that a filler had not been added to it. It colors cotton, wool and silk, yellow.

8. Santel (sanders), a tree that grows in Asia (specifically on the Coromandel Coast in southeast India), was imported
Dyers' weed

Oak galls

to Philadelphia and shipped from there to Bethlehem. Thirty pounds of it was purchased in 1778 to try as an experimental dye for red, and for mixing with other colors.

In addition to dyes, Weiss also had to buy mordants—substances used to fix the coloring matter. Mordants purchased were potash, alum, tarter, galls, vitriol, copperas and gum arabic. Since some supplies inevitably had to be bought, any dye or mordant that could be found or made locally was eagerly sought after as a way of keeping expenses down. The nuts and bark from black walnut and butternut trees were used extensively in brown dyeing, and toward that end it was directed (in 1752) that the “bark and roots of walnut trees when cut are to be preserved for the dyer.” Sumac bark helped to darken the brown color produced by walnut and butternut dyes, and alder bark made a black dye; both came from trees which grew along the Monocacy Creek. Tannin, when mixed with bark and nuts not only darkened their color, but helped to set it as well. It came from the closest source of all, the tannery, where it was used to tan hides.

Also close at hand was the most common mordant used in the dye house; a mordant collected from all the townpeople, including the master dyer himself. It was stale urine (“sig”) which, when mixed with indigo, gave linen the permanent deep blue color which made eighteenth century dyers so famous. Another mordant, potash, was bought or made from a recipe purchased for three pence by Brother Otto in 1757.

As mentioned above, these ingredients were listed in Weiss's inventories and ledgers; dyeing recipes, however, were mostly passed down orally, and for information about them it was necessary to consult other written accounts of professional dyeing as it was done in Weiss's time. The following eighteenth century recipes will make the colors that are documented as having been produced at the Bethlehem dye house. The dyestuffs and mordants called for in the recipes are ones that were used by the dyers there.

1. Yellow drab: “take three quarters of a pound of fustick, two ounces of madder, two ounces of logwood, boil well; then add one quarter of a pound of allum, run your cloth one hour; then sadden with two ounces of copperas, and handle till your color pleases.”

2. Blue: “To set a vat of nine barrels, fill your vat about half full of boiling water, put in two pounds of potash dissolved [in soft water, with the lye poured off], then add twelve quarts of wheat bran clear from the kernel, sprinkle it into the vat with your hand, then take one pound of good madder, then with the rake mix it with your dye, then add two pounds of indigo well ground, wet with urine, cover the vat closely... rake well and cover close; let it remain eight or nine hours, then plunge and rake well... bubbles will appear by repeating the plunges, and if a thick blue froth rises on the surface of the dye... and the dye appears a darkish green, the dye is in a good state, and is fit for colouring.

“When the goods are ready for colouring, the dye must
be heated, and add three pounds of indigo as before, together with the same proportion of potash, madder and wheat bran, and six pounds of woad, heat hot, and fill the vat within four inches of the top, cover close and follow the same process in plunging and raking as before. If the dye is in good state there will be ten or twelve quarts of froth or head floating on the surface of the dye, the colour of which will be of a beautiful dark blue and the dye of a dark green; this is the proper state of the dye. 54

3. Red: "To dye wool with madder, prepare a fresh liquor (four ounces of allum and one of red tartar to each pound of spun wool, and . . . sour water—water and fermented bran), and when the water is come to a heat to bear the hand, put in half a pound of the finest grape madder for each pound of wool; let it be well raked and mixed in the copper before the wool goes in, keep the wool in an hour, during which time it must not boil." 55

4. Brown: "To twenty yards of cloth, take three quarters of a bushel of butternut bark, and three quarters of a bushel of walnut bark, boil well one hour, but moderately; run your cloth one hour, then if the strength is well out of the bark and dye, take the bark out of the dye, and add one pound of copperas to add with; run your cloth three quarters of an hour; air and rince [sic] your cloth and shift your liquor from your copper, wash clean and fill with fair water; then add four pounds of fustick chips, boil well, and then add half a pound of allum; run your cloth half an hour; then add five pounds of red-wood chips, boil one hour, and add a quarter of a pound of allum; run your cloth three quarters of an hour; let it steep, and run till the strength is well out of the dye. To sadden, take one gallon of sig, and handle [till your color pleases]." 56

5. Black: "To [dye] twenty yards of cloth fill your copper with water, heat, and add three pounds of copperas; heat near boiling, run your cloth one hour, then air and run again, boiling the [same] time as before; air and rince [sic], and shift the liquor from your copper (rinse [sic] your copper clean) and fill with water, and add six pounds of logwood chips, boil well, run your cloth thirty or forty minutes, let it boil again fifteen or twenty minutes, then run again as before; then add one quarter of a pound of blue vitriol, run your cloth, boiling, three quarters of an hour; then, if it is not black enough, run again, and handle till your colour pleases." 57

6. Silver: "To dye one pound of cloth or yarn it will require the following articles

- Half an ounce of copperas
- Half an ounce cream of tartar
- 3 ounces of logwood
- 2 ounces of sumac

Use the same proportions to dye any number of pounds. Prepare a kettle with about four gallons of water, then take two ounces of the shoots and leaves of sumac that are cured and cut up fine, and three ounces of logwood chips; put them loosely into a thin coarse bag and boil it for about one hour, then take the bag out. Now add to the dye half an ounce cream of tartar, then bring it to a boil, and put in the woollen for one hour: it is then to be taken out and aired. In the next place refresh the dye with water, then add to it half an ounce of copperas; when it is dissolved bring the dye to a moderate boil, then enter the woollen and move it round for twenty minutes; it is then to be taken out, aired, and rinsed." 58

The remains of Bethlehem's third dye house today showing the actual dyeing area next to the dyer's residence.
CONCLUSION

The remains of Bethlehem's last dye house still stand on the building's original site; it is the only known eighteenth century dye house still existing in the United States. Its importance to our understanding of the past is undisputed: its specific contents are known from a variety of inventories taken every year; its ledger books tell us a great deal about its day-to-day workings; and the many documented references to the dyemaster and his trade by other members of the community give an almost living picture of its operation.

Today the building lies essentially as it was left when WPA workers removed most of its western walls. However, handhewn stones from the Santee Mill, which stood just north of Bethlehem, have been salvaged for rebuilding, and the dye house makes a unique structure to consider for restoration. The space in the two-story dyemaster's house is ideal for adaptive reuse in a variety of different ways, and the 1772 inventory provides a unique picture of the one-story section (opened in 1771) where the work was actually done. Thousands of yards of fabric and yarn in a variety of fibers and colors were dyed here, and until ready-made cloth could be purchased in the early nineteenth century, this dye house remained an integral part of the community. Restoration would make it possible to once again see indigo-colored linens hanging from its ceiling; would once again bring an important craft back to life in Bethlehem.

ENDNOTES

1 Pennsylvania Indians used pigments and dye stuffs long before the colonial period, but generally not for clothing. Indian clothing was mainly skins—deer, bear, beaver or raccoon—sewn together. While records do mention the red dyeing of deerskin, colored pigments were used primarily for facial decoration: blood root was a major source for the red pigment; burned amber was also used; wood ash or black shale made the black. “Painting the face was a universal custom among the men and women” (Paul Wallace, Indians of Pennsylvania (Harrisburg, 1970), p. 21.), and was mentioned in European accounts of the Delaware Valley Indians as early as 1639.

Indian women were subdued in their face painting compared to the men; often putting round, red spots on each cheek, reddening their eyelids and temples and even the tops of their ears. The men’s faces were highly decorated. “The figures, painted on their faces, are of various kinds. Every one follows his own fancy, and exerts his powers of invention to excel others, and have something peculiar to himself. One prides himself with the figure of a serpent upon each cheek, another with that of a tortoise, deer, bear, or some other creature, as his arms and signature.” (George Henry Loskiel, History of the Mission of the United Brethren Among the Indians in North America (London, 1794), p. 49.) The Ohio Moravian missionary David Zeisberger noted a man who painted one side of his face red, the other side black.

Early Dutch and Swedish traders were the first to give textiles in exchange for furs. The Indians began to adopt European styles and most of this cloth was already dyed: “Their holiday dress either blue or red, and sometimes black [was], hung all around, with red, blue and yellow ribbons.” (Loskiel, pp. 51-52.) Printed linen and cotton skirts were worn by the women. William Penn included textiles when he purchased parcels of land from Pennsylvania tribes. White blankets, shirts, coats, caps, stockings and muffler (a coarse woolen cloth few Europeans would wear, made especially for the Indian trade) were included as part of the payment in his 1682 treaty to buy the land for his country house, Pennslyva Manor.

3 Thomas Radd, Good Order Established in Pennsylvania and New Jersey, 1682 (Reprinted, Cleveland, 1902), p. 33.

4 Scharf and Westcott, I, p. 146.

While not all English settlers came to Pennsylvania with seventeen servants as did Quaker merchant Robert Turner, it’s still doubtful that many city dwelling Quaker families wove their own textiles, let alone dyed them.
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This hymn — intended as a practical aid to worship (as were all Sudermann’s poems) — expresses theological concepts in popular language and imagery: “The godly love, which I deeply feel, is only dreaming of the time when my soul [the bride] will come to her bridegroom [Jesus Christ]. Then I will feel peace and quiet forever. So it is my deepest desire to be there. My heart will not separate from God by day and night. I praise his love, and, if necessary, I would even suffer for that. The one who can feel that godly love knows its uniqueness, and he also knows the maliciousness of the world, so that he will separate from the world.”

**DANIEL SUDERMANN, SCHWENKFELDER HYMN WRITER**

by Monica Pieper

When the followers of the Silesian nobleman Caspar Schwenckfeld von Ossig emigrated to Pennsylvania in 1734 they left behind their most important problem: persecution by governments and churches because of their faith. More than a century before, another man had solved that problem in a quite different way. This man was Daniel Sudermann, poet and hymn-writer of the Schwenkfelders, who collected and edited the works of authors belonging either to the radical Reformation or to the medieval period of the mystics.

Daniel Sudermann was born (in 1550) and grew up in the Liege region of Belgium, the son of a famous painter and designer. About his religious education, he relates in a poem that he was baptized as a Roman Catholic, then went to a Calvinistic school when he was eight years old (Figure 1). He listened to Lutheran sermons as well. Sudermann was also familiar with the ideas of the Dunkers. In 1594 he joined the followers of Schwenckfeld, to whom he remained faithful to the end of his life. He demonstrated his loyalty to Schwenckfeld by collecting and copying the writings of his religious teacher and leader.
While traveling with his father, Sudermann became acquainted with many noble families in Germany. After the death of his father, he worked as a personal tutor for the nobility in several German cities. Finally, in 1585 he took employment at the Bruderhof at Strasbourg. The Bruderhof was the chapterhouse of the Protestant canons of Strasbourg, where the nobility sent their children to be educated. During the first years of his educational activities at Strasbourg, Sudermann lived at the Bruderhof itself. Later he had an apartment in the town near the cathedral.

The city of Strasbourg had been a religious center and place of refuge since the beginning of the Reformation, and even before. As a crossroads between France, Germany and Switzerland, the city became an important destination for religious leaders who were persecuted in their own countries and who were searching for a new home. When Martin Luther's writings created doubts and criticism concerning the situation of the church and the Christian lifestyle, voices arose throughout Europe to proclaim the new ideas of true Christianity. The city of Strasbourg became a meeting place for these religious seekers in the years that followed; Caspar Schwenckfeld had been there twice (1529 and 1534). Others who came were Hans Denck (1526), Michael Sattler (1526), Paracelsus (1526), Pilgrim Marpeck (1528), Melchoir Hoffmann (1529), and Sebastian Franck (1531).

Again and again the government of Strasbourg had to examine the religious background and beliefs of these newcomers and observe their activities. The situation wasn't so difficult in the following decades when Sudermann lived there, but he was suspect too. Between 1622 and 1626 he was observed several times — as may be seen in the existing government documents. There are some letters from the cities of Tübingen and Worms containing information about Sudermann and his friends. The letters were answers to questions by members of the Strasbourg government who knew that Sudermann occupied himself with texts with forbidden religious contents. This despite the fact that Sudermann tried to avoid all public interest in his personal life and work. This was the main difference between him and other sectarians of the time: he thought it would not be useful for the readers of his text editions and poems if he were to become an object of public interest; i.e., if he risked losing the possibility of writing and printing. He was not a man who sought a high profile through controversial proclamations. He preferred working quietly, but with enthusiasm.

There is also another reason for the fact that the government finally abandoned its persecution of Sudermann: although he considered himself a true Schwenkfelder, he never published just the literature of that circle. He was also interested in the authors of mystical theology; in Reformation literature of Lutheran and Calvinistic origin; and he read the writings of the church fathers and the medieval
Catholics. So it must have been very difficult for examiners to determine his real position and to accuse him of a particular "crime." After 1626 there was no more public interest in his activities, and Sudermann used that liberty to turn to the publication of his large collection of poems during the remaining years of his life.

Because of this, Christian communities on both sides of the Atlantic can even today enjoy singing and reading his poems. Sudermann's hymns contain symbols and images from centuries of Christian poetry in Europe. They express an extraordinary combination of mystical symbols and the teachings of Caspar Schwenckfeld.

SUDERMANN'S WORK

As has already been mentioned, Sudermann was the son of a painter and designer, and thus was familiar with the effects of art on human emotions. This experience was important for his work during his whole life. Another valuable experience was his employment as a teacher; he knew the methods of teaching and was able to influence young people and to share important religious thought and knowledge with them. So he applied two talents in his poetic and editorial work. When he read the sermons or teachings of his preferred theological authors, he tried at once to "translate" the difficult content of the work into the way of thinking and language of the religious layman. Mostly he chose the form of the poem to repeat main thoughts of his famous predecessors.

These poems were never supposed to be solely art. Sudermann was convinced that there was no better method to learn and to retain the important contents of the Christian faith than rhymed poems. So he started writing poems early in his life, and he collected them in large, hand written books. He often read them again and again, changing words and sentences to improve the effect. In the last years of his life he finally took a selection of more than two thousand poems as an edition of the work. I have decided to describe the development of Sudermann's writings in such detail since there are some hymns whose story continues in Pennsylvania.

Fig. 2: First draft of Sudermann's hymn, "Herr, nimm von mir, In diese(r) welt."
with a lot of German, French and other songs of that time, because he often mentioned a melody of a secular song as the tune for his hymn. He did this in our example too: “Herr, nimm von mir, In diese(r) Welt” follows the melody of a secular song from the Netherlands. Another note on the manuscript shows his strict and exact methods of working: “Ist getruckt worden Anno 1620 zu Strassburg” (was printed in 1620 at Strasbourg). This type of printing note is to be found in many of his manuscripts.

The contents of the hymn can be summarized as follows: A Christian man wants to live only in the presence of Jesus Christ, so he asks Christ to deliver him from the temptations and charms of the World. Thus Sudermann combines two religious traditions: 1) The medieval mystical theology which taught that the three steps of purgatio-illuminatio-unio were necessary to reach union with Christ, and that the first step (purgatio) demands abandonment of all worldly relations; 2) Schwenckfeld’s negative opinion about the Kreatur (creation); in other words, all those things which hinder man on his way to Christ.

In the history of the Schwenkfelders this hymn occupies an important position. Sudermann himself informs us (just as in the manuscript) that the hymn was printed, but there is no printed version existent, in either a German or any other European library. Only the Schwenkfelder Library at Pennsburg, Pennsylvania possesses a printed book with the Sudermann hymns which contains this too. The book was probably brought to Pennsylvania by Matthias Yeakle, one of the original immigrants. In Europe the hymn was soon forgotten, but in America it became part of the services of the Schwenkfelders, and it was copied and printed several times. A first copy appears in the hymnal of Georg Kriebel in 1757, and some years later it was printed in the Saur edition (1762), where it appears with forty-six other hymns of the poet Daniel Sudermann.

Another hymn, “Liebende Seele, welche nun bist” (“Dear soul, which now”), had a similar fate. Sudermann published it for the first time in 1611 as a part of his work “Von der Tochter Zion...” (“Of the Daughter of Zion...”). This hymn expresses a religious symbol well-known in all Christian poetry in medieval times — the human soul is the bride of Jesus Christ. Sudermann enjoys employing this motif! The idea is already found in the texts of the Church fathers (but there not the soul, but the church is the bride of Christ), and during the German Baroque period there were several authors who dealt with that subject. Sometimes the poetry inspired by that motif must even be regarded as erotic literature. Some famous names may represent the whole circle of poets who treated the

![Fig. 3: Sudermann’s hymn, “Liebende Seel, welche nun bist.”](image)
theme: Bernhard von Clairvaux, Johannes Tauler, Philipp von Zesen, Martin Opitz and Gottfried Arnold.11

Sudermann himself had no interest in erotic imagery. He described the bride as a poor human being, longing for her union with the groom and desperately suffering from her relations to the world. To Sudermann this situation contains a lesson: The soul has to rise ubei sich (above itself; above its limits). It must leave behind all creatures which hinder the way to God. If it falls back one day it has to start once again, and it must not give up. Sudermann uses several symbols to explain the necessity of the union with Christ: The dove which Noah released came back when it saw there was no possibility of surviving on earth; the fish can only live in water. These symbols were familiar to religious laymen since the Middle Ages, so everyone knew the subject. In the last verse Sudermann wishes his soul to be "verzückt" ("in ecstasy") and "mit Gott vereint" ("united with God")—expressions which have their origin in mystical language.

"Liebende Seel, welche nun bist" took the same route to Pennsylvania as the previously mentioned hymn,12 and is to be found in the same book as "Herr, nimm von mir, In diese(r) welt." In 1749 it was copied and allotted a position in the "service order"; that is, it was sung during the service of a special Sunday or a fixed holiday.13 In the Saur edition the hymn appears in the chapter "Von der Liebe zu Gott" ("By the Love to God").14 Sudermann called his poem a hymn, but he didn't give a melody; so it must be supposed that the melody was added in Pennsylvania.

In the Saur edition one can find only melody devices without music because the hymnal didn't have space enough. At the end of the hymnal all the tunes are summarized. Sudermann used to work in the same way; he reminded his readers of a popular tune—for example of a well-known secular song—to show them the melody for his hymn. Thus he didn't need any space on his printed page for melodies, but he needed a lot of space for his illustrations, since he tried to draw a picture for nearly every hymn he wrote.

There is only one collection among Sudermann's printed works that contains music as well as illustrations.15 Since this book was not taken to Pennsylvania, I want to show its interesting construction here. The hymn I have chosen as an example, "In der hellen Abgrund" ("Into the abyss of hell"), tells the story of a human being trapped in his life of sins which have led him to Hell, not to Jesus Christ. He knows that it is impossible for man to fulfill God's claim of justice. Then he remembers that even the pious persons of the Old Testament weren't able to fulfill that claim, but God accepted them anyway. So, the hymn-writer concludes, each Christian can be hopeful again, because God's justice is not the same as man's justice.

The illustration (Figure 5) which is combined with "In der hellen Abgrund" shows a rocky landscape with
a big, dark hole in the middle. Seated there is a female figure. She is praying — desperately and hopefully at the same time — for mercy and salvation. This figure, drawn with long hair and white dress, corresponds to Sudermann’s pictures of the human soul. Certainly the speaker of the prayer is the soul. Along with Schwenckfeld, Sudermann was convinced of the dualism in human nature: Only the soul can have a dialogue with Jesus Christ; the body is only interested in worldly pleasures and sins. The soul must be strong enough to win the fight against the body and its interests.

The illustration is followed by the music in combination with the text of the first verse. On the next page the whole hymn is printed, but not in verse. That might have been difficult for the singer, but Sudermann never divided his hymns into verses. Indeed, the Schwenkfelder immigrants, who used his hymns in Pennsylvania, had already begun to mark the verses in Sudermann’s original books that they brought with them. During his lifetime Sudermann himself looked after the printing and selling of his books, but after his death most of his work was soon forgotten in Europe. Only in Pennsylvania were his hymns sung in the services and used by the Schwenkfelder community.

Aside from hymns, another form of Sudermann’s poetic work came to America. He wrote hundreds of short poems, each consisting of four lines and each trying to compare difficult theological concepts with a well-known worldly experience. Known as “emblemata” in the history of literature, this was a favorite form of writing in German Baroque. Sudermann’s “emblemata” are not as artistic as others of that time, but he didn’t want to produce art, he wanted to be helpful in the practice of the faith. A number of these poems are contained in a Sudermann book found in Pennsburg’s Schwenkfelder Library.16

Some of them are original enough to allude to here. Each of the pages is divided into five parts: A text from the Bible in both Latin and German; the poem in the same two languages; and an illustration by Sudermann (see Figure 6). Sudermann’s hymns express solely theological statements in popular, but reserved language and imagery. In the “emblemata,” however, he shows that he is able to write in a more aggressive manner too. The Devil, for example, will run away if Christians are praying seriously. Sudermann compares the Devil with a fly confronted with a hot pot. In another such poem he describes learned men without practical Christianity as hollow bells. Bad preachers are sick sheep who infect the whole flock. The following example tells of a rich but avaricious man who is only useful to others when he dies. So he is compared with a pig, useful for man only for butchering:

Kein lebend schwein ist nutz in hauss,
Geschlachtet, es theilt fleisch, wurst, speck auss:
Also ein reicher, karger Mann
Keim Menschen nutzt — er sterbe dan.

(A living pig is of no use in the home,
But slaughtered, you get sausage, bacon and pork from:
As well a rich but miserly man
Who serves no one—he dies then!)
Although Sudermann condemns the learned man, he himself had studied theological literature, from the church fathers to the authors of his own time. He collected the results of these studies in his only prose work, *Harmonia oder Concordantz* (Harmony or Concordance). This book is 469 pages long and contains the teachings of famous Christian authors about the most important questions of faith. Catholic, Lutheran and Calvinistic writers are mentioned. Through this collection Sudermann intended to show that the different groups have no reason to fight against each other, because their teachings do not differ very much in the main points. Since Sudermann was very much interested in reaching that conclusion he avoided quotations which would have shown the contrary. Doing that, he surely was not correct, but his peaceful intention must be seen as positive in a time of terrible religious controversy.

The most interesting part of *Harmonia oder Concordantz* is Sudermann's endnote: He declares that the expressions of the quoted authors correspond to the teachings of Caspar Schwenckfeld! If he had been right about that, the emigration of the Schwenkfelders from Silesia in 1734 wouldn't have been necessary.

Nevertheless, Sudermann knew about the difficulties this book would create because he avoided writing his name as editor on the title page (Figure 7). He suggests printing only the initials "D.S.", but later he eliminated even those two letters. Today it is difficult to imagine...
that the problems mentioned here could be dangerous to human life and peace. Christian communities in our time have to face other problems of survival. By studying the biography and work of poets like Sudermann we can see that not only our existence and lifestyles are important, but that Christian life can consist of many different thoughts and forms.

Sudermann’s position — especially in the last mentioned work — may not be quite convincing, but he earns acknowledgement because of his struggle for peace in a world of confessional infighting and controversy. Individuals like Sudermann fought for that peace patiently and painfully; some of them by writing, others — like William Penn and Franz Daniel Pastorius — by acting.

In the hymnals of the EKD (Evangelische Kirche Deutschlands; German Evangelical Church) there is still one hymn of Sudermann’s to be found. The poet says he found it among the writings of Johannes Tauler. On one of the four Sundays before Christmas every community in Germany sings “Es kompt ein Schiff geladen” (“A laden ship comes sailing in”). The singing of this hymn proves that Sudermann was right in his intention of overcoming confessional boundaries. The hymn, perhaps written by a Catholic and reworked by a scholar of Schwenckfeld, is sung in every Protestant community. It is the only Sudermann hymn which is familiar to most Christians in Germany today, and as such, it has a special right to be shown here at the end (Figure 8)."
The poem was written in 1624 and is combined with an illustration of Sudermann (Figure 1). The page is hand-written and appended to the "Schwenckfeld-Epistolare" of the Library of the University of Halle. Perhaps Sudermann drew the picture himself. The page is also the only evidence concerning Sudermann's death: Sudermann added every year the actual date, the last noted date is 1631. In the "Schwenckfeld-Epistolare" of the Herzog August Bibliothek, Wolfenbüttel (Cod. Aug. fol. 37,27) the page is contained as a copy (= source for this publication). Detailed biography of Sudermann see also in: Monica Pieper: Daniel Sudermann als Vertreter des mystischen Spiritualismus. Stuttgart 1985.

The documents of the Bruderhof don't give any information about the exact task of Sudermann there. Some poems — dedicated to scholars — allude to his educational activities.

Ratsprotokoll, Archives of the city of Strasbourg, no. 103 (1622)f. 194v., no. 104 (1623)f. 118, no. 488 (1623)f. 103r.-107r.

The manuscript (MS.germ.quarl. 102) is part of the Sudermann-collection of the Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin, which gave permission for its publication.

4VN 33-12, Schwenkfelder Library, Pennsburg, Pa.

Neu-Eingerichtetes Gesang-Buch is sich haltend eine Sammlung (mehrehteils alter) schöner lehr-reicher und erbaulicher Lieder, Welche vor langer Zeit her bey den Bekennern und Liebhabern der Glorien und Wahrheit Jesu Christi bisz anjetzo in Uibung gewesen; Nach den Haupt-Stücken der Christlichen Lehr und Glaubens eingehleut, und Mit einem Verzeichniss der Titel und dreyen nutzlichen Registern versehen. Anjetzo also zusammen getragen, und Zum Lobe Gottes und heilsamen Erbauung im Christentum, ans Licht gegeben. Germantown, gedruckt bey Christoph Saur, auf Kosten vereinigter Freunden, 1762.

In the Saur edition the last two verses are marked as Pennsylvanian addition, but — as shown by the manuscript — it is Sudermann's own poetry.

Source: 894.1.theol., Herzog August Bibliothek, Wolfenbüttel, which gave permission for its publication.


5VN 33-12, Schwenkfelder Library, Pennsburg, Pa.
6VB 4-5, Schwenkfelder Library, Pennsburg, Pa.
8Christoph Saur(ed.), op.cit. p. 333f.
9The title of the collection is: "Etliche hohe geistliche Gesange . . ." (894.1.theol.) Herzog August Bibliothek, Wolfenbüttel.


The illustration shows the title page of the only surviving manuscript, (MS.germ.quarl. 105) Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin.

The hymn is printed in the collection "Etliche hohe geistliche Gesange . . ." (894.1.theol.) Herzog August Bibliothek, Wolfenbüttel.
THE PERNICIOUS EFFECTS OF 
WITNESS UPON PLAIN-WORLDLY RELATIONS

by William T. Parsons

In May and June 1984, events took place in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania which virtually guaranteed that life will never be quite the same in the Amish regions there. At the invitation of the Bureau of Motion Picture and Television Development, a branch of the Department of Commerce of the State of Pennsylvania, Paramount Pictures, a division of Gulf & Western conglomerate, made the commercial movie, Witness, in the central and lower townships of that county in nine or ten weeks time.1

The moment leaders of the Amish community learned of the proposed venture, they registered their strenuous objections, although by the very nature of their religious beliefs they could take no stronger action. They did, however, appeal to the former Amishman, Professor John A. Hostetler, who has been the most devoted and accurate voice of the Amish for twenty-five years, to do what he could to “get the picture stopped.” Hostetler did try; he called upon public and private Pennsylvanians to express their objections to the Commonwealth, but rarely evoked any response from Harrisburg. In the end he failed to halt it.

The rationale of the Bureau was simple: a motion picture made in this locale would bring upwards of six million dollars into the regional economy. Not only do the Amish live here, but it is also part of the East Coast urban megalopolis. The money looked good, but the scheme ignored the beliefs and customs of the Old Order Amish, the folk who were most affected. Incidentally, the economic return for the region has been closer to two-and-a-half million dollars, though that is not an amount to ignore.

Amish objections were registered on several scores. They are trained and still believe that work is the way to satisfaction and achievement. Those who do not work are suspect morally. Tainted money is evil. When the movie people offered huge rents for brief use of properties, that looked like a bribe. That sort of money is sin. Moreover, movies which flaunt greed, lying and violence, including bloody murder, are not compatible with Amish life and values. We who are idealists insist that William Penn’s invitation to the Rhineland Germans (some of them Amish) to come to Pennsylvania to work and live in their own way without coercion, is still in effect today. These Plain folk should be able to spurn the inventions and machinations of the world as they
have attempted to do for two-hundred-and-fifty years; the world should not impinge upon such important beliefs. May they not escape the boorish, complaining, interfering presence of droves of tourists and hustlers, whose cameras have invaded home, market and workplace? In all honesty, I understand that not all people agree to such Amish rights.

Is John Hostetler right that the film amounts to "marketing the Amish soul"? Or is Merle Good correct when he states that the controversy over the film may have "more of an adverse effect upon the Amish people than [Director] Weir's [actions] will have"? Many who are not Old Order seem prone to wonder just what the fuss is all about. Many of my friends who have seen the film point out that the nudity, violence and bloodletting are far less prominent than in many other promotions we see in films and on television everyday. While I must concede that the film was well directed and could have been much worse, I still object. Unfortunately for our Mennonite neighbors, it has aroused a heated debate among them, bringing confrontation in print where virtually all participants regard themselves as sympathetic friends of the Amish. Note the twenty articles, editorials and letters in *Gospel Herald*, a Mennonite weekly journal from Scottdale. Several of the letters from readers wondered aloud why Mennonites should become so embroiled in a debate about the Amish. All the choices are difficult.

This paper began as a study of exchange singings between members of two communities of Pennsylvania German Mennonites and Amish people. Those exchanges took place between November 1978 and July 1984, a relatively short period in the ongoing history of Old Order folk in Pennsylvania. Nevertheless, it represented an attempt to examine some cultural variations among them in an atmosphere of mutual trust and understanding. The two groups were loosely organized, with a consistent framework of singing styles.

Partners in the singing were 1) a historical study group of Franconia Conference Mennonites and counterparts in the Church of the Brethren who came from the upper middle part of Montgomery County, Pennsylvania; 2) Old Order Amish and Old Order Mennonites (horse-and-buggy members and black-bumper Wengerites) along with Old Order River Brethren from Lancaster County *Gemeinde*, or communities. Without formal structure, the group usually met twice a year: once during the summer, in June, July or August, in the Salford Township locale of the Pennsylvania German region; then the November return singing gathered at the farm of an Old Order elder, preacher, or singing leader of a community of the Lancaster Dutch area. Among Old Order people, the rules of the church (Ordnung) forbid musical instruments in religious services, so we sang unaccompanied. So also, because of the Old Order rule prohibiting the use of recording devices as well as photographs, no audible nor visible record was kept. I have always adhered to that rule of understanding and, so far as I know, did all others who sang.

The Lancaster County locale of the singings ranged from Gordonville or Ronks at the center, to Bowmansville and Honeybrook in the east, and to farms in Pequea and Providence Townships, slightly south of Lancaster city and toward the Susquehanna River. Out there, we met in the kitchen of an Amish or Mennonite house, or less often in a barn or tobacco shed, or in the side yard in warm summer weather. The site in Franconia Township (or Salford Township) was on the threshing floor of a Pennsylvania barn (Schweitzer scheiter), or occasionally in a one-room Mennonite school house or in the basement of a meeting house. Sometimes we were in Delp's Herrite Meeting.

Singings at Old Order farms began with a meal, both for nourishment and for fellowship, so it became customary for Franconia Conference hosts to offer a picnic meal. After the main meal at the Old Order homestead, the men gathered in the parlor or on the front porch and in the yard, while the women ate cleared away the meal and cleaned up so all could sing in the kitchen, at the same tables where we had eaten our supper.

When it was time, the homeowner or other singing leader gave a first signal and all who could, found place around the tables set end-to-end in the farm kitchen. When we sang at Christopher Dock's Salford schoolhouse, we all sat around an open space in the middle of the floor. All the Vorsingers (singing leaders) of the participating groups sat at the singing table, along with most of the male and female visitors. All others — the remaining males, most of the women and such children as were interested — sat on chairs or benches around the perimeter.

Although the composition of the singing group always varied, persons often attending included I. Clarence Kulp, Henry Derstine, Lois Gonzalez, Alan Keyser, and Willi Parsons of the Franconia "Goschenhoppen Sing-Schlieler," Phares Hurst, John Zimmerman and his two sons, Amzie and John, led the horse-and-buggy Mennonites. Amos Hoover was the black-bumper Mennonite representative, and several Old Order River Brethren came occasionally. The Amish included Ahner F. Beiler and Joe Beiler, Amos Fisher, Levi Stoltzfus and Sam Stoltzfus, der Hutmacher, as well as Elam Fisher and numerous others.

Other persons who participated sometimes included C. Richard Beam, Evan Snyder, David Yoder, John L. Ruth, Martin Ressler, John and Beulah Hostetler, Blanche Schultz and Phyllis Parsons. When Hermann and Jutta Jaeger of Bad Bergzabern and Widmar Hader of Stuttgart visited Pennsylvania, they also came to the singing.

We sang from the *Unpartheyisches Gesang-Buch* of the Lancaster County Mennonites, and from *Die kleine geistliche Harfe der Kinder Zions* or from A. G. Clem-
mer's "Deutscher Anhang" in the English language Church Hymnal: Mennonite (1953), both now superseded hymnals of the Franconia Conference. Most often singers held forth in the Pennsylvania High German of the Plain folk, i.e., written as a variant of Deutsch, but pronounced in Pennsylvanisch Deitsch. For example, Leut, Freud and Zeit rhymed. Now and then the singing included English language gospel tunes before we finished.

Often we simply started from a volunteered first line or with a familiar tune from a source other than the printed books we used. Some of the religious folksongs were not found in the books we used, but were pieces remembered from other occasions. Since there were never enough hymnals or songbooks, all of the singers shared books or just sang from memory.

For Old Order folk whose Ordnung allows no electricity, therefore no radio or television, and who do not attend shows or motion pictures, this is a permitted activity. It must remain an experience common to all, never competitive nor the occasion for one singer to act superior to any other. Each song remained an expression of joy. Our singings taught us that familiar items often had variants, many of which were also meaningful and acceptable. In short, it was a positive evening which gave no offense.

When I said to Abner Beiler one evening that it was really a shame that I could not record the singing, he said, "Use the copy of Amish hymns and songs that Merrill Ressler had sent to the Library of Congress." Another example of Amish sly humor, perhaps, for I am told the L. C. rejected the donation since no written consent from the singers was included, as I found out later. Although I do own a copy of Ressler's tape, I still regret that I was not able to preserve the variant forms, debates about origins and correct usage, comments about word use, and the memorable hymns of our informal get togethers.

Let me demonstrate some types of music we sang, varying words and styles in this introduction. As a Church German with no Anabaptist ancestry, I had never heard religious music of this sort, but the singings offered a fine way to learn. I am at home in eighteenth-century studies. In the Goschenhoppen Sing-Schieler I am the token Deitsch Reformiert, the only one who is neither Mennonite nor Dunker. But I am a scholar, and this was a learning experience.

When the Franconia Conference singers led off, we ordinarily began with a hymn in the old slow way of singing, die alte langsame Weise. That meant to employ what the leaders called regelmässig vorsaage, sometimes also termed ausleine (lining out the verse), after which the singers joined with the tune. For example, "Sey Lob und Ehr dem hochsten Gut" was familiar to virtually all who came to sing. The Montgomery County element would sing from the Franconia Conference Mennonite hymnal, Die kleine geistliche Harfe der Kinder Zions, which has been used since 1804. (My own copies of Die kleine Harfe are a fifth edition from Doylestown, 1848, and a seventh edition from Elkhart, Indiana, 1904."

Then the Lancaster Mennonites might well respond with the same hymn sung to their tune version, using virtually the same text from their Unpartheyisches Gesang-Buch der Mennonisten Gemeinen, also in use since 1804. All sang along to tunes of each other group, from books of the local community or from personal
copies. Most of these are true folk melodies, transmitted orally, without musical notes or instruments, passed from one generation of *Vorsinger* to the next. Lutheran or Reformed Germans prided themselves in their church organs and additional instruments.

Then we sang a faster tune, set to the same words. Listen to Goschenhoppen versions of "Sey Lob und Ehr" and another slow hymn, "Herr Jesu Christ, dich zu uns wend." The fast tune for the latter differs only slightly from that in the *Deitsch Reformiert* hymnal that my grandmother used in 1894.

When it came time for an Amish contribution to the singing, Kulp or Kaiser asked that we use a song which is quite fast for an Old Order tune. It was one I had never heard before. Apparently all of the Old Order folk know "Es glänzt der Christen inwendiges Leben," whose tune is vaguely reminiscent of a fifer's marching tune. Not strange at all, for we were told that really is the source. The words are quite moral and uplifting and sound strange to my ear when used with that martial tune. In Joseph Yoder's *Amische Lieder*, one finds a version as sung by the Kishacoquillas Valley Amish: alternate lines are the same as Lancaster, but the melody of the second and fourth are quite different.

In general, even at friendly singings the Amish do not sing from the *Ausbund*, for that hymnal is used essentially with Sunday meeting. At several singings we did prevail upon them to sing the "Lobgesang" for some singers who had never heard it before. Here is that ultimately slow hymn from Merrill Ressler's recording which I had labeled Library of Congress. Sometimes it takes them twenty minutes just to sing its four verses.

Two of our very favorite hymns, one of them for children, appeal to Old Order folk as well as to the Franconia people, but for us they are especially dear since they were written by leaders of our very own. Christopher Dock, Skippack schoolmaster, wrote "Kommt liebe Kinder, kommt herbei" to encourage his students to live a Christian life. One of the Franconia preachers, who obviously remembered his Swiss origins, wrote "Wie lachet der Himmel wie gliitzet die Erde," with its recollection of "die Gemsen," steep-slope animals which never existed in Pennsylvania. To illustrate just how local those items are, they were completely unknown in Lancaster County until the Goschenhoppen singers carried them out to communities there. In the short five years we sang together, they have both become new favorites.

At some time during most of the singings, usually well into the evening, one of the Old Order people would recall that at previous singings we often sang some of the camp meeting songs which celebrate the anticipation of a happy, though eventual, heavenly reward. These are the true Pennsylvania German spirituals, sung in nineteenth century revival meetings to a catchy tune, often originally a secular or popular melody. These are what the folk called "the choruses." Of course, as true folk music, they varied from county to county and from song leader to song leader. One hymn beautifully adapted to that chorus style, is "Nummer 54 in em A. G. Clemmer, sei Deitscher Anhang: Kommt Brüder, kommt, wir eilen fort," whose many choruses included "In die Ruh," "Ich wär so zärn," "Wo die Perlen Thoren," "Meine Heimat iss nicht hier," "Ein seliges Leben in meiner Seel," and triumphantly, a German equivalent of the English language camp meeting song.
"And when the battle's over, we shall wear the crown" ("Un wann der Kampf ferbei iss, grieBen mir die Gron").24

The other spirited hymn of heavenly triumph is also to be found in the A. G. Clemmer "Deitscher Anhang." It is "Kommt Bruder steht nicht stille," perhaps more commonly known by its chorus name, "In dem Himmel ist Ruh."25 Do you see how all that made for a beautiful fellowship, encouraged worldly people, even professors, farmers and factory workers among us, to be open and understand the other person, whatever his faith or profession? Yet it violated none of the demanding rules and restrictions of the Ordnung. I have never left any gathering with a better feeling of calm and well-being than I did from those happy evenings.

Yet a cloud came upon the horizon, completely unexpected. Suddenly Amos Fisher, Abner Beiler and Amos Hoover, three seekers among the Old Order Brethren, became less communicative, less sharing of this musical tradition, more concerned that they hold absolutely to traditional limitations. Amos Fisher was one of the early sufferers, though I found that out from another friend.

He took part in a dialogue seeking to ease some local fears and tensions: differences about the way Plain folk acted compared with Worldly neighbors. A photographer for a Lancaster newspaper, who surely knew better, not only photographed Amos at that meeting but also published it the next morning. There stood Amos Fisher, looking out from a scene which disturbed the bishop. At the next meeting, Amos had to stand before the Gemee and publicly confess the pride which overcame him and allowed his image to be thus represented before the world.26 Whether Amos even realized that the photo had been taken is not at all clear. No matter, it was clearly against the rules: "It was the Ordnung," he said.

Was it surprising then, when the furore about Witness broke upon an equally unsuspecting Lancaster County, that the entire Plain community recoiled? Certainly not, but they had no say.

What were the facts of the Paramount production, really? Well, it is certainly true that contradictions abounded. Statements and accusations were made both in private and in the public press.27 There is little doubt that Director Peter Weir is one of the outstanding filmmakers at work today. One of the images often evoked is that of Weir with a copy of Hostetler's Amish Society on his desk.28 John Hostetler was asked to serve as historical or sociological consultant for the film. He refused, protesting that the film was not appropriate in face of real Amish objections.29 The story Paramount publicized was that Hostetler refused because they had offered too little money, when price was never discussed.30

Thus, attempts of producer and actors to learn details of Amish life by careful observation and by living briefly among them has a hollow ring. Unfortunately arguments and criticisms became quite heated, a contradiction in the quiet of the Amish country.

Hostetler's efforts to fulfill the trust the Amish had in him, namely that, while acting on their behalf, he might be able to sway the governor and the Harrisburg bureaucracy, were twisted to make him a shrewish voice of decadence.31 When he failed, those Plain folk just withdrew into their customary shell. William Ball as spokesman for the National Committee for Amish Religion, which earlier had been heartily applauded by the Amish themselves, made attempts which paralleled those of Hostetler.32 But when these two took on the Hollywood establishment, they suddenly became pariahs.

Some of the executives at Paramount failed to show the common sense which would have at least maintained a moderate tone in the discussions. The film's producer told a national newspaper that one reason he wanted to make the movie was because Harrison Ford "would look funny in an outfit like that," an unworthy statement.33

The film could have been a powerful testimony to Plain pacifism. Even though it did in some parts show more sensitivity than have many other similar items, it missed the mark by a long way.34 Still, the picture was not intended to be a documentary; it was and is a story, an entertainment. Some players did well, others never came close. "Their Pennsylvania Dutch accents left much to be desired," wrote one correspondent, though she added, "but the portrayals was closer to authenticity than I had dared hope for."35 On the other hand, the herb man who rescued Ford had a decidedly Yiddish accent; while Yiddish and Pennsylvania German dialect have some things in common, as John Costello has demonstrated linguistically,36 in this case it simply did not fit.

It is difficult to assess statements in the press by actress Kelly McGillis and to compare them with the Amish interpretation of what happened. She claimed to have lived with an Amish family for two weeks to absorb their way. The interpretation I got from the Lancaster Amish is that she misrepresented herself as a stranger who was "just interested" in Amish customs and lifestyle. When they realized who she really was after some days, they asked her to leave. Again, perhaps a simple contradiction, but compounded by an executive snort that worse misstatements were often made.

No work of art, like Witness, ever receives universal approval nor total rejection. So it was with this. Of those who have objected, some have some particular dislike, while others center on a completely different error. The main point in question (one that both Hollywood and Harrisburg have totally missed) is the degree to which this film contradicts the Amish value system. Gushing blood, not only in the opening ten minutes, but in a scene unbelievably gauche, objec-
tionable in almost every sense, the drug pushing detective is gunned down in the *fiihergang* of the Amish barn, to leave a smear of blood against its whitewashed wall.

To many persons sympathetic to the Amish, injection of just that sort of contradiction is unjustified. No one claims that the Amish are without fault. The real objection to the film has little to do with plot or detail, it is that the film was made in the first place.

As in so many other cases, the attempts of Harrisburg bureaucrats to avoid responsibility has made them the ultimate in misrepresentation. Having heard the legitimate objections after the filming they approved and invited, they announced in spring 1985 that in fairness to the Amish and after local objections, they would not approve a second such film. But then, why a first?

The Pennsylvania Dutch Visitors Bureau promised in late winter 1984-85, that they would not exploit the movie as part of a tourist promotion. Six weeks later, their national ad for tourism in Pennsylvania offered: "Visit Another Country...Pennsylvania Dutch Country — As Seen in the Movie Witness." A later admission that the initial statement was in error, changed nothing.

Small flaws appear in any artistic work, so I regard criticism of lack of perfection to be minor. John Book, Samuel and Eli Lapp were convincing characterization; Rachel Lapp was much less so. If I heard the dialogue correctly, Samuel greeted Eli as Opa. That is valid homeland German but not used by Pennsylvania Germans in usual conversation.

Scenes between Samuel and John Book and with his Grossaadi Eli are delightfully convincing; the elders are made to look more ridiculous than is comfortable. Eli concludes that if Book can navigate about the farm, he can work: milk cows, for instance. He comes to wake Book and "the English" sleepily inquires what time it is. With a guffaw, I answered before the old man could, "Halwe fimi!" Guess what? It was indeed four-thirty.

Was the scene of an Amish visit to Intercourse, John Book in his "high waters" and all, convincing? Would they really have taken him to town, knowing the odds were virtually all bad? If they had done that, how would they actually have handled his violent action to defend the passively defensive real Amish? Smashing the nose of the city slicker wise guy was almost as offensive as were the police shoot-outs on Lapp's farm, if also understandable.

Students reminded me, knowing of my general objection, that the film did make a major point of peaceful resistance in one of the last scenes in the movie, after Samuel summoned all the neighbors by ringing the bell as an alarm. Even as they gathered, they threw down whatever pitchforks, shovels and rakes they carried, which otherwise might have served as weapons. The arrival of all those farm folk, completely unarmed, then forced the surrender of the corrupt chief of police even though he held the gun, not they.

The topless scene struck one of my German acquaintances in Pennsylvania as being poignant and valid; I thought it was in bad taste and unnecessary. The language of Philadelphia police was vile. Those things combined to earn the film an "R" rating. That is what the producers wanted but what appalled moderate Anabaptist observers. The thing is, those who are portrayed in the film, in good taste and in bad, the Amish, will never see it. In fact, Amish acquaintances insist that, after initial reactions to the filmmaking, they have no further thoughts and precious little concern today.

Increased tourist traffic was a main concern. It grew perceptibly, especially after the film premiere in Lancaster on 7 February, 1985, to be the biggest year for tourism there. Encroaching upon the Amish was extensive. News stories of horror incidents and interference showed a lack of manners and no common sense. But that is nothing new. Indeed one of the best assessments of the problems tourism presents was written a decade ago, before the story-line of *Witness* existed. Grant M. Stoltzfus looked at the problems, which he assured us were then raised by the Broadway epic, *Plain and Fancy*. Thus we have been through all this before. Still, it is no less discouraging when a tourist auto from Florida squeals to a halt. From car windows, cameras poke out to film an Amishman working. When he raises his arm to prevent his face from being photographed, they boo him roundly, give him the finger and speed off.

Yet has the film really brought very many more visitors to the Dutch Country? Chamber of Commerce figures indicate that 1985 showed a large increase. But a calm Amish voice responds that he has not really seen any more this year, 1986, than in the past. If he is correct, then much of the furor appears overblown.

When Merle Good asks the question directly: "Is Hostetler the official spokesman for the Amish people?" the answer obviously is "No." Good uses that assumption to challenge Hostetler. I would counter that no single individual speaks for more Pennsylvania Amishmen than does John Hostetler. He has served them in many ways. This question reminds me of a singing at Amos Fisher's. A group of the Amish constantly surrounded John, telling him of new developments and minor changes in their ways and methods. I said to Amos, "But you know that when you tell him such things, he will incorporate them into his next book," He smiled as only he could, then answered simply, "Why do you think we tell him all that?" Of course, I am not acquainted with all Lancaster Amish, so I could be wrong. Still, those I do know all regard him as their friend and spokesman. They are the ones who first told me that he was originally an Amishman.

Merle Good does have a point when he says it will take more than a mere movie, no matter how good or
bad, to effect any basic change among them. "If Amish society rose and fell on something so insignificant as a movie which none of them will see . . . then the Amish would have disappeared from the earth generations ago."49 In assessing effects of Witness, Hostetler responds, "It's an event that contributes to the erosion of the boundaries between the Amish and the world . . . More and more boundaries are falling. You can see the boundaries breaking down."50

Pettiness and ignorance have disturbed them as they disturb other Americans, but will surely NOT change their values. Just as they have conditioned themselves so that they perspire very little, even with hard work in dark clothing under a summer sun, I have no doubt they will take all this in stride. But the way all this affected us and our improving Plain-Worldly relations, became apparent as we prepared for a summer singing at Amos Fisher's farm in June and July 1984. The occasion was an ordinary one, although I was making the arrangements for the Montgomery County contingent rather than to have Clarence Kulp do it. If there was anything special about the plans, it revolved about the participation of Hermann and Jutta Jaeger, who would be on one of their American folksinging tours. As they had done before, they looked forward to the evening of fellowship and singing at Amos's farm. Beam and Parsons were about the extent of Church German representation.52 But when I went out to talk to Amos Fisher in order to make final plans — singing space, food, time expected and all that — he said that the entire situation had changed "because of the Hollywood picture people." My first reaction was to cancel immediately. "No," he said, "I am hopeful that all will be fine." An indication to the contrary, as I reflected on it later, was his switch to English as we spoke about it. He was one of my patient teachers in the dialect, who knew that my comprehension of nuances was sometimes less than it might have been. As I see now, so that I would understand precisely, he said it all in English.

The upset was major. Amish bishops throughout the area were frustrated because of the developments. As his friend Christian Kurtz wrote in 1986, "Amos was helpful to many people."53 When Amos Fisher told me the details of the Witness controversy, I did understand and I believe his observations were entirely correct. The Amish objection, he said, was that this movie crew had been invited by state officials, though opposed by the Amish community. When they stated their objections, no one listened. So they went to John Hostetler and asked him to intervene and do his best to kill the project. Hostetler assured me later on the phone that he really had tried, but with absolutely no success.

Fisher went further to detail the offensive events. First, the producers, who admirably attempted authenticity, tried to hire Amish folk to act in the film.54 The bishops said "No," and not a single Amishman participated. "Why," said Amos, "the money they are throwing around is obscene. For use of an Amish farm as the site of the film, they offered $260,000. Imagine. But NOT ONE Amishman agreed; not a single one, even for such money, which anyone could find use for." On that farm, work would be taken care of for six weeks, the family to be put up at a motel, expenses paid.

"But Amos," I responded, "if no Amishman would rent to them, how did they get the place to make the film?" With a twinkle in his eye, even under those trying circumstances (and revealing some rivalry which still exists), he said, "They rented from a Mennonite who used to be Amish!"

"And the barn raising, was that at the same place?" I asked. "Oh no, they wanted a spot which was more on a hill." "Well, how did they manage that?" "Same way," Amos answered, "but to find a place they could rent, they had to go down almost to the Maryland border." (That scene, I might note, was one of the most effective and most authentic scenes of the entire movie.) "They filmed the whole scene in a few days," he continued, "and when they had finished, they told the farmer they were leaving." "But," said the astonished farmer, "what am I to do with the frame of the barn that's in my field now?" The answer, according to Fisher, was: "That is your affair. You have lumber there, you can finish the barn and it's yours at no cost. Or tear it down, sell the wood and pocket the money." (I have read that an Amishman who served as advisor for the barn-building, was excommunicated.55)

Amos Fisher was clearly disturbed. But he continued, "I believe our singing is not involved, so we have it." My response was quick, "O K, Amos, but we do not want this to hurt you in any way." "No, no, but if anything changes, I will let you know."

The very next day he wrote a short note to me.56 "I got a chance to talk to other Amishmen. We call it off. You know it is all right and I know it is all right, but how does it look, as we Amish object to Worldly presence, if I have automobiles and vans out behind my barn? No, we don't have the singing, we call it off," he repeated. "Maybe next summer," said I. "We see."

When I spoke to Abner Beiler at his Buchbinderei in Gordonville later on, his sad judgment was, "No, Parsons, I think the singings are finished." At the very least, that was the last time I sang with Amos Fisher, for he died of cancer on 24 January 1986.57

To be sure, even before Fisher died, two more visits did occur in October and November 1985. I attended one of them, Abner Beiler beside me. It was at an Amish farmhouse in Honeybrook. But it was also an entirely different kind of singing, more like a concert of Franconia songs, and the Amish joined in. Not a single hymn from Unpartheyische Gesang-Buch; not a single Amish item to accompany or to answer a Franconia hymn. And more of the singing was in English. Perhaps we will sing together again one day.

But you see what Witness has cost me personally. The
friend with whom I enjoyed singing so much; who personified Old Order values, died before we ever sang together again.

We all remember scenes, flowers, smells or thoughts from the past. For me it is usually music. If Beiler is correct and our singings are at an end, a Dunker hymn would sum it up. Clarence Kulp often tells the fact that he sang it at Reinhard Gottshall’s funeral when a great modern Vorsinger was buried: “Wann ich nicht mehr.”* Now the singings may be over: “Wann sie nicht mehr.”*
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TRADITIONAL SLOVAK COURTSHIP AND WEDDING CUSTOMS

by Helen Urda Smith

INTRODUCTION

I was brought up in a family to whom Slovak tradition and culture were an important heritage, and I was also able to interview and absorb those values from compatriots, artists and practitioners who rehearsed the olden ways whenever possible. I myself became a storyteller and have taught Slovak stories and traditions to several generations of family and neighborhood youngsters. Although I have attended and participated in traditional Slovak weddings in Pennsylvania and in Czechoslovakia, I realize that the majority of weddings and formal ceremonies involving Slovak-Americans today have become thoroughly modernized, and the traditional costumes are being used less and less often.

I know that many people today have no respect for the practices of former times (many second and third generation Slovaks in Pennsylvania simply reject ethnic traditions out of hand), and that many more are simply unaware of their rich ethnic heritage. Moreover, while many non-Slovak Americans are aware of such incidents as the “bartered bride” through the music of Bedrich Smetana, few know the actual tradition — the ritual kidnapping and stylized swap of the bride — in Slovak folk culture from which it derives. How much more reason, then, for those of us who do know (and care) to preserve as many of the traditional observations — or, at the very least, a knowledge of those traditional observations — as possible. The following descriptions fit that mold.

THE COURTSHP

Traditionally, Easter Monday is a day of great expectation for girls of marriageable age in Czechoslovakia, for that is the day that many will find out if the boy they care for, cares for them. Carrying bottles of plain or perfumed water, young men come knocking at the door in order to sprinkle the girl they wish to court. In some sections of the country they carry a switch instead, and gently tap the girl of their choice with it. If met with a parental frown the young couple may, depending upon the strength of their feelings, abandon the relationship altogether. In more favorable circumstances, however, the relationship progresses, and the courtship ritual follows a familiar pattern.

When the first of May dawns, some girls will find that their suitor has erected a Maj outside of their house. The Maj is a pole decorated with long, colorful ribbons that blow in the breeze; the higher the pole, the greater their love. In response, the young man is invited to dinner; a dinner the young woman will help to prepare. Now he finds out if he will be welcome in the family permanently; if so, his father must visit the prospective bride’s home and ask her father if the family will kindly give the hand of their daughter to his son. The girl’s father consults privately with her mother and their answer is then given to the prospective groom (he and his mother have arrived in the meantime) and his family. They ask what the bride’s gift (or dowry) — to be given on the wedding day — will be, and detailed plans begin to be made.
The young people continue their courting, going on trips to see plays and musicals, going for walks, picnics and to Sunday afternoon dances on the village green, or to the movies in the evening. They might also go for a stroll to the cemetery to visit the graves of their families and friends. This is one of the quiet, serious times of courtship, in contrast to one of the most festive and joyous aspects of that period: the bride-to-be being serenaded about ten o'clock in the evening by music and song from her intended from beneath her bedroom window.

The sound of the singing and the strains of the gypsy violin are a supreme pleasure to hear, not only for the young woman, but for her friends and neighbors as well. After the impromptu concert the singers and musicians are invited in and treated to good food and drink. Sometimes the future bride is given her engagement ring on this occasion; but that is not always the case, for this is one decision made by the young people themselves. It is a private matter, not interfered with by anyone. However, the couple will discuss their wedding plans with their pastor, and the banns will be announced on three consecutive Sundays. In this three week period anyone opposed to the union must speak up or "for ever hold his peace."

THE WEDDING

A happy time, the courtship period passes rapidly and the wedding day is soon at hand. When she wakes on the morning of the day she is to be married, the bride looks nostalgically around her room and sees all her possessions packed, ready to be moved to her new home. Touching the down coverlets (duchni), she remembers the summers of her childhood when she watched the geese, and, working very carefully, helped her mother pluck the down and feathers and lay them (covered by cheesecloth so they wouldn't blow away) out in the air to dry. She also remembers the paráčki, parties held on winter evenings, when friends and relatives got together to de-bone the goose feathers. While the women did the work in a separate room (for again, the slightest breeze would send down and feathers flying), the men looked after the children and entertained themselves by telling jokes, and by playing musical instruments and singing. Of course refreshments were served, and a wonderful time was had by all.

From the toasty-warm down comforters, the bride moves on to her down pillows and her pillow cases, beautifully decorated with colored eyelet embroidery and edged with lace. All have been made by her mother or by herself, as were the rest of her linens (woven from the family's home grown flax) which are also delicately embroidered in her favorite colors. Taught by her mother, she has also made the fine lace that forms part of her dowry, and her hand-cut crystal glasses were made by her father, her relatives, or her friends.

Awakened from her reverie by the sound of voices, the bride sees from her window her arriving guests, the men
wearing beautifully embroidered white linen jackets (kabańice) and black boots, also embellished with fancy embroidery. She hurries to get ready for the bridal luncheon, for which many delicacies have been prepared. The guests will sample a variety of soups; chicken and geese will be on the menu; a whole beef or ox may be roasted; or pigs butchered to produce ham, kielbasi (a smoked sausage with a light garlic flavoring), or hurike and jaterníčki (sausage delicacies made of ground, cooked pork liver, heart and kidneys mixed with spices, onions and cooked rice; served fried). There will also be a number of baked goods served: kolačke, bite-size sweet raised dough baked in fancy shapes and filled with apricots, prune butter, nuts or poppyseed; kifles, dainty crescent- and fancy-shaped fruit-filled pastries; and perhaps tortes, sweet butter cakes garnished with fruits of the season and plenty of whipped cream.

After lunch her mother — assisted by the maid of honor — helps to dress the bride, while the father and best man assist the groom. During the ceremonial preparation, the young couple is told what to expect of marriage and is given advice on ways to meet its challenges. When she is dressed, the bride calls in her father, and has her last moments of privacy with her parents before the wedding. She kneels before them and repeats the following:

PROSBA ŅEVESTI
Ja na tmavej ceske postavena stojim;
Či dobre či zle si vivolim.
Rodicovia moi radi bi šte znali,

Že ako sa bude so monov nakladati.
Ale je to šetko zakrito pred nami
Neviemo to nikto čo sa stane snami;
Či dobre či zle?
Odpustite mi panenske krehkosti,
Kcen na sebej zvežiti nové povinosi.
Ostavajte zdravi zmlım Panom Bohom.

A BRIDE'S FAREWELL
I stand on a dark and lonely road
Wondering what my future will hold;
Whether I choose good or bad,
If I'll be happy or be sad.

My dear parents you'd like to know
What the future holds in store for me.
It's in God's hands, it is my fate,
It's hidden from us 'til a later date.

Forgive my young errors, whims, and deeds,
I take upon myself new responsibilities.
May God be with you when I'm away,
May health and happiness be here to stay.
I bid farewell to my youth and home,
Don't be sad and feel alone;
In my memory and heart you'll be.
And may God be with us, you and me.

Now the bride kisses her parents; they bless her in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and she is ready to leave her family home.
If the bride and groom are from different villages, a ribbon is strung across the road when the bridegroom’s party comes to collect his intended; they are stopped by the bride’s people and must pay before they are allowed to cross the barrier. This payment is for the privilege of taking the bride from her home town, and is the origin of the custom of “the battered bride,” celebrated in the musical composition of the same name by Bedrich Smetana. It is all done in fun, but the money remains in the town for church or community use.

When it is time for the ceremony, the groom and his party wait for the bride at the town hall, where the marriage is first performed according to civil law; then it is on to the church for the religious service. Again, the groom and his party await the bride and her attendants. They leave the church after the marriage; relatives and friends of the bride throw cookies and zakuski (small butter rolls) wrapped in fine linen handkerchiefs to the crowd waiting to greet the newlyweds. This signifies to all those assembled that both partners will be willing always, with God’s help, to welcome guests into their home for food and hospitality.

From the church the bridal party and guests proceed to the home of the bride’s parents to continue the festivities. The bridal couple sits at the head table, along with their respective parents, siblings, grandparents and, most particularly for they have a special role to play, their godparents. After a pastoral prayer the toastmaster introduces the members of both families and the members of the bridal party. Next is a toast to couple, and then food is served, and will be served continually, even if the celebration lasts for several days. It is the custom for the bride and groom to feed each other.

Dancing — to the music of a gypsy violin, citar, accordion, cymbals and drums — begins as soon as the meal is finished, which means that the bridal dance usually starts at about ten o’clock in the evening. First the bride dances with her mother and father, and then with her sisters and brothers, in that order. When they have finished, the groom dances with the members of his family in the same order the bride did with hers; and when they are done, the father of the groom dances with the bride’s mother after which the interchanged families dance together, thus signifying that they are now a part of each other through their children.

When the interchanged families have finished their dance, the bride’s father presents her to her new husband. Then, if either of the newlyweds have an older, unmarried brother or sister they will be given a broom — dressed as a member of the opposite sex — as a dancing partner. Each unmarried sibling must dance one dance with his or her wooden mate, amid much laughter and clapping. Each will keep that broom as a memento of the happy occasion. As the bridal dance continues, each person who dances with the bride or groom must put a donation in a basket. The donated money will be given to the bride to help her supply her kitchen or for other household needs. Later in the evening the bride is “stolen” and then “found” by the groom who must pay for
her return, while at the same time promising to be good to her. They return to the dance floor, whereupon the bride throws her bouquet and the groom his flower.

After the bouquet and flower throwing ceremony, the bride is seated, music begins to play again, and the guests sing “Naša Mlada Nevesta” (Our Young Bride). Now her godmother removes the bride's veil and, depending on the community she comes from, puts on her head a beautiful babuška (a square piece of fabric, generally made from very fine cashmere embroidered and trimmed with lace which is folded into a triangle and tied under the chin); or a fine cepec (a hat or cap — depending on the bride’s preference — of lace, linen or silk, embroidered and trimmed with ribbon). Now she is accepted into the community of married women, and she listens as her godmother gives a kindly recitation of her responsibilities: wifely, motherly, community and churchly duties; of which the latter are especially solemn. Now is is the groom’s turn, and he is instructed as to his responsibilities as a husband, father, son-in-law, and member of the church and the community. And, once again, church duties are emphasized — God is never to be forgotten.

The bride’s dowry is presented at this time, and then the couple bids a sentimental farewell to all. They depart, heading for their new home where, on the threshold, the groom sings softly to his bride:

“Dobru noc ma mila
Dobru noc
Nechiije sam Pan Boh,
Na pomoc
Dobru noc dobre spi
Nech sa ti snivaju o mie sni.”

(“Good night my love,
Good night.
May God be your helpmeet.
Good night, sleep well;
May you dream beautiful dreams of me.”)
of banging on their door, accompanied by music and shouted questions: "Are you sleeping?" "Did you sleep well?"

This is to remind the young folks that there is a time for everything; and everything has its time.

Meanwhile, the wedding party has been going on all night, with different orchestras taking shifts, and the guests singing such beautiful Slovak folk songs as "Sadla Muska na Gonarik" ("A Fly Sat on a Branch"), "Kebi dali Esie Ráz Viberat" ("If Only They Let Me Choose One More Time"), "Kônik Beži" ("Slovak Heritage"), and "Pod Tym Našim Okenečkem" ("Underneath Our Window"). When daylight arrives the party proceeds to the home of the groom's parents, where they have breakfast and enjoy a huge kolach — a pastry of sweet raised dough baked in the shape of a rose — prepared by the bride's relatives. Rich in texture, it is beautifully wrapped in fine linen adorned with beautiful ribbons and is carried on a decorated pole about ten feet high.

After breakfast everyone returns to the home of the bride's parents, and continues with the festivities which may last for several more days; or in fact, until the last guest leaves, bestowing good wishes and many thanks on their hosts and the bridal couple. Small wonder that anyone who has ever attended a traditional Slovak wedding never forgets it. Since World War II, many things have changed in Europe as they have in this country. It is sadly reported that some of the beautiful customs are dying and Western clothes are becoming the style, leaving the world a poorer place by far. But we who have seen former times have wonderful memories — memories of the music, of the dancing and singing, of the good food and the warm hospitality — that will live with us forever.

ENDNOTE

1 This Slovak version was recalled for me by Mrs. John Feher, the former Margaret Mizur (Adam). Mrs. Feher died recently, two days after her ninetieth birthday. The English version, in parallel expressions, is my own, as are the other translations.
BOOK REVIEWS


These two related publications have recently appeared in print and may be of some interest to our subscribers and to students contemplating summer 1987 courses. Books organized and edited by Professor Werner Enninger of the German University of Essen, they speak to a mutual interest many have in Plain folk and Plain living. Both are bi-lingual, although the number of articles in English outnumber the articles in German by three to one. Friends of Pennsylvania Folklife will be delighted to see articles by Marion Huffines, John A. Hostetler and William T. Parsons (all of them contributors to our journal), which appear in one or the other of these books.

Both volumes emanate from the Conferences on Amish and Mennonite Life held at Essen in 1984 and 1986. They reflect the interest of Homeland Germans and German-Americans in scholarly studies about German-American people and their language. French, Swiss, American, Eastern European, and Canadian writers treat various aspects of language, costume and custom, as well as describing folk migration themes.

The 1984 volume contains articles on clothing, occupation, religion and speech as visible signs of Amish and Old Order Mennonite similarities and distinctions. John A. Hostetler examines silence as a folk survival mechanism; Enninger himself describes speech patterns and variations in Amish High German; interviews, casual conversations and publications such as the Budget serve as sources of expressions and information about the Old Order people; and Gertrude Huntingdon shares some of her experiences with the Amish in much the same spirit as has Hostetler. Of similar interest are names much less familiar to an American reading public, for people named Kehr and Kalesny show Amish or Anabaptist reaction to the surrounding community in such disparate places as Virginia and Slovakia.

The second volume, dated 1986, contains the work of a larger number of contributors than did the earlier one, and examines a broader spectrum of confrontations and experiences as well. The breadth of information ranges from connotation of clothing to the cultural aspects of Amish quilts. Photography and Mennonites, motion pictures and the Amish also bring together seemingly contradictory subjects.

In this tome, Kurt Kehr tackles the always puzzling problem of Pennsylvania German language forms, connotations and difficulties involved when the supposedly stay-at-home move into other locations or spread their farming, religion and culture beyond formerly restrictive bounds. Even more difficult is the linguistic and cultural problem of settlements of other dialect Germans and how to categorize all that. Perhaps Kehr will find solace in the obvious fact that Pennsylvania Germans and other German-Americans have still not reached agreement on how to solve that agonizing question.

What Enninger, Raith and Wandt have accomplished promises much for the future of their projects and the program at Essen. As Werner Enninger notes in his preface, 1987 and 1988 programs in Pennsylvania and Iowa bode well for the future of this cooperation.

In 1987 Americans with a sense of language importance will have an opportunity to speak out, for Old Order topics will be discussed at length at John A. Hostetler's already announced conference at Elizabethtown College in July. Moreover, classroom studies related to subjects these two books address have already been announced for the Collegeville campus. The Institute for Pennsylvania German Studies there will offer a summer replete with college-credit courses for the aficionado as well as for the neophyte, between 1 June and 14 August 1987, encouraging participants to take time out to participate in Hostetler's conference toward the end of July 1987.

Devotees of dialect poetry will almost surely find a new friend in this neophyte who writes in such a sympathetic way. As I read his comments on lethargy and on his aversion to telephones and weather forecasts, I found myself cheering aloud. We must be spiritual twins at least. This is not his first publication—but as André himself notes, it is his first book of verse, and it is good. Its appeal is as strong in Pennsylvania as it must be in the Rhineland, for any Pennsylvania Dutchman who reads Es Bischli Gnippli (Piilzic h: Gedi chte in Pfalzer Mundart, Kircheimbolanden: Selbstverlag Andre, 1986) and has his linguistic and cultural problem of settlements of other dialect Germans and how to categorize all that. Perhaps Kehr will find solace in the obvious fact that Pennsylvania Germans and other German-Americans have still not reached agreement on how to solve that agonizing question.

What Enninger, Raith and Wandt have accomplished promises much for the future of their projects and the program at Essen. As Werner Enninger notes in his preface, 1987 and 1988 programs in Pennsylvania and Iowa bode well for the future of this cooperation.

In 1987 Americans with a sense of language importance will have an opportunity to speak out, for Old Order topics will be discussed at length at John A. Hostetler's already announced conference at Elizabethtown College in July. Moreover, classroom studies related to subjects these two books address have already been announced for the Collegeville campus. The Institute for Pennsylvania German Studies there will offer a summer replete with college-credit courses for the aficionado as well as for the neophyte, between 1 June and 14 August 1987, encouraging participants to take time out to participate in Hostetler's conference toward the end of July 1987.

Devotees of dialect poetry will almost surely find a new friend in this neophyte who writes in such a sympathetic way. As I read his comments on lethargy and on his aversion to telephones and weather forecasts, I found myself cheering aloud. We must be spiritual twins at least. This is not his first publication—but as André himself notes, it is his first book of verse, and it is good. Its appeal is as strong in Pennsylvania as it must be in the Rhineland, for any Pennsylvania Dutchman who reads Es Bischli Gnippli (Piilzic h: Gedi chte in Pfalzer Mundart, Kircheimbolanden: Selbstverlag Andre, 1986) and has his

This is a worthy addition to the growing list of Good Books which deal with popular aspects of Plain life and culture. As one might expect since they try to avoid all worldly ways and lifestyles, most Amish toys are homemade. This book not only shows hand-crafted playthings—it contains dozens of full-color photographs—it also explains how their creation often teaches needed skills, and actually re-affirms Amish family values. Anyone with an interest in the Amish and their ways or in American folk art will enjoy this beautiful book; more information can be obtained by writing to the publisher in Intercourse, Pa., 17534.

NKG

**NEW ACQUISITION AT ALLENTOWN ART MUSEUM**

If your interest in the Moravians has been piqued by our cover story, you might want to see the Allentown Art Museum’s latest acquisition, the painting “Niagara Falls,” by Moravian artist Gustavus Grunewald (1805-1878). Born in Germany, Grunewald was a pupil of the premier German Romantic artist Caspar-David Friedrich. In 1831 he joined the Moravian community in Bethlehem, and served as the drawing master at its seminary from 1836 to 1868. Although he returned to Germany in 1868, virtually all of his productive years as an artist were spent in America; he exhibited regularly at the National Academy of Design and the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts, Philadelphia.

“Niagara Falls,” unknown to American art historians and scholars of Moravian history, was sold at Christie’s in New York in December 1985. It is the earliest and largest of several scenes of the falls painted by Grunewald, and measures 34½ by 54 inches. His most ambitious early painting in this country, the work is dated 1834 and inscribed “Philadelphia.” The museum has a special interest in Grunewald because of his links with the Lehigh Valley, and is in the process of compiling an inventory of his works. So far fifty works have been identified, many of them in institutions in Bethlehem.

The Allentown Art Museum is located at Fifth and Court streets, and is open Tuesday through Sunday.

**GUCC YUSCHT WAS EIKUMME ISS (CHUST SEE ONCE WHAT WE GOT)**

In the mail from Ken Hottle way up there in Allentown, came items he found in sale books from Shenkel, Pa. Ken does not save dialect items, but knows how much we prize them. Ibach’s “Grutta Kling” (The sound of frogs and tree-frogs) was one relatively familiar piece, and the other is the broadside advertisement reproduced here.

---

**Now Horrich Yusht Mohl Do.**

Olles wos Deim House Nuch Fail’d.

Now horrich mohl, dei house is guth,
Sheh ougelegt ollawaig.
Sheh eigericht mit fenstera.
Un Deera, Shtoovn, Shtag—
Gookt ollawaiga recht un guth,
A ding fail’d ovver nach—
Es brauch ollivver neiy paint,
Duh sel draf gwald de wuch.

Dei hulswarrick leit shaawda do mit,
Perfaulet un shpringt der uf;
Un no kusht mainer ivver ‘n wile,
Now yusht ferlus dich druf.
Dei gons house inwenneich un ous,
Fum keller bis tsu’m doch,
Brauch neiy paint, sel waisht du wul.
Un aw dei houseocode noch.

Now griick der yusht sel “PENNSY PAINT,”
De beccht im lond gomocht;
So sha un frish in foppiva,
Dos se em gwald awlocht.
So wulfei aw ferlus dich druf,
Dos aryeds ward gomocht;
Un wahrt feel longs dos onner paint,
Kauf kenny sunsh, geb och!

De “Pensy Paint” Works sin gwald der blots wo mer griickt was mer ordent. Oil ehra paint is guaranteed by de

Morgan-Ruth-Moore Paint & Color Co.,
401-417 South 11th Street,
READING, PA.

---

Although this epic poem really deserves a proper translation into poetic English, the best I can do on a moment’s notice is to summarize it as follows:

Of course your house is very nice
But a coat of paint would help;
The shabby spots would disappear
As you apply the paint yourself.
To do the job from cellar up
With hearty soul, not faint;
May I suggest you do the work
With good old “Pensy Paint!”

W.T. Parsons, Archivist
ALMANACS AVAILABLE

When a recent gift of almanacs came to the Pennsylvania German Archives, it included not only several dozen items we did not have in the collection, but also several duplicates and a number of single copies already in our files. If you have any interest in obtaining any of the following numbers, we ask only a swap or even-up exchange. Just send for the master list of our almanac collection. If you have any which are among the ones we are missing, just send it (them) to us, indicating which items from our collection you want in exchange and they will be sent in the first return mail. If you have no copies for exchange, just send $5.00 for each Almanac you want from the following list and they are yours. All items are one of a kind and so are subject to prior sale. Some copies are damaged or are lacking front or back covers.

John Baer Sons. Lancaster, PA.

Agricultural Almanac for the year 1882.
Same, 1883 (Jones Dtwiler’s copy); Same, 1884.
Same, 1885 (D.H. Bertolo’s copy); 1886.
Same, 1890 (D.H. Bertolo’s copy); 1892 (Bertolet).
Same, 1893 (D.H. Bertolo’s copy); 1895; 1897; 1898.
George Childs, Public Ledger, Philadelphia, PA.

Public Ledger Almanac, 1877, 1881, 1884, 1885, 1886, 1888.

Since we have been very fortunate that many Friends of the Pennsylvania German Archives have remembered us when they have such items to dispose of, we expect still more will arrive in time to come. If interested, send us a Want List. We may be able to help you. Of course cash payments and cash gifts are surely welcome. We feel good whenever we can help friends.

MISCELLANEOUS VOUCHERS

Listed below are several miscellaneous vouchers from the American Revolution, taken from Pennsylvania Militia Accounts, 1774-1794, in the collection of the Office of the Comptroller General which is located in the William Penn State Archives, Harrisburg, Pa. Such items are often useful to genealogists compiling family histories. (Translation into English where necessary by William T. Parsons.)

macunschhi Daunschip, northemton caunide den 7 tag october 1778, freind Coll Balith: ich lasse euch mit die sempar zeilen wissen das der georg fetzer seine zwei monet in der militz geDInzt hat.
so viel fon mir, georg knappenberger, Capten

(Macungie Township, Northampton County, 7 October 1778, Friend Colonel [Stephen] Balliett: I let you know for the regular tally that George Fetzer has served his two months in the Militia.
So much from me, George Knappenberger, Captain)

****

Rec[iev]ed. January 31st. 1781 of Peter Richards, One of the Sub L[ieutenan]ts, County of Philad[elphi]a [later Montgomery], the sum of Two hundred and forty Dollars, being for the Use of Four Muskets (in the Campaign at Trenton.) belonging to Four Men of my Comp[an]y. L 90.--
P[er] me, Johannes Jost, L[ieutenan]t.

*****

Received May ye 13th 1782 from Jonathan Blare [Blair] Collector for Non-Attendance, The sum of One Pound & Four Shillings, it being for Drummer’s pay for the forepart of the year 1781. P.W. [Philadelphia (later Montgomery) County] Received. Philip Wentz

*****

Towamensing Sept[ember] 28. 1782
I do hereby certify that Bernard Cline [Bernhard Klein] has served seven Days under my Command on the Frontier in March Past.
Witness my Hand.

[Northampton (later Carbon) County] Peter Roads, Capt.

*****

Zeugnis das hannes heller hat gedien Im Jahr 1782 in allen Moster und Battalyn Dag mit aus Er war Krank. Bezyt mit meiner hant.

Paul Feyrer, Capt.
(Witness that John Heller served in the year 1782, in all musters and Battalion Days except when he was sick. Authorized by my hand.

Paul Fe yer, Captain)

*****

Den 26 Abril 1784. Ich bezaige mit meinen guten willen und Wörtern, dass ich bezahlt sieben schilling und 6 bentz an Peter Fentling für meinen drromen zu flicken.

Valentein Gresch
(26 April 1784, I certify by my good intention and statement that I paid seven shillings six pence to Peter Fentling to have my drum patched.
Valentine Gresch)

CORRECTION

Due to an editorial mistake, the information about Barbara Knox Homrighaus on the “Contributors” page of the Winter 1986-87 issue is incorrect. Mrs. Homrighaus co-authored a social history paper, “Building a Town but Preventing a Community: A Social History of Centralia, Pa. 1985”; she did not do a sociological study of Centralia.
INSTITUTE ON PENNSYLVANIA GERMAN STUDIES
SUMMER COURSES 1987

In 1987, the Pennsylvania German Department presents an Institute on Pennsylvania German Studies, unique not only in the United States, but anywhere in the world. 1987 is the fourteenth year that a full schedule of courses has been offered. A student may elect to register for eleven semester hour credits in an eleven week period. Courses given by professors from Pennsylvania and Germany are listed below, for college credit or audit. Local history sources, archives and Dutch country artifacts. Programs and field trips.

**PA GER 201. PA GERMAN HIST & CULTURE TO 1800**

**SESSION A**
3 hrs/day, 3 credits  Dr. William PARSONS  1-19 Jun
History and cultural experiences of the unique ethnic group which is Pennsylvania German. From German origins to Pennsylvania and into bordering provinces. Plain Folk & Fancy Dutch. Religion, crafts, folk art & music. Museum and field trips.

**PA GER 202. PA GERMAN HIST & CULTURE SINCE 1801**

**SESSION B**
3 hrs/day, 3 credits  Dr Wm PARSONS  22 Jun-10 Jul
History and culture of Penna Germans in the U.S.; in other states and nations. Politics, business, frontier, art & music. Women among the Folk. Plain People in today's world. Visit Kutztown Folk Festival & other indoor and outdoor museums. Speakers and visual aids; student participation. Bibliography

**PA GER 426. SEMIOTIC ASPECTS OF AMISH LANGUAGES**

(1 week)
3 hrs/day, 1 credit  Dr Werner ENNINGER  13-17 July
An examination of the languages (Pennsylvania German, Amish High German, American English) and some non-verbal codes (clothing, hair and beard style, buggies) of the Amish from a semiotic perspective. Development, structure and function of the languages and nonverbal codes.

**PA GER 427. OLD ORDER SCENES AND SOUNDS**

(1 week)
3 hrs/day, 1 credit  Christian NEWSWANGER  20-24 July
A personal view of the Old Order Amish by a nationally known folk artist and author, who has lived and worked with them. Examination of the aesthetics and evolution of his artistic style. Field trip to an Amish family. Award-winning documentary film by the professor. Exhibition of his Amish art.

**PA GER 423. SCHWENKFELDERS IN EUROPE AND AMERICA**

(1 week)
3 hrs/day, 1 credit  Dr Monica PIEPER  27-31 July
Identification and beliefs of Schwentfelders from Silesia and Saxony. Their faith testimonies, hymns and diaries; life in Europe. Religious causes for emigration to Pennsylvania; conditions encountered here. Leaders and development in Penna. Schools & education; Fraktur art & needlework. Schwentfelder hymns and literary activities. Artifacts in museum setting.

**PA GER 424-5. PENNA GERMAN ITEMS FOR TEACHERS**

(2 weeks)
3 hrs/day, 2 credits  Barry FLICKER  3-14 Aug
Theories and examples of classroom use of Pennsylvania German materials; holidays & festivals, music & the arts; games and programs; dialect sayings & poetry. Movies & plays about the Folk. Enrichments data for history and folk culture classes.

For information and enrollment forms, write to:
Dr. William T. Parsons, Head, Penna German &
Director, Institute on Penna German Studies,
P.O. Box 712, 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