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"Out of the Heart Comes the Issue of Life" (1943), by David Y. Ellinger. (From the Collection of Mr. & Mrs. Richard Machmer; photo by Derk Visser)
"LOVE, DAVID"
by Nelson M. Williams

Some years ago I purchased a fraktur painting of a peacock. Under the urn on which the bird is sitting is written “D. Ellinger”; on the dust cover on the reverse side is sketched a tulip growing out of a heart. Inscribed under this is “Love, David.”

Knowing it was not antique, but admiring the painting because of its intrinsic charm and its beautiful, bright colors, I became interested in learning something about the artist. So, when a colleague pointed him out to me at an antiques show, I took the opportunity to introduce myself. From that initial meeting through many, many more, emerged this appreciation of David Ellinger, based largely on his recollections, supplemented by the records he has kept from his earliest days."

Fortunately for me, he has a good memory for dates, places, and people. Evidence, I suggest, that he has always had a keen appreciation for the events which shaped his life, and wanted to retain the experiences, good and bad, so they would continue to influence him long after they became history.

INTRODUCTION

Widely known for his primitive oil paintings, watercolors, fraktur pictures, pastels, and theorems, David Yeager Ellinger, born August 22, 1913, found success as an artist when he was quite young. The sale of some of his paintings to Beatrice Kaufman—wife of playwright George S. Kaufman—in the early 1930s was reason enough to assure the young man that he had the potential to fulfill his lifelong ambition to become a professional artist.

Later, Beatrice Kaufman and her long-time friend Dorothy Pratt (wife of Richard Pratt, a photographer for House and Garden magazine) became friends and regular clients of David Ellinger’s, as well as strong supporters of his work. In fact, Beatrice Kaufman hosted a private showing, attended by many famous people, of his art in her New York City home. Most of the pictures displayed were purchased, and even a partial list of the buyers reads like a society and show business Who’s Who: Fredric March, Ilka Chase, Moss Hart, Harpo Marx, Claude Rains, and Doris Duke. (Chase’s acquisition, “The Country Auction,” was later bought and reproduced by the New York Graphic Society which offered prints for sale in Hobbies magazine.)

This sponsorship had important consequences for David Ellinger, for it not only made his work available to important style and trend setters, but introduced him to a world beyond his home in southeastern Pennsylvania. And, it brought him to the attention of others in the art world, men and women who could open doors for him and give him broader recognition. One such person, Vera M. White, an artist herself and active in Philadelphia art circles, purchased an Ellinger painting at the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts show in the fall of 1943. Her support helped bring about his recognition by many members of the Philadelphia art establishment, and the result was a number of group and one-man shows that further established his career as an artist.

From the first, David Ellinger was identified with the Pennsylvania German community of his native state. As one critic wrote: “Through the art of David Y. Ellinger flows the entire tradition of Pennsylvania Dutch [German] culture which is his heritage. Imbued with a complete vision, his work presents a consistent and harmonious unity. Because his vision centers about that which is in his blood, his heart and his eyes, his hand and imagination have released the spirit lying fallow in the old folk art and given it new expression. Participation in the habits, customs and the deep inner realization of the Pennsylvania Dutch life marks all his canvases.”

Speaking of a specific Ellinger painting featured on the cover of the August, 1944, issue of German American Review, Walter Baum, an outstanding artist and founder
of the Baum School of Art, tells us "A tall plant rooted in rich soil with its flowers lined against the sky, merits the unusual title 'Out of the Heart Comes the Issue of Life.'" He then goes on to talk of the symbolism involved: "The flowers are tulips and the root is a heart, the significance of which is further explained by the landscape—typical of the Pennsylvania Dutch country—over which the symbol presides." Of Ellinger's "Dutch Country," Baum notes: "The farm buildings are painted in an intense red, while the house is a yellowish green. Its people wear the garb of the Mennonite people. But the chief charm—that of individuality—is the artist's manner of painting trees. They look as though they might have been taken from some piece of old Pennsylvania Dutch fraktur such as embellished old books or family records."

In conjunction with an exhibition of David Ellinger's..."
paintings at the Weyhe Gallery on Lexington Avenue in New York City, The New York Times of November 25, 1944, featured a photograph of “Grace,” an oil painting depicting an Amish family gathered for a meal, the scene illuminated by an oil lamp hanging over the table. On that same date, the New York Herald Tribune referred to the artist as “a young primitive from the Mennonite region of Pennsylvania . . . [whose] pictures are personal reflections of the picturesque life and backgrounds of the Amish and Mennonite sects. His work is very simple, indeed, being as brightly colored as a new toy; but aside from the color there are decorated barns, trees with their conventionalized Pennsylvania Dutch detail, and gatherings of people wearing poke bonnets and wide-brimmed hats. All the stiffness of primitive art finds a neat focus in this painting in a kind of simple abundance, entertaining to behold.”

Closer to home, a Philadelphia Inquirer writer said of Ellinger’s work: “He paints only what he knows—the people and the places he has grown up with and loved. And through his love for them and the things for which they stand—the mysticism and honesty and sincerity that are their chief characteristics—he has become the spokesman for a group [the Pennsylvania Germans] that is fast taking its place as an important and significant part of America.”

EARLY INFLUENCES

Interestingly, since he has always been so closely associated with the Pennsylvania-German community and culture, David Ellinger is quick to point out that despite his German forebears he is not a member of that ethnic group. (The term is properly applied only to descendants of those immigrants almost exclusively from southwestern Germany, Saxony, Silesia, and Switzerland who settled primarily in colonial Pennsylvania.)

David’s father, John Frederick Ellinger, born in Philadelphia in 1885, was of German descent; his mother, Sara Marie Yeager, was born in Chester County, Pa., in 1889. She was the daughter of Harry Dean Yeager, born in Downingtown, Pa., and also of German descent; and Ada Mary Griffiths, a Quaker woman of Welsh ancestry born near Chester Springs, Pa.

John Frederick Ellinger, who had attended classes in drawing and wood carving at the Philadelphia School of Industrial Arts (now the University of the Arts), was a skilled cabinetmaker employed at the Baldwin Locomotive Works at the time of his marriage; later he worked for the Philadelphia Transportation Company. While he did not make his living as an artist, he retained his interest in art, an interest he encouraged in sons David and Paul (born April 14, 1911), taking them to exhibitions at the city’s
many museums and galleries. David has many recollections of visits to the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts where his own work would be displayed in a number of shows, beginning in 1940. He also remembers visits to Memorial Hall in Fairmount Park where many of the works of art now housed in the Philadelphia Museum of Art were displayed before the Museum was constructed on the Parkway.

This exposure to fine art had a profound effect on David, making him aware of the work of others and reinforcing his own desire to express himself through his drawings. He remembers decorating with watercolor and crayon sketches the house in the Mantua section of Philadelphia where he was born. He also remembers holding exhibits of his art, and of identifying one particular work as his “masterpiece.” Seeing one of his childish drawings, a man selling pencils door-to-door told Mrs. Ellinger that one day her son would be a famous artist.

Although David Ellinger went on to success in the art world, his mother did not live to see it; she died in the great influenza epidemic of 1918 when David was five years old. Her death was a great blow to the little family, and following it the boys were sent to live with their Yeager grandparents who owned a small farm in the little Montgomery County village of Trappe, thirty miles northwest of Philadelphia. David and Paul were to live there for five years, their father visiting every weekend and on holidays until he remarried and took them to his new West Philadelphia home.

Over the years the Ellinger family had made many visits to “Granny’s farm,” so the boys were familiar with the general routine of life in the country and quickly adapted to their new surroundings. Grandfather Yeager worked for an insurance company in Philadelphia since the farm was too small (only fifteen acres) for him to earn a living from it. But with its truck garden, chickens, cow, and horse,
The Trappe School on West Fifth Avenue was built in 1851 and still stands, although it is no longer used for its original purpose. In this 1921 picture of the student body the farm did provide much of the family's food. When the Yeagers needed to replace their few farm animals they dealt with John Fisher, a local livestock dealer. Along with other neighborhood boys, David and his brother were often hired by Fisher to help drive cows along the local farm lanes and public roads for delivery to his customers.

The years spent with their grandparents were happy ones, and the boys thrived. The community of Trappe, made up of single homes and small farms, was a rural paradise for David and Paul, one that contrasted sharply with the crowded city neighborhood they had left. It was in this quiet setting that David, surrounded by the beauty of the place and by the honesty and love of the people he knew, developed his love for life in the country. It was here that he observed the plain people who were his grandparents' neighbors, and the neat farms with their decorated barns and well-tended gardens that we recognize as the subjects of his art. He drew what he saw, and these early paintings caught the attention of those who first recognized his talent.

* * *

David Ellinger is second from the right in the second row, while Paul is first from the right in the back row.
David Ellinger was ten years old and his brother twelve when Frederick Ellinger remarried and took them back to West Philadelphia. His new wife, the former Caroline (Carrie) Sophia Fetzer, had been an art teacher and was a graduate of Philadelphia's Drexel Institute of Technology. One might think that with similar interests she would take more of an interest in David, but she soon made it clear that she did not want him or his brother in the house, and relations were strained from the beginning. In fact, she made no effort to prevent the boys from overhearing conversations with her friends in which the rearing of stepsons was described as a "thankless effort."

With the birth of a half-sister, Mabel, and the realization that their father was growing increasingly distant—"almost like a stepfather"—the boys began to long for the happy life they had known in Trappe. But their grandparents no longer owned the farm there; they had sold it and moved out of the area soon after the boys returned to their father. In fact, they had sold it and moved out of the area soon after the boys returned to their father. So, when the situation in the Ellinger household grew intolerable, Paul rode his bicycle to Trappe and took a job on a farm a short distance from his grandparents' former property.

Some months later, David, who did not own a bicycle, took public transportation to Trappe to visit the family farm's new owner, a woman named Winnie Morris; he had already been introduced to her by his grandmother. He asked her for work, but she did not need help since her nephew was staying with her. The Ellingers knew David had gone to Trappe to look for work and had arranged to meet him and take him home. Bitterly disappointed that he had not succeeded in finding a job, Carrie Ellinger told her husband that he had to get rid of David, since she said nothing. Returning a week later to "look over" his prospective place of employment, he decided it was not a place where he wanted to live and once more went back to Philadelphia.

But more determined than ever to leave home and make his own arrangements, he obtained money from a neighbor and again made the long journey on public transportation to Trappe. School was about to begin, and he hoped Winnie Morris's nephew had left the farm. That proved to be the case, and she hired David immediately for nine dollars a month plus room and board. In the nine months he worked there David earned his money, for the property was now a chicken farm which often housed 3500 birds at a time.

Winnie Morris was one of the most colorful of the many unusual characters David would meet over the course of his long career. He soon learned that in addition to owning the chicken farm she was in show business, working as an exotic dancer. This meant she was away touring for weeks at a time, and David was left to handle most of the many farm chores, helped in the evenings by Winnie’s male companion who commuted to a job in Philadelphia. In addition to his farm work, David was expected to serve the couple’s bootleg whiskey (it was the era of Prohibition) from a jug usually kept suspended from a cord in the well to keep it cool and out of sight. When guests were present he was given caramel candy to dissolve in it so it would have a proper whiskey color.

The incident that precipitated his leaving the Morris farm involved Winnie’s theatrical trunk, that mysterious box kept securely locked in her room when she was not on the road. David had been admonished that under no circumstances was he ever to touch it, and, curious though he was, had obeyed. Then, at a time when she was very drunk she asked him to open it, and when the key could not be found made him smash the lock with an axe. Still following her instructions, he removed for her inspection the contents of various drawers and compartments, a colorful array of the beautifully feathered and sequined costumes standard for the profession: harem pants, gypsy skirts, fans, shoes, veils, headdresses, brassieres, and G-strings.
Although fascinated by the finery so different from the somber garb usually worn by the women he knew, David nonetheless felt Winnie Morris’s lifestyle was too “strange” for him to ever be comfortable with, and decided her house was no place for him to live. So, a few days later when he was alone on the farm he finished his chores, packed his few belongings in a paper bag, wrote a note explaining he was leaving and left it where it would be seen by Winnie’s friend when he returned, and set out for a farm about a mile away that he remembered from the days he lived with his Grandmother Yeager. She would take David and Paul in the farm wagon to Graterford (a village not far from the farm, on the Perkiomen Creek) to have their hair cut.

One of the farms they passed on the way was owned by Emerson Baldwin, a one-eyed, bearded man who looked to the boys rather like “a man from another world.” In fact, the Ellinger boys were so frightened they always urged the horse on, so they could pass his property quickly.

But David also remembered that his grandfather had sometimes worked for Baldwin when he needed extra help in the harvest season, and knew he would be able to introduce himself as Harry Yeager’s grandson. Not knowing whether or not he would find a home but trusting matters would work out, he reached the Baldwin farm at twilight on an evening in early May. Through the kitchen window he saw the housekeeper, Martha Ann, lighting kerosene lamps. A short, roly-poly woman whose hair was knotted on the top of her head, she always wore the dark clothes then so common among country women, with a black shawl drawn up to her throat and secured there with a large safety pin.

Martha Ann told David her employer was looking for a boy to help on the farm, and while they waited for him to come in for supper she asked what sign he was born under. With no knowledge of the signs of the Zodiac David did not understand the question and said so. She then asked in what month he was born and when he answered “August,” she explained he was born under the sign of Leo, the lion. She went on to say that she was born under the sign of the present month and so was a Taurus, adding that should he be hired he must not worry if he heard her walking about during the night since “the bull would be in the heavens” and she wanted to look for him.

Hired immediately (for ten dollars a month plus room and board) David, who “had heard of bulls in the pasture, but never in the heavens,” had time to ponder that phenomenon that very night since he spent much of it awake, frightened by the usual, but to him unfamiliar, noises heard especially in old houses after dark. In fact, he remembers being frightened every night for weeks, and lying in bed resolving to go back to Philadelphia at first light. But he never did, even though the days were long and the work hard.

The 105-acre Baldwin property was primarily a dairy farm, and at that time had a herd of about thirty-three animals with perhaps twenty which had to be milked twice a day, seven days a week. Up at 4 a.m., David was responsible for milking six or seven cows himself in addition to washing and assembling the cloth strainers and cleaning the cooler used to lower the temperature of the milk before it left the farm. Then he drove the farm wagon to the Graterford railroad station (about a half mile away) so the milk could be loaded onto the 7:01 a.m. train to Philadelphia. The rest of the day he helped with all the other jobs involved in running a farm.

It was very hard physical labor, and in spite of plenty of nourishing food (Martha Ann was a good cook) David, a slightly built adolescent, suffered a number of ailments diagnosed by a local doctor as “growing pains.” Fortunately, David had a friend who thought otherwise. That friend, Mary Law, would become—after his mother and grandmother—the most important woman in David Ellinger’s life. She, too, had been orphaned at an early age and perhaps this common experience helped forge a bond between them, and contributed to her desire to care for him. In any event, it was Mary Law who made a home for him, and who gave him the affection and sense of security he had not known since leaving his Grandmother Yeager’s three years before. She would be his friend and companion for the next twenty-two years, until her death in 1948.
David Ellinger had met Mary Law on his first day at the Baldwin farm. Baldwin owned the farm jointly with a college friend, an obstetrician named Mariah Walsh, who lived and practiced in Philadelphia but made frequent trips to Graterford. She, in turn, knew Mary Law, who worked as housekeeper for an Episcopal clergyman, the Reverend T.W. Davidson and his wife. When Mr. Davidson died, Dr. Walsh persuaded the two women to move to Graterford where they rented a house on Gravel Pike, the main street. Mary suffered from failing eyesight and while she was never completely blind, she qualified for a monthly grant from the state. This income and Mrs. Davidson’s widow’s pension allowed them a modest but comfortable living. When David joined them he had not been to school since leaving Philadelphia more than two years before, and Mary Law insisted he return. Since neither of his new guardians paid taxes in the township he had to walk a mile and a half to the high school in the neighboring town of Schwenksville. Soon tiring of this he left, never to return.

Even while going to school, however, David had a part-time job so he could help with household expenses. He worked for several years for Jess Kline, who owned a store (built on pilings over the Perkiomen Creek) where he sold magazines, newspapers and post cards, tobacco products, and various kinds of ice cream and candy. Kline was a barber, so the building also housed a barber shop and, for a time, the post office. (Again, one of David’s jobs was to meet the morning train, this time to collect the mail.) At the time, Graterford was a popular summer resort and Kline rented cabins and canoes to visitors trying to escape the heat of the city, so David helped with the chores necessitated by these rentals in addition to working in the store. An important part of the small community, the store was popular with local residents who often gathered there in the evening to listen to favorite radio programs such as Amos ‘n’ Andy.
"The Bridge at Graterford" by David Ellinger. Jess Kline’s store is the second building to the right of the bridge; the extension built out the back housed his barber shop.

Through all of his difficulties with his father and stepmother, and during the long months of hard work on the Morris and Baldwin farms, David had continued to draw and paint, remembering the great paintings he had seen on his museum trips and imitating the styles of famous artists. A good student when he returned to school, he was encouraged by his principal to consider a teaching career, but he “just wanted to paint”; an urge he found “overpowering.” Mary Law recognized his talent and encouraged him, even helping to buy the supplies he needed from her limited income. Now he was able to display and sell his work in Kline’s store. It was during this period, too, that he entered his first “exhibition,” an arts-and-crafts show at the high school he had left some time before.

A hard-working, religious woman, Mary Law also encouraged David to attend the local Mennonite Church, which he did, “because it was close.” As he explains, he “had no special interest in being a Mennonite, but admired these plain people [and] liked being with them.” David was no stranger to religion, for in the years he and his brother had lived with the Yeagers his grandmother, although not herself affiliated with any religious group, had nonetheless encouraged her grandsons to attend Sunday School and church. So during that period David went to the nearby Augustus Lutheran Church partly because many of his friends did, but mainly because of what he calls their

"Love thy Neighbor," 1935; the interior of the River Brethren Church in Graterford. (Collection of Dr. David Bronstein; photo by Derk Visser)
"New Holland Farm Sale," one of David Ellinger's paintings that "show[s] the way of life of the Pennsylvania-German folk in the 1940s and 1950s."

“interesting activities,” which included making pictures of scenes associated with the lessons. He has many fond memories of his association there, and one of his most ambitious early (1931) artistic efforts was a large painting of General George Washington standing with his horse in front of the historic old church building. Unable then to depict the horse’s head properly, his solution was to show the animal eating, its head hidden in the tall grass.

Paul Ellinger had made a different choice and attended the local River Brethren Church, which was also close to the Yeager farm. In fact, many of the Yeager’s neighbors were members of that plain sect and were people much admired and respected by both Ellinger boys. While the River Brethren Church did not have the “interesting activities” associated with the Lutheran Church, it did have Love Feast observances. These religious services were held at a neighborhood farm, with the men sleeping in the barn and the women in the house. David accompanied his brother to these and remembers well the fellowship and the long tables loaded with large bowls of good food. Another of his early paintings, “Love thy Neighbor” (1935), shows the interior of the church with the women sitting on the left and the men on the right, their large black hats hanging on pegs above their head.

"Mocha Pitcher with Bluebottles," 1957 (From the Collection of Mr. & Mrs. Charles Steinberg)
The plain people and their activities would be the theme of dozens of his paintings in the years to come, for growing up in the small Pennsylvania-German communities of Trappe and Graterford where he worked, played, and worshiped among the River Brethren and Mennonites left David Ellinger with an abiding respect and affection for their values and culture. During these formative years he developed two other interests—in gardens and antiques—that would also become an important part of his life and work.

Paintings such as “The Secret Garden” (1962) and “Zinnias in Spatter Pitcher” (1944) attest to his love of flowers and plants. Like his interest in the plain people, his involvement with gardening is a direct result of country living; when he was growing up the garb of country women may have been sober, but their gardens were not. Especially in Pennsylvania-German areas, colorful, showy plants such as coleuses were prized, and farm women freely shared clippings from—and their knowledge of—these and other house and garden plants with friends and neighbors.

David Ellinger came to know well three women, the Slotterer sisters, who were friends of his Grandmother Yeager’s. These women lived from the sale of boxwood plants and also had a bountiful truck garden. They “planted by the almanac,” and he learned a great deal about gardening from them. And, when he worked on the Baldwin farm he soon found out that the housekeeper, Martha Ann (a native of England), and Emerson Baldwin’s business partner, Mariah Walsh, were familiar with English gardens and had a wealth of information about how, when, and where to plant. It is knowledge he has used well in the years since, always keeping beautiful gardens for his own enjoyment and that of his friends.

A knowledge of plants was not all he learned from the Slotterer sisters. Quiet but kind and compassionate, they impressed him deeply, living as they did in what he describes as “the old way”: planting, canning, preserving, cooking and baking much as their forebears had done. They were the last, he says, “of an old world.” Their Trappe house was filled with beautiful antiques, and their descriptions of their house in Connecticut (the family was from New England) with its grained and decorated woodwork particularly intrigued him. Soon after he began living with Mary Law, David started buying small, antique items he liked for their beauty or utility, or because of some association they had with his grandmother’s house or with the old way of life he had seen at the Slotterers’. Although when he first started collecting it was with no thought of selling, going to country sales and making purchases from his neighbors soon led to him doing just that, and in 1932 he opened his first shop.

This was made possible by the move to a larger house, across the street but close to where they had been renting. Here there was room for a studio for David, and he also had the use of the small barn next door where he sold his antiques. A local man, Fred Grimison, a furniture restorer himself and knowledgeable about antiques and local history, made a sign for the shop. He had taken an interest in David, making him an easel and cutting pieces of wood for him to paint on when he could not afford to buy canvas or art board.
David Ellinger and Mary Law moved to "The Old Still House" (supposedly once the site of a bootlegging operation) on Fifth Avenue in Trappe in 1934. Still standing, it is near the Trappe School David attended as a boy.

MENTORS AND FRIENDS

Relating kindnesses such as these and saying there always seemed to be people interested in him and concerned for his well-being, David Ellinger is quick to acknowledge the help he received over the years. In the spring of 1933, he and Mary Law (Mrs. Davidson died the year before) left Graterford, beginning a series of moves that would find them living in three different locations in the adjoining towns of Trappe and Collegeville before he was able to buy a house in Trappe in 1945.19 It was during this period, in 1934, that one of the most significant events in his life as an artist came about, the result of support given artists under the programs of the Works Progress Administration.

A government agency established "to provide work relief for employable persons in need,"20 many are familiar with WPA projects which built roads, schools, post offices, and other public buildings, but few know of its arts program. This included projects in art, writing, music, theater, and historical records. David first heard of this program—and the fact that he might be eligible for employment under it—in 1934, from the social worker who visited Mary Law in connection with the public assistance she received because of her blindness. When he learned too that his cousin, Ada Funke, an actress employed in a WPA theater project, was a friend of Mary Curren,21 the Pennsylvania state director of the Federal Art Project, he got her to arrange an interview for him.

Impressed by his work, Mary Curren hired him for one of the "creative projects" that was a part of the Public Works of Art Project, and he worked at an easel for approximately nine months.22 One of his paintings from this period, "Scene," was included in an exhibition held at the Corcoran Gallery of Art in Washington, D.C. in April and May of 1934. It was an exhibit arranged "to give an accurate cross-section of the work done under the Project throughout the United States and in the various mediums in which the artists . . . worked."23

When the easel-work project ended David was interviewed for a job with another WPA project, the Index of American Design. Its aim was "to compile material for a nation-wide pictorial survey of design in the American decorative, useful and folk arts from their inception to about 1890."24 The objects included in the Index were either photographed or, more generally, illustrated in renderings or drawings, and "each drawing was accompanied by a data sheet, filled in by research workers."25 Over the six-year life of the project (1936-1942), 20,000 Index plates and 7,000 photographs were produced; they are now housed in the National Gallery of Art in Washington, D.C. A monumental work, "the Index did more than record the 'usable past.' It popularized, as museums and art associations had never done, American folk art."26
Earthenware flower pot with slip decoration; one of the renderings done by David Ellinger for the Index of American Design. He earned eighty-five dollars a month while working for the WPA.

The state supervisor of the Pennsylvania Index of American Design was Frances Lichten, artist, author, and folk art expert. It was she who interviewed David, saying he “was just what they were looking for.” He was immediately put to work making renderings of Pennsylvania German ceramics from the collection at the Philadelphia Museum of Art. “What was insisted upon [in this work] was strict objectivity, accurate drawing, clarity of construction, exact proportions, and faithful rendering of material, color and texture so that each Index drawing might stand as a surrogate for the object.”27 It was a demanding job, but through it David learned a great deal about painting, the only formal instruction he ever had. His teacher much of the time was Frances Lichten, who had had art training. She taught him how to round and shadow objects, and the techniques of glazing and scumbling (methods of modifying the tone of a painted area by overlaying parts with a wash of transparent or opaque color).

The two became friends as well as colleagues, and when her influential work The Folk Art of Rural Pennsylvania appeared in 1946, she inscribed a copy “To David Ellinger, in grateful appreciation” for the help he had given her in its compilation. For not only was he the owner of several of the folk art items shown in it, but it was he who took her to many of the places—especially in the Oley Valley and other areas of Berks County—where she found much of the material for the monumental study one expert called “easily the handsomest, most comprehensive, and most important book [on the subject] to date.”28

Another skill learned by David during this period, that of theorem painting, was self-taught, but it would later bring about a major change in his career. Taking note of this change in a recent interview is the well-known lecturer, scholar, and folk art expert, Dr. Donald A. Shelley, who first met David Ellinger through Frances Lichten when both artists were working on the Index project.29 Asked to comment on his artistic strengths, Dr. Shelley says that David “has an extremely sharp eye . . . [and] is a good craftsman; he knows his materials and his paintings . . . show that.” He goes to say that “one of the things he

“Flowers in Canton Bowl,” 1980; theorem painting (Collection of Merle Wenrich)

[David] is particularly proud of is that he is a versatile person. He has worked not only with oils on canvas but also . . . in pastel, in watercolor and over the last twenty or thirty years, very heavily in paintings on velvet.”

Theorem, or velvet painting, had been popular in the first half of the nineteenth century, especially with upper class young women who attended the fashionable seminaries of the day. Old theorems brought high prices when they came on the market, and David was familiar with them because of his antiques business. But he knew nothing about the techniques used to produce them when he received his first commission for one around 1940. This commission came from Dorothy Pratt, the already-mentioned friend of Beatrice Kaufman, and with it David began to research the subject and experiment with making them. This involved designing and cutting stencils from stiff paper, with a different stencil for each shape and color; these were placed on the cloth one at a time in the proper sequence, and color applied through the openings.30

“Prize of the Season,” 1962; theorem painting (Collection of Merle Wenrich)
When, later in his career, he began devoting more time to theorem painting, he was so successful he was not only considered by experts to be one of the very best in the field, but in the words of one expert “perhaps the best known contemporary painter of theorems on velvet as well as on cotton or paper.” This same authority goes on to point out that “his sensitively stenciled and painted pictures may be mistaken for antique examples, even though he does not try to reproduce period paintings.”

Despite that acknowledgement, some of David Ellinger’s theorems have been passed off by others—some knowingly, some not—as antiques. He says that for years he could not sell theorems to some dealers if he signed them, but nonetheless always included his initials in an inconspicuous spot such as on a flower tendril or in the foliage. After his theorems began bringing good prices at art sales however, he retained the “D.Y.E.” on the front but also signed his full name on the back. Some years ago he was at an auction where one of his theorems was sold for $1,600 as an antique. When he made himself known to the purchaser and identified the work as his it was immediately resold, still bringing $800 when it was announced that he had painted it.


That aspect of his career was still far in the future though when his friendship with the Kaufmans and Pratts began after an unusual first meeting. Both couples owned farms in the New Hope area of Bucks County, as did a number of New Yorkers prominent in the world of the arts and the theater in the 1930s. In order to furnish their New York City and Bucks County houses Beatrice Kaufman and Dorothy Pratt scoured southeastern Pennsylvania in search of antiques and folk art. On one of these shopping trips they bought some of David Ellinger’s paintings from Harry Applegate, a Pottstown antiques dealer. When, on a subsequent trip the women sought information about David (including where he could be found), Applegate concocted the story of an aged and bearded rustic living on an isolated farm where, retired from his normal rural pursuits, he was busy painting the scenes on display in his [Applegate’s] store.

Not satisfied with that information and still looking for an address, the women made inquiries elsewhere and were eventually directed to the house in Collegeville where David and Mary Law were living at the time, and where he had his studio and antiques shop. Surprised and confused at first because they were expecting to meet a much older man, they soon saw the humor in the situation and recounted the story many times over the years. Always smartly dressed and smoking incessantly (both carried long cigarette holders) Beatrice Kaufman and Dorothy Pratt would make many more trips to Collegeville and Trappe, and would often entertain David and Mary in Bucks County. Visits to the Kaufman farm there were always interesting (on one occasion the door was opened by a balding “butler”: Harpo Marx without his trademark curly wig), but for David, who always had an eye for beautiful things, visits to the Pratt farm were a special treat. Pratt, a photographer for House and Garden, often took pictures for the magazine there, and then various props and furnishings would be arranged in such a way that the place looked like a stage or movie set.

BUYING AND SELLING FOLK ART AND ANTIQUES

According to the late Earl F. Robacker, noted collector, scholar, and folk-art expert, “perhaps the first recognition that there really was an art of the American folk, as distinguished from tutored art, came with the Centennial of 1876, in Philadelphia… [There] for the first time the bars of insularity… were let down, and the component parts of America had a chance to look at one another and at what they were doing.” In 1926 the sesquicentennial celebration was also held in Philadelphia, “and probably the most significant single facet of that exposition was the work of one person, Hattie Brunner.”

An antiques dealer in Lancaster County, Mrs. Brunner had access to, and a great knowledge of, “the choicest specimens of folk work the Dutchland could produce.”

But the event which impresses Dr. Shelley as that which really gave folk art respectability was an exhibit, “Art of the Common Man,” held at the Museum of Modern Art in 1932. Personally acquainted with most of those active in the New York City art world then, Shelley says many were already collecting such art: “They had not only discovered Pennsylvania folk art, but folk art from Africa and from other areas of the world. They were beginning to draw a parallel between the simplicity and stylization of modern art, and the arts of these early peoples. However, this exhibit was totally American art and this new term ‘art of the common man’ stuck with this whole period and this subject for quite a few years.”

Dr. Shelley also reminds us that this was the time when the Abby Aldrich Rockefeller Folk Art Collection (now in Williamsburg, Virginia) was being assembled. The Williamsburg Restoration Project was begun in 1929, and later projects along the same lines were the Sturbridge Museum in Massachusetts, the Farmers’ Museum at Cooperstown, New York, the Henry F. Du Pont Winterthur Museum in Delaware, and the Henry Ford Museum and Greenfield Village in Dearborn, Michigan (where, until his retirement in 1976, Dr. Shelley served successively as curator of fine arts, executive director, and president).

It was, in short, a time of great activity for those buying and selling Americana, and David’s antiques business—begun as a sideline—prospered and began to take up a great deal of his time. Many of his customers were other dealers, for David, according to Dr. Shelley, was known as a “picker,” or “person who generates contacts with private people, farmers or country people who may have family things that would be of interest. David was frequently the
first person in line who was able to get things directly out of houses. Hence, people watched David’s stock very closely, because they had a chance to pick things they couldn’t find anywhere else.”

In addition to dealers, some of the outstanding collectors of the day visited his shop and made substantial purchases. Among them were Louise Du Pont Crowninshield who was active in the restoration of historic buildings in New Castle, Delaware (many of the items she bought from David are displayed there); Mrs. Crowninshield’s brother, Henry F. Du Pont of Winterthur Museum fame; Pierre Du Pont’s private secretary, Titus C. Geesey, whose valuable collection of Pennsylvania-German artifacts is now housed in the Philadelphia Museum of Art; and Albert C. Barnes.

Dr. Barnes, whose collection of Impressionist paintings is one of the finest in the world, was also an early collector of American folk art—for his home, Ker-Feal Farm, as well as for his museum—and did much to generate the same interest in others. When he was only seventeen and still living in Graterford, David was introduced to Dr. Barnes by Gerald Lollinger, an art restorer. Lollinger, who had worked in various European museums including the Louvre, was living in the area and advertising in the local newspaper. Although he had no work for Lollinger, David sought him out to get an opinion on his paintings. Lollinger, in turn, introduced him to Dr. Barnes, who was impressed enough to offer to send him to Europe for study. Afraid to go that far for fear he would be homesick, David declined.

Dr. Barnes became a customer a short time later when David sent him a penny postal card with a drawing of a sgraffito plate he had for sale. As a result, several days
later when he was in the middle of a dental appointment both he and the dentist were surprised by a visit from Barnes, dressed in bright orange trousers, emerald green jacket, and blue beret. With him was his assistant, Violette de Mazia, equally colorful in gypsy costume and blue beret. After that David always looked for items he thought would interest the Barneses, many times arriving at Ker-Feal Farm “like a peddler,” with various parcels whose contents would be spread out for their inspection and approval.40

Mrs. Barnes had a special fondness for mugs with frogs or toads on the bottom, and he always looked for these for her collection. (Said to have been developed by an English physician, the shock of finding the creature after the contents were consumed was supposed to effect a cure for various ailments.) From time to time David also purchased paintings that Barnes chose not to keep in his collection. On one occasion, for example, he purchased six paintings by Charles Demuth for $900 and then resold them for $250 each. Dr. Barnes remained David’s good friend and a good customer until his death (in an automobile accident) in 1954. In fact, on the day he died David was in New York buying a Schimmel carving for him.41

Other major collectors have also maintained the same kind of long-term client­friend relationship with David Ellinger. Two of them, Richard and Rosemarie Machner of Berks County, are the authors of Just for Nice. Carving and Whittling Magic of Southeastern Pennsylvania, and were instrumental in arranging an exhibition of the same name at the Berks County Historical Society in Reading in 1991. Many of the items displayed in that show (and in the book) came from their own highly regarded collection. Saying they are glad they met David when they first began acquiring folk art, they acknowledge the advice, encouragement, and assistance he has given them over the years, and make special mention of his ability to spot the right thing” at an auction or in a shop. They admire, too, the eye for color so evident in his theorems. It was seeing— and buying—these at various auctions that led them to seek David out and was the beginning of their long friendship with him.

Another major collection of American folk art and antiques that was assembled with David Ellinger’s close cooperation is that of George and Florence Dittmar of Monmouth County, New Jersey. Their house, parts of which date to the mid-18th century, was featured in the April, 1978 issue of The Magazine Antiques. Since many of its beautiful old furnishings were acquired from David and many of its walls are decorated with his paintings and theorems, the owners refer to it as the “House of David.” Florence Dittmar, who says “It was a wonderful day for us when we met David,” goes on to add that their “things reflect much of the beauty that is David . . . a wonderful friend and a very, very fine person.” George Dittmar, who speaks of a fifty-year love affair with antiques, considers him to be one of the most knowledgeable people in the country in all areas of collecting. Noting that for various reasons he and his wife did not always buy everything David recommended to them, he also admits that “later we often regretted our decision.”

One such recommendation turned down by them (and later regretted) involved a painted chest that was later the subject of much controversy. It was originally acquired by an antiques dealer named Billy Greenberg in 1936 at a farm sale near Kutztown, Pennsylvania. He sold it to a New York lawyer and when the lawyer died his sister sold the chest back to Greenberg, who in turn sold it to David Ellinger for $5,000, a great deal of money at the time. David offered it first to the Dittmars, and when they decided against purchasing it, sold it to another dealer for $6,250.

The controversy began when the chest later came to auction. Among those attending that sale were Hattie Brunner, whose seminal role in the field of Pennsylvania-German folk art has already been mentioned; David and Betty Bronstein of Harrisburg, noted collectors who were also David Ellinger’s good friends and clients; and David himself. Without David’s knowledge the Bronsteins asked Hattie Brunner her opinion of the piece, and she called it “an Ellinger chest”; a comment overheard by many. The Bronsteins bid on it anyway, getting it at a bargain price for an antique. Learning of Mrs. Brunner’s remark, David explained the provenance of the chest to the Bronsteins, who added it to their extensive collection. In spite of the incident, however, they remain on excellent terms, with Dr. Bronstein saying he is “pleased to be David’s friend, and considers him to be an excellent artist, especially of theorems . . . the best in the country.”

The story of the painted chest does not end there, however. Some months after they bought it, the Bronsteins suggested to folk-art expert Monroe Fabian that he include it in a book he was writing on the subject. Fabian declined to do so, for he too had heard of Hattie Brunner’s comment. Ironically, Fabian, who rejected the Greenberg chest because of doubts about its authenticity, accepted as genuine and included in his book, Pennsylvania German Painted Chests, a chest that actually was David Ellinger’s work, attributing it instead to the “Oley Valley, c1820.”

This chest had been purchased by a dealer at a sale near Bernville in Berks County. Devoid of decoration, it was a weathered gray color and covered with chicken dirt. Saying he and his wife wanted it for their own use, he commissioned David to paint and decorate it. On chests that were to be decorated for a particular customer there was often an ornamental frame, called a cartouche, with the owner’s name and perhaps the date painted on it. As he cleaned this particular chest David saw the outline of a cartouche, but it had not been filled in. He had the chest for nearly a year, doing a meticulous job with the painting and sponging; when he finished he signed his name on the inside of the lid. Later the dealer sold it as an antique—a not uncommon practice—and it eventually turned up in Fabian’s book.
DAVID ELLINGER, ARTIST: AN EVALUATION

As already mentioned, Dr. Donald A. Shelley first met David Ellinger when he was working with Frances Lichten on the Index of American Design. What has not been mentioned is the fact that it was Shelley who made David’s work known to the owner of the Weyhe Gallery in New York City. With his photographs of David’s paintings Shelley initiated a chain of events that culminated in David’s three one-man shows there in 1945-46; shows that generated the positive reviews quoted earlier, and that also proved to be a great financial success. His close connection with the artist’s career and his unquestioned expertise undoubtedly qualify Dr. Shelley to evaluate David’s work and place in the folk-art world, and he generously agreed to do so.

Much as he called attention to the “Art of the Common Man” exhibit which he feels helped give folk art legitimacy, he mentions a motion picture and an issue of a magazine that contributed to its popularity. *Come Live With Me*, “a charming romantic comedy” made in 1941, starred Jimmy Stewart as a starving writer who marries Hedy Lamarr to keep her from being deported. The couple live in a Bucks County farmhouse furnished with beautiful antiques. A section of the June, 1941 double issue of *House and Garden* features an article about the movie, and is devoted entirely to “the Pennsylvania Dutch influence.” Shelley also reminds us it was at this time, as a result of the movie, that Peter Hunt revived the tradition of painted furniture in New England. Hunt’s popularity and the furniture he painted and sold in New York City stores did much to encourage a wave of interest in the decorative arts and in antique china, glassware, and pottery.

It was the right time, then, for the debut of an artist whose work was, in the words of Dr. Shelley, “a celebration of Pennsylvania folk life itself”; an artist “interested in the way people lived and how the antique objects [that he collected, the] paintings, costumes, pottery, and tin, fitted into everyday life.” Enumerating his strengths, Shelley says “the thing I am interested in most about David is that he is a very creative person. . . . I found that David’s paintings, as I knew them in the ‘40s, usually stemmed from some particular interest that he had: either in a smokehouse, or in a bed of tulips or of phlox or azaleas or whatever; or a wonderful setting in the countryside. . . . He is an extremely observant person. He has an excellent memory for details, and I guess some artists I can think of in this connection would be painters like Van Gogh or Cezanne. You find a painting that concerns some subject that . . . interested them particularly and they will do a central painting of that subject. Then, over the next couple of months or years they will repeat it, over and over again. They will come back to that and redo it, and refine it and
The movie *Come Live With Me* and this magazine issue which featured an article about it did much to stimulate interest in American folk art. (Courtesy of House and Garden; copyright 1941, 1969, by The Conde Nast Publications)

rework it, recompose it and even recolor it to represent different times of the day."

Shelley goes on to say that, in his opinion, "David Ellinger is really perpetuating the story of the country folk of eastern Pennsylvania, particularly of Montgomery, Lancaster, and Berks Counties. But he is certainly not 'naive' and his is not what I would call a practiced naiveté, as with Grandma Moses, where you have an elderly lady, or even with Hattie Brunner, another elderly lady, doing what she can do on the basis of her keen memory. With David it is much more involved. David is familiar with the techniques of the great artists of all periods. He is a versatile, very versatile, artist. He can understand . . . and work in the styles of any of those people, but what he did was develop a style of his own that fitted the subject matter that he was painting. That, I think, is what makes his work so valuable from a historical point of view. David's reputation cannot help but continue to increase."

Expressing disappointment that David Ellinger was passed by when the Whitney Museum assembled exhibits in 1974 ("The Flowering of American Folk Art") and 1980 ("Folk Painters of Three Centuries") that did include Pennsylvania painted furniture and folk art, Shelley attributes David's omission to the fact that he is still living, a reasonable position for a museum to take. "But again," he adds, "I guess we Pennsylvanians suffer a little bit from a 'pro-New England' strategy that was set in place by the first historians in the early part of this century, when mostly the Pilgrims and their story superseded everything else in American history."

Asked where David Ellinger stands in relation to others in his field, Shelley explains that he would be classified as "a regional Pennsylvania folklife painter," adding that "the thing that would best sum up his position would be to say that . . . painters like Edward Redfield or Daniel Garber really put Bucks County on the map, [and] you could likewise say that Andrew Wyeth and his family put Chester County on the map. You might also say that Hattie Brunner in Reinholds put Lancaster County and Lebanon County on the map. And I think that David's milieu would largely be Montgomery, Berks, and Lancaster Counties. It's kind of curious that prior to the mid-19th century, and even back in the 18th century, there is very little in the way of pictorial, visual material that details the Pennsylvania landscape. When you come down into the 19th century you will find a few foreign artists such as Charles-Alexandre Lesueur and Auguste Köllner, but David really fills in a theme that is going to be of more and more interest."

Shelley goes on to say that "we really haven't had (and I may be stepping on some toes here) . . . a first rate painter of 'folklife in Pennsylvania' for the last century. One that really shows you what you would like to know about Pennsylvania life, about the interior of the house, about the way people lived, how they dressed, the way they worked, and so forth." Pointing out that David's paintings do "show the way of life of the Pennsylvania German folk in the 1940s and 1950s," he concludes by saying: "His strength over the years will be that his paintings will become more and more valuable for the messages that they impart, and for the very personal approach that he took towards his subject matter."
“Harvest,” Fruitville farm in Montgomery County, by David Ellinger. An example of “pictorial, visual material that details the Pennsylvania landscape.”
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ENDNOTES

1This appreciation is the result of many meetings with David that took place in the last half of 1991. I write not from the point of view of the critic, but from the perspective of one who has been touched by the beauty and simplicity of his art. No effort has been made to delve into every aspect of his life and career. What I have attempted is to include that which may help provide the basis for a greater appreciation of his art.

In his burning desire to become an artist, David Ellinger has proven, I suggest, that success comes to those who are so committed to a calling that they cannot escape answering it regardless of whatever fears might haunt them, or the despair and hopelessness of their circumstances of life and time.

Perhaps Anton Chekhov expressed it best: “He who is without desire, without hope, and without fear cannot be an artist.”

2The November, 1951 issue; unframed, the prints were $18 each.

3Dr. White brought the young artist to the attention of the oil painting committee of the Phila. Art Alliance, which scheduled a one-man show for him that ran from Feb. 22-March 12, 1944. A Nov. 30, 1943 letter (among David Ellinger’s papers) from Julius Bloch, an outstanding artist of the day, notified David of the committee’s decision, adding: “Every member of it was delighted with your pictures.” Of them Bloch added: “They are so bright, fresh and interesting in pattern and motif.”

4Following the Art Alliance show David had the first one-man show mounted by the Norristown, Pa., Art League (May 26-28, 1944), quickly followed by an exhibition at the Carl Schurz Memorial foundation at 420 Chestnut Street in Philadelphia for six months beginning in August 1944 (the first such show the Foundation had sponsored).


7Ibid.

8Ibid. Baum called the exhibit “a success story about a youth who had never hoped to succeed.”

9Ann Hark, unpublished work, Nov. 1944.


11This was the first such show sponsored by a community center.

12Mary Law had been raised by a Quaker family who lived near Chadds Ford in Chester County. Later she went to live with a farm family and worked in their stall in Philadelphia’s Reading Market until she was seventeen, when she began her job with the Davidsoms.

13Described by David as a lovely, regal woman always beautifully dressed as though ready to receive visitors, it was Mrs. Davidson who bought him his first suit with long trousers. Sixteen at the time, he remembers it vividly: “On a visit to one of my aunts I was wearing the long trousers and she cried, realizing that her dead sister’s boy was growing up. People were more sentimental in those days.”

14Located at the northeast corner of Gravel Pike and Bridge Street, the store has long since been demolished. David also worked for a time at Heaveners’ Store (directly across the street and also gone now), and at the American Store in Green Lane, Pa., where his grandmother had sometimes shopped.

15Schwenksville High School served the community as more than a school. Functioning much as a community center, it had a number of exhibits where local people could show their handiwork. A number of local amateur artists entered this particular show, and David proudly recalls that one of his early paintings was displayed next to one by the well-known and respected inventor of the bronchoscope, Dr. Chevalier Jackson. Dr. Jackson saw promise in David and encouraged him to become an artist.

16David gave this painting to the Reverend William O. Fegely, who served as pastor of the church from 1898 until 1943; his daughter Alma was one of David’s favorite Sunday School teachers. The painting now hangs in the church parsonage.

17The first Davidson-Law residence in Graterford was rented from Mary Fisher and was located at what is now 655 Gravel Pike. The second house was rented from Hannah Moyer and is today numbered 674 Gravel Pike.

18Mr. Grimison later founded the Trappe Historical Society and was...
its first president.

"They lived for a year in a building close to the Collegeville-Trappe
borough line that was a toll house on the Philadelphia-Reading Turnpike
until tolls were eliminated in 1900; it was demolished in 1941. In 1934
David and Mary moved to Fifth Ave., Trappe, to a property known as
the old Still House, because a previous owner was supposed to have
conducted a bootlegging operation there. This house still stands, as does
the near old Trappe town building that David and Paul attended when
they lived with the Yeagars (it is no longer used as a school, however).
In 1938 David and Mary moved to 62 Second Ave., Collegeville,
where they rented a house from two elderly brothers. (It, too, has since
been torn down.) While he was living there David painted, decorated,
and signed several frakturs carved by a local amateur craftsman in the
style of the famous Jacob Schimmel, whose works even then were
expensive. David gave them to some of his best customers as Christmas
gifts, and later some were passed off as originals, much as were some of
his theorems and frakturs.

With the payment from his successful Weyhe Gallery exhibitions,
David made his first purchase of real estate in 1945, buying a substantial
property at Seventh Ave. and Main St. in Trappe. Mary Law died there
in 1948, and David sold the property in late 1951 and bought a farm
in Birchrunville, Pa., where he lived for a year before moving to rented
quarters in the Town Hall in Royersford, Pa.

In 1956 David moved from Royersford to the Hood Mansion in
Limerick, Pa.; it was occupied at the time by a Philadelphia lawyer, a
descendant of John McClellan Hood, who built it in 1834-5. It was at
this time that a young man, Richard Yost, who was a skilled craftsman
able to repair and refinish furniture and make picture frames, came to
work for David; he and his family continue, even today, to make their
home with David on Ridge Pike near Pottstown.

But before they moved to that location in July, 1965, David and
Richard moved at least six other times. Leaving Hood Mansion in 1959
they lived in Port Kennedy, Pa.; at "Walnut Hill" in New Castle, Del.;
in Royersford, Pa.; in a house near Spring City, Pa.; on the Wolfe Farm
near Fairview Village, Pa.; and again in the Spring City property.

*William F. McDonald, Federal Relief Administration and the Arts
the WPA are referred to this book, subtitled The Origins and Adminis-
trative History of the Arts Projects of the Works Progress Administra-
tion.

*The two became acquainted through their mutual interest in the
theater. Ada Funkе's superior was Jasper Deeter (founder of the Hedgerow
Theatre in Rose Valley, Pa.), director of the Federal Theatre Project for
Pennsylvania and New Jersey.

*David supports the view that the great art that Dr. Barnes had
brought him, suggesting 'the color is not right,' or that a defect in
the firing of a ceramic piece or in a blown glass item was damage and
not in the making of an article. But in the end he accepted most of the
items for his collection. He knew I brought him only the very best.

"David attended classes at the Barnes Foundation in 1950 and 1951.
At thirty-seven he was older than the other students, and did not take
part in the social life of the student body. This failure to befriended
changed when they learned, at a "graduation" social at Ker-Feal Farm,
that he was acquainted with Dr. and Mrs. Barnes. When Dr. Barnes
spoke of you with great pride and affection." (Ellinger Papers.)

"David remembers that Harpo Marx's wife, Susan, collected Leeds
ware with a yellow tulip design which, even in those days, "was scarce
as hen's teeth."

*Robacker, p. 23.

*ibid., p. 26.

*ibid., p. 27.

*R. Barnes was always an adolescent in David's eyes. He was
always ready with a joke. He would kid me about some of the things
I brought him, suggesting 'the color is not right,' or that a defect in
the firing of a ceramic piece or in a blown glass item was damage and
not in the making of an article. But in the end he accepted most of the
items for his collection. He knew I brought him only the very best.
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At thirty-seven he was older than the other students, and did not take
part in the social life of the student body. This failure to befriended
changed when they learned, at a "graduation" social at Ker-Feal Farm,
that he was acquainted with Dr. and Mrs. Barnes. When Dr. Barnes
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ware with a yellow tulip design which, even in those days, "was scarce
as hen's teeth."
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STUDEBAKER AND STUTZ:
The Evolution of Dunker Entrepreneurs
by Donald F. Durnbaugh

In the popular history by Frederick Lewis Allen, The Big Change: America Transforms Itself, 1900-1950 (1952), the author described the evolution of the automobile industry: “First was the phase of numerous competition. During these first two decades of the century automobile manufacturers were legion. Hundreds of mechanically minded men scrabbled for capital and set up their little factories to produce cars: bicycle makers like Pope and Alexander Winton, electric-company employees like Ford, plumber’s supply men like David Dunbar Buick, wagon builders like the associates of Clement Studebaker, axle manufacturers like Harry C. Stutz.”

It is with the last two named—the Studebaker family and Stutz—that we are concerned. It is not all that generally known that both the Studebakers and Harry C. Stutz were closely identified with the Brethren movement. Known throughout the 19th century as part of the “Plain People,” the German Baptist Brethren (nicknamed Dunkers or Dunkards) were often mistakenly identified in the public view with related groups such as the Mennonites and their relatives, the Amish.

Like these Anabaptist-rooted religious bodies, they had a European background and a penchant for nonconformity. Unlike Mennonites and Amish, they had largely assimilated by the first decades of the 20th century into the main-stream of American society. In fact, tensions over the adoption of programs for home and foreign missions led to serious schism in the early 1880s. By 1908 the numerically largest group had dropped the “German Baptist Brethren” appellation to take the name “Church of the Brethren,” by which it is still known.

A subplot in this drama of acculturation was played by two Dunker families from Ohio, individuals from which achieved national, even international, fame as manufacturers of wagons and automobiles in Indiana in the late 19th and early 20th centuries; these were the Studebaker brothers of South Bend, and Harry C. Stutz of Indianapolis. In both cases, values derived directly from their religious inheritance were attributed by them and by others for their rise from obscurity to prominence. Without attempting more than a brief sketch of the business history of these men—important in its own right—this essay will look at their early years for clues to entrepreneurial success. It will also refer to the strain that this success placed on the relations of the Studebakers and Stutz with the strict religious regimen that formed them.

THE STUDEBAKERS

Although linked forever with South Bend, Indiana, the Studebaker story begins farther East. The European ancestors of the famed wagon makers lived near Solingen (noted for its steelware) in the Lower Rhine area of northwestern Germany. The first Studebakers arrived in North America in 1736 on the vessel Harle. Brothers Peter and Clement, with a cousin Henry, “qualified” on September 1, 1736. By mid-18th century, the family was in York County, Pennsylvania; by the end of the century one branch of the family lived in Adams County, near Gettysburg, where
John Clement Studebaker (1799-1877), the father of the famous Studebaker wagon makers, was born in 1799. He established a blacksmithing and wagon-making shop there by 1830. A trusting and generous soul, J. C. Studebaker was soon in financial difficulties because of co-signing notes for impecunious acquaintances. When these persons defaulted, Studebaker had to make good the debts. According to family tradition, this occasioned financial failure and the decision in 1835 to move farther west. The relocation from Adams County was accomplished in conveyances of his own manufacture, including a large Conestoga-type wagon drawn by four horses. (The sturdy wagon has been preserved in a South Bend museum.)

In the words of a family historian: "Years later (during the Civil War), Studebaker wagons came back to these fields and the forests where John had created their prototype, but under circumstances that devout Tunker could neither have visualized nor approved." The reference of course is to the portentous and sanguine battle of Gettysburg, where captured Studebaker wagons from Gen. George Meade’s army were used by the Confederate forces under Gen. Robert E. Lee to evacuate their wounded.6

The new location of the family was in the vicinity of Ashland, Ohio. After their arrival in June, 1835, John Studebaker and his family began to wrest a livelihood from the pioneer area. Proceeds from the first crop on their 160-acre farm were insufficient to cover the needs of the family and repay remaining debts from Pennsylvania; they had to give up the land. After the failure of the next effort, a milling enterprise, Studebaker attempted to better his lot with a rudimentary blacksmith’s shop. The older sons added to the family’s income by working away from home. All narratives of this period agree that the family was quite poor despite all of the hard labor. Because his customers were themselves too poor to pay their debts for his blacksmithing labors, Studebaker found himself in arrears with his own creditors and suppliers. This was doubly painful, because the Brethren ethic to which the Studebakers adhered stressed the obligation to work hard and avoid debt. “Owe no man anything but to love one another” was the motto that John C. Studebaker had hanging over his forge.

Nevertheless, despite their economic straits, the simple Studebaker cabin was noted for hospitality. A neighboring innkeeper complained bitterly that he had no possibility of making money so long as the Studebakers kept on offering overnight lodging and meals without charge to migrants passing through on their way West. A much-cited case found the family providing accommodation for sixteen nuns who were traveling through the area. This was in a structure that measured twenty-one feet by sixteen feet, with a sleeping loft overhead for the ten children (three others died in infancy).7

John Studebaker was loyally supported in his freehandedness by his wife, Rebecca Mohler Studebaker, whom he had met at a Dunker meeting. The Mohler family had long been active and noted in Brethren circles, with early connections also to the famed Ephrata Community (founded in 1732), the first Protestant monastic society in the colonies. (Some of the descendants of the Mohler family in Hagerstown, Maryland, involved themselves in automobile manufacture.)
The Studebaker dwelling was also the site of regular Brethren worship services. It was quite typical for Brethren of this period to meet in homes until their numbers warranted the construction of a simple frame or stone meetinghouse, unadorned by steeple, pews, or altar. It is said that to make room for these meetings, the furniture from the cabin had to be moved to the woodshed. The large Studebaker family presumably added to the size of the young congregation as well as to the crowded conditions of the meetings.

By mid-century, economic trials prompted further removals to the West by members of the Studebaker family. Evidently the first to make the attempt was the oldest son, Henry (1826-1895), who worked for a time in 1847 in Goshen, Indiana, returning on foot after failing to make his way. He returned to northern Indiana in 1850, this time accompanied by his brother Clement (1831-1901), and this time to stay. Other members of the family soon followed, using wagons of their own making. The father had himself inspected the location and was favorably impressed by the fact that other members of the Brethren faith had previously settled there. It is said that John C. Studebaker supported himself by cutting wood and selling it, before setting up another shop.

After early ventures in varied jobs (including school-teaching for Clement), the two older brothers, Henry and Clement, established a blacksmith shop in February, 1852. Their total capital was sixty-eight dollars and two sets of tools; it is said that forty dollars of this amount was a loan from Henry's wife. Family tradition has it that the income for their first day's work was twenty-five cents.

A younger brother, John Mohler Studebaker (1833-1907), left in 1853 to try his fortune in the gold rush in California. He paid his way across the continent by donating a wagon which he constructed using iron work forged by his older brothers. This was one of three wagons made by the young firm during the first year. John Mohler made his fortune in Hangtown, California, not, as it turned out, by panning gold, but by using his skills to make desperately needed wheelbarrows for the miners.

In the meantime Henry and Clement developed an expanding business in building farm wagons. From the first they were determined to use only high quality materials and building techniques, aiming—as their slogan had it—to "always give a little more than you promise." Their growing reputation for sturdy wagons and honest business practices gradually brought them success.

But with success came problems which led to the withdrawal of Henry from the firm he co-founded. It seems that the brothers were soon awarded contracts by the United States military for wagons used to combat the Latter Day Saints in the West. This was at the time of the Mormon War of 1857-1858. As the migrating Mormons had also begun purchasing Studebaker wagons for the trek to their kingdom of Deseret, this posed an ethical dilemma. The teachings of the Brethren movement had always been against involvement in military pursuits. Those becoming members were asked if they would follow the historic nonresistant position of the church.

The problem was described in these terms by a family historian: "Orders came in ever increasing numbers from transients bound for Oregon, California, and the substantial..."
Mormon settlements in Utah. Ironically, other orders came from army regiments ordered to suppress that colony of 15,000 souls near the Great Salt Lake. This anomalous interest undoubtedly forced Henry out of the partnership. A good Dunkard could not help arm one side, much less both.10

An unsigned biography of Clement Studebaker referred to this crisis: “Under the influence of the persuasion of his Dunker brethren and yielding to the inclinations of his own heart, Henry expressed a desire to retire from the business which he and Clem had established, and which had already begun to yield good returns, and to go to farming.”11 Evidently there was a formal visit by a group of deacons to Henry Studebaker, raising a disciplinary issue of military involvement, which could be the reference of the above-cited phrase to “the influence of the persuasion of his Dunker Brethren.” This “deacons’ visit” was the normal way during this period in which Brethren held the line on a member’s conformity to belief and practice. Later descriptions of the dissolution of the partnership tended to gloss over the tensions, explaining Henry’s defection as caused by illness or exhaustion. (It is known that John C. Studebaker discouraged his youngest son, Jacob, from serving in the Union Army during the Civil War.)

During the Civil War (1861-1865) large orders came to South Bend from the Union forces, and profits from these contracts enriched the company’s coffers.12 By 1868, these “considerable Civil War profits” made it possible for Clement and his wife Anna to move to a larger home on a tract of land called “Tippecanoe Place.” This was to become the site of the Studebaker mansion, heralded in local histories and often visited by celebrities including political dignitaries from Washington, D.C.

Henry was replaced in the firm by younger brother John Mohler (as he was always referred to in the family), who bought out his share for $3,000 (some sources say $4,000). John Mohler had returned in 1858 from California by way of the Isthmus of Panama and New York City. He invested his savings in the company and took on the position of supervisor of manufacturing which he held for forty-five years.13

Later on, other members of the family became integral parts of the company. In 1870 younger brothers Peter (1836-1897) and Jacob (1844-1887) joined the firm as salesmen. Peter became known as the champion salesman, first in Goshen, Indiana, and later (after 1865) at St. Joseph, Missouri, which was the staging ground for wagon trains heading west. In 1872 he became treasurer of the firm in South Bend.14 Jacob was assigned responsibilities for the carriage trade, catering to the special desires of wealthy clients.

After Clement Studebaker’s wife died in 1863, he remarried. His second wife, Anna Milburn (of the Mishawaka wagon maker family), was an active member of the Methodist Episcopal Church and Studebaker became a member of that denomination in 1868. He made major contributions to Methodist institutions, including a large gift to DePauw University. Other family members too shifted from the earlier family connection with the German Baptist Brethren, as increasing prosperity brought changes in lifestyle no longer compatible with the strict discipline of the sectarian Brethren.
The first gasoline-powered Studebaker, built in 1904. Its price was $1,600.

Nonetheless, it can be accepted that foundational qualities derived from the family background contributed to the unusual success of the enterprise. W. H. Smith, in *A Romance of the Forge*, gave his opinion of the basis for the Studebaker achievement by stating: "It is not luck, it is not fortuitous circumstances. Circumstances might have combined, but if the pluck, the persistence, the energy, the willingness to toil with their hands, the honesty and integrity of purpose had been wanting, the Studebaker name today would have been unknown."

Another writer, Dr. I. H. Betz, concluded: "In looking over this long story from start to finish, it is evident that moral character and honest dealing wear the longest. The tendency through competition to cheapen production and thus pass an inferior unsatisfactory article which is dear at the lowest price, upon the general public must in the end prove unprofitable and unpopular. The principles instilled by the older Studebakers in their children in the direst adversity which were well and thoroughly learned bore fruit in manifold proportions and remain as a shining example to the world."

Many of the same traits were credited to the Studebaker firm as it made its careful but decisive shift to the manufacture of automobiles around the turn of the century. This occurred during the last years of direct leadership by the first generation of Studebakers. After the first experi-
HARRY CLAYTON STUTZ

Although his inventive efforts did not create an industrial concern comparable in size to the Studebaker Company, Harry C. Stutz is also a name to be reckoned with. His incomparable sports car, the Stutz Bearcat, is generally regarded as a milestone in automotive history; it is often used as illustration for encyclopedia articles on the American automobile. In some ways it became an icon of the Jazz Age; a symbol of the fast lane of the 1920s. Speaking of those years, a study of the Great Depression noted fittingly, but somewhat inaccurately, that: "The decade ended appropriately with the bankruptcy of the Stutz Motor Car Company, manufacturers of the Bearcats that bore the raccoon-coated flappers of the booming Twenties."17

Stutz was the son of Henry and Elizabeth Snyder Stutz.

Harry C. Stutz, 1876-1930
(Courtesy of Automobile Quarterly)

Stutz racer, Indianapolis, Ind., 1912 (Courtesy of the Free Library of Philadelphia)

one of five children. He was born on September 12, 1876, in Ansonia, Ohio, near Dayton. His parents were active members of the Donnels Creek congregation of the German Baptist Brethren, one of a number of strong Brethren congregations in southwestern Ohio. Harry joined the congregation at the age of fifteen. As was the case with the earlier Studebakers, the Stutz family were of German descent and were not well off financially. Young Harry knew what it meant to be poor; at an early age he helped his father on the farm. His education was limited because he had to become a wage earner while still an adolescent.18

His inventive bent became evident early on. Even as a child the family noticed this interest and his attempts to create something new. At the age of ten he tried to make a bicycle. Once he hitched his pet dog to his cart and started it off to see how fast it could go. The dog sighted a rabbit and began chasing it, leaving Harry far behind. Eventually a fence intervened so that he was able to recover the pet and the then somewhat dilapidated cart. When his attempts met with failure, he would persist despite all difficulties. At the age of fourteen he successfully built a machine to hull beans.19

As a young man he found work with the Davis Sewing Machine Company and the National Cash Register factory in the nearby city of Dayton. He then worked in a machine shop, which often involved him in the repair and manufacture of pumping engines for rural purposes. While there he invented a gasoline engine which was found to be quite efficient; it was put into production and enjoyed good sales. During this period (1898) he married Clara Marie Deitz and established a home in Dayton; the couple had one daughter, Emma Belle (Horne).

It was at this juncture in his life that he became interested in automobiles. While still involved with the repair and manufacture of farm pumping engines, he kept himself well informed of developments in that burgeoning field.
This interest is not surprising, for the turn of the century saw a boom in the creation of motor cars of all types and methods of propulsion. Many came from just the kind of small machine shop in which Harry Stutz worked. A leading historian of the American automobile industry, John B. Rae, commented: “Virtually all the pioneer American automobile manufacturers had technical training or business experience, frequently both, and usually were already in a business that could turn to motor vehicles fairly readily. They were makers of bicycles, horse-drawn carriages and wagons, or stationary gas engines, or operators of machine shops, or metal fabricators.”

Stutz is credited with being one of the first Dayton residents to own and drive a car. His first effort, in 1898, was “Old Hickory,” created from abandoned agricultural parts, with a two-horsepower stationary gas engine, and a binder chain to transmit power to the driveshaft. Two years later he built a small car for his personal use, and in 1902 he announced that he was building a “few runabouts” for local citizens. Possibly his first gainful employment with an automobile manufacturer was with the C. Altmar Company of Canton, Ohio.

He was by no means definitely committed to the demanding and expensive enterprise of auto manufacture, lacking the resources and experience for such a venture. In 1899 he launched his own machine shop, hoping to perfect a gasoline engine useful for stationary or vehicular purposes. He succeeded so well in this that in late 1902 he sold his company and all his manufacturing rights to the Lindsay Auto Parts Company of Indianapolis, which physically incorporated all movable elements of the small plant; Stutz was himself engaged to oversee the production of his engine in the Indiana capital, moving there early in 1903.

The Lindsay company shifted from the production of gasoline-powered vehicles to specialize in axles and transmissions as the Lindsay-Russel Axle Company, and Stutz did not stay long with the Indianapolis firm; by 1904 he was employed by the G & J Tire Company. His connection with the tire firm was also short-lived; later in 1904 he became a salesman for the Scheble Carburetor Company, which he helped to organize. This too did not last long, because in 1905 he joined the newly organized American Motor Car Company of Indianapolis, famed for building cars with an innovative, underslung design. Although often given credit for this style, Stutz was not its inventor. A trade magazine, The Horseless Age, gave credit to Stutz in its September 20, 1905, edition: “Harry Stutz, of Indianapolis, Ind., has nearly completed a four cylinder car, which will be placed on the market by a new concern, known as the American Motor Car Company.” This “American Car” became well-known, and its success led to Stutz’s appointment as engineer and factory manager for the Marion Motor Car Company from 1906 to 1910. Later he switched to the similarly named Nordyke & Marmon Company.

Stutz stayed with the company for several years, on his own time developing his plans for a superior vehicle. By mid-1910 he was in a position to form his own business, the Stutz Auto Parts Company, with financing provided by Henry Campbell, who was to be linked with Stutz in several later ventures. Despite this new beginning, early in 1911 Stutz was also working as designer and factory manager for the Empire Motor Car Company. But all of this maneuvering took a back seat to a notable achievement later that same year.
On Memorial Day, 1911, the first of the Indianapolis 500-mile endurance races was inaugurated, on a track originally constructed in 1908. The Marmon Company entered a car designed for them by Harry Stutz. In addition, Stutz entered another design, a car bearing his own name. The Marmon Wasp won the race but the inventor’s Stutz also did well; although it was awarded eleventh place (after the complicated scoring process had been completed) and thus failed to win a monetary reward, it became famous as “the car that made good in a day,” because of its design and durability. Automobile enthusiasts were impressed that the car required neither mechanical adjustment nor repair during the grueling competition, despite the fact that it had been built in just five weeks immediately preceding the race. In succeeding years Stutz-designed cars were leading contenders for the checkered flag at the Indianapolis 500, and Stutz was well on his way to the proverbial fame and fortune.22

In 1912 the Stutz Auto Parts Company was followed by the Ideal Car Company, created to build the Stutz automobile. The two companies were merged in 1913 and went public in June, 1916, as the Stutz Motor Car Company with Harry C. Stutz as president. It flourished and made the Stutz name synonymous with fine sporting cars. The Stutz Bearcat (first produced in 1912) has been called by an authority the “most popular American sports car of that day.” This is the more striking because of the intensity of competition. During this era more than 280 different makes of cars and trucks were produced in the state of Indiana alone, some fifty of them in Indianapolis.

The first annual report of the Stutz Motor Car Company, released in February, 1917, reported that the output of its cars had increased from 759 in 1913 to 1535 in 1916. Net profits had increased during the same time span from some $292,000 to $649,000. Stockholders learned that the company had completed the erection of a new building on 10th Street, occupying an entire city block. Successive annual reports documented increases in profits, reaching nearly $7,500,000 by 1919.23

In that year Stutz decided to leave the company and sold off his interests. Although the company continued until 1936, it declined steadily during the 1920s. Stutz had become wealthy but was not content to remain idle. He began to build fire engines (a business that continued until the 1940s) but soon returned to his first love, creating (using his initials) the HCS Motor Car Company. The company built HCS vehicles from 1920 to 1926, concentrating first on small cars and then on rugged taxicabs. A race car called an HCS Special won the Memorial Day classic in 1923, but it was actually another make with minor modifications.24

Some years thereafter Stutz seems to have lost interest in the details and stresses of the automotive industry. He divorced Clara, and in 1925 was remarried to Blanche Clark Miller. The couple moved to Florida, settling in the Winter Park area near Orlando. Stutz invested in orange and grapefruit groves and did well with them; however, he could not completely give up inventing and became interested in developing motors for aviation. He invented a small motor for this purpose and was planning for its manufacture by the Stutz-Bellanca Airplane Company when he died rather suddenly of appendicitis on June 25, 1930. This took place in Indianapolis, just after he arrived there by car from Florida. He had undertaken the journey following a mistaken diagnosis of influenza.

Those who knew him well emphasized his sturdy Dunker qualities of steadiness, simplicity, integrity, and honesty. Although his cars were noted for their graceful lines and speed, their simplicity of design was what caught the attention of the engineering community. He was a modest and unassuming man, noted for his kindess and sympathy. He offered employment to the disabled, when that was by no means common. An associate who knew him well said that “Harry Stutz would be longest remembered for his honesty.” He supported directly a number of relatives and was a quiet benefactor of a large number of other persons.25

These traits notwithstanding, the personal lifestyle Stutz developed at this time was in tension with his religious upbringing. For one thing, the Church of the Brethren frowned on divorce. Then, too, the avocations the inventor developed during this period of affluence were also questionable from the church’s point of view. Particularly devoted to trapshooting and considered to be one of the best shots in the region, Stutz became a gun collector and developed one of the leading collections of sporting firearms in the United States. This was certainly not considered an appropriate hobby by a religious group stressing pacifism and non-resistance, and designated a “Historic Peace Church.”

CONCLUSION

Stutz and the Studebakers, in their distinctive but parallel ways, provide instructive lessons on the relationship between religious ethics and business success. In some sense, they help to illustrate the much-discussed thesis of German sociologist Max Weber (1864-1920), put forward in his classic work, The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism, first published in 1904-1905.26 The qualities Weber associated with his concept of “this worldly asceticism”—sobriety, thrift, diligence, integrity, application—are precisely those which contemporaries and later commentators have observed in these Dunker entrepreneurs. The effects of this ethic, principally in commercial success and the accumulation of wealth, also illustrate the tensions between the narrow path of nonconformity taught by the Brethren faith and the increasingly prosperous businessmen. This too finds nuanced discussion in the study by Weber. As such, the exploits and experiences of these men provide useful case studies in the evolution of entrepreneurship.
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LATCHES AND LOCKS
by Henry J. Kauffman

At the beginning of this short survey of locking devices it should be noted that virtually nothing has been published on the subject. Only a few collections are known to exist, and none can be seen by interested people; there are no collections in the nation's major museums. Not surprising, since there was never any readily apparent reason for collecting them. Practical, utilitarian iron objects, most lacked the aesthetic appeal of silver, pewter, or copper artifacts, and virtually none were signed by their makers since it was difficult to imprint a name on them, and there seemed no logical reason for doing so. Indeed, the trade itself was somewhat obscure. The 1789 Boston Business Directory, for example, lists the names of nine goldsmiths but no locksmiths. In many cases the colonial locksmith was replaced by the local blacksmith, who is known to have frequently made locks and keys.

With very little—or nothing—in their houses worth stealing, the earliest American colonists did not bother to lock their doors. This does not mean, however, that iron locks were not known or used in the European countries from which they came. In an illustration in the Book of Trades, published in Frankfurt in 1568, two locksmiths are shown punching a hole in an iron plate. One man holds the punch while the other strikes it with a hammer. This was the traditional way of making a hole in iron, and was probably the procedure used by the first locksmiths working in America. Fortunately, only a few holes were needed to permit the lock to be fastened to the door.

From the Book of Trades (Frankfurt, 1569), two locksmiths at work.
The earliest securing device seen by the author was on an untouched old house near Amherst, Massachusetts. It consisted of a wooden bar held by iron brackets secured on each side of the door. The brackets—obviously the work of a blacksmith—were made by attaching a horizontal iron bar to a vertical iron bar with a tenon riveted on the outer surface of the vertical piece. This work was so carefully done that the joint is completely obscured.

Of course this bar-and-brackets device could not be opened from the outside unless a latch was installed. The so-called Suffolk latch made for this purpose (and also used on inside doors when no lock was required) varied in overall length from ten to approximately forty inches. The small sizes were used on common inside doors while the larger types were utilized on church doors and doors of other public buildings.

Suffolk latches usually had five parts: (1) the handle, as a rule forged from one piece of iron and consisting of an upper and lower cusp with the hand grasp in between; (2) the thumb lift, consisting of a flat or curved plate on one end, the other end extending through the door to raise the bar and to provide a handle so the door could be opened from either side; (3) the bar, a long piece of strap iron attached horizontally to the door with one nail and held in place by a (4) staple; and (5) a catch, usually shaped like a number four with a long tapered point, that was driven into the door frame to secure the door.

The handle, which appeared on the outside of the door, was the critical part on which the blacksmith lavished his
skill and ingenuity. It was usually forged of one piece of iron, although a type used at Farmington, Connecticut, was made up of separate cusps and a handle. The top cusp was generally the larger of the two, and the bottom cusp was an inverted copy of the top. However, some latches lacked a bottom cusp, and in those cases the bottom end of the handle was driven through the door and clenched on the other side. Cusp designs varied from place-to-place but the simulated lima bean was used over a long span of years and in most of the places where latches were used in America. The bean latches usually had flat strap handles which were widest in the center and tapered toward the ends. They were usually of the small type and rarely had any ornamentation.

The thumb lift on the outside of the door was either a flat or curved plate; sometimes it was attached to the handle with a pin and was called a swivel-lift. Other latch handles had only a hole punched in the upper cusp through which the lift projected to the inner side of the door. On these latches the lift was enlarged in back of the plate by partially “slitting off” a tongue, which held the lift in place.

Although the function of the latch handle was obviously
The drawing on the left shows a Suffolk latch secured with nails; the one on the right a latch fastened in place with screws, the method used in the nineteenth century.

of first importance, its ornamentation determined its charm. The handle, usually semicircular in shape, was frequently ornamented by filing designs on the outer flat surface, or by swaging the center portion of a round handle to enlarge and ornament it. Many collectors regard the second type as European; however, there is little, if any, documentation to support this hypothesis.

In the contour of the cusps we find an endless variety of designs, many of which defy classification. However, certain patterns were in common use in the various parts of America throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The arrowhead, the swordfish, and the ball and spear design were popular in New England, while craftsmen in Pennsylvania seem to have been partial to motifs such as hearts, tulips, and birds. Some geometric designs were used in Pennsylvania, but they were usually less attractive than those derived from nature.

The parts of the latches located on the inside of the door were more important for their function than for their decorative quality, and in style showed little variation in the different areas where latches were used. The surface of the bar was enriched in some cases by filing designs on it, and curves were filed on the edges with a round, or half-round, file. Sometimes a knob was also attached to the bar. Some of the catches were highly ornamented by attaching on the front part a support which was twisted and nailed to the door frame below the catch. This support helped to keep the catch in a horizontal position, but its use was probably more decorative than functional.

It is evident from the style, method of manufacture, and examples found in situ that the Suffolk latch was a creation of the blacksmith of the eighteenth century. The design of the Norfolk latch differed from that of the Suffolk, but there is some evidence that an early, handmade type of the Norfolk latch was also used in the eighteenth century.

Contemporary records, style, and methods of manufacture indicate, however, that the Norfolk latch was a favorite in the nineteenth century. The handle consisted of two
A panel of rare door hardware made by Warner Blacksmiths at East Haddam, Conn. (Courtesy of Wadsworth Atheneum, Hartford)

pieces. The first was a flat strap of iron—usually machine rolled—whose top and bottom ends were ornamented with designs that appear to have been punched or cut with a curved chisel. The maker's name was sometimes stamped on this strap in bold letters, but none of the names has been identified as that of an American manufacturer. The word "patent," too, was sometimes found on the strap, and this suggests English manufacture. Nevertheless, the inclusion, in 1826, of "Best Norfolk Thumb Latches and Bolts, of a quality equal, if not superior, to any imported," among the products made by the J. & J. Patterson Company located near Pittsburgh, is proof that this type was made in America.

The second part of the Norfolk latch's handle, the part that was actually grasped, was semicircular in shape as on the earlier Suffolk latch, and was slightly flattened or

Advertisement of a lock manufactory dated 1826. A very rare evidence of lock production.
An August, 1797, entry in a blacksmith's account book for "3 Iron Rim & door locks with handles."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>H. Joseph Pentis</strong></th>
<th><strong>Dr.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To altering 36 harrows, teeth 3 d 1½</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To an iron &amp; 10 kinds of chain for 30 3/4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>H. Robert Saunders</strong></th>
<th><strong>Dr.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is mending a bridle bit. a bar &amp; hook</td>
<td>7 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Doctor John Gold</strong></th>
<th><strong>Dr.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For repairing a pair of chain rings</td>
<td>1 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To mending &amp; attying for chair barriages</td>
<td>2 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To mending a pair of small stillards</td>
<td>6 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>H. Joseph Pentis</strong></th>
<th><strong>Dr.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To hewing a large plough &amp;c.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To repairing a loop for the beam</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To dressing a bolster</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>H. Joseph Pentis</strong></th>
<th><strong>Dr.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is mending a dairy lock &amp;c, putting in three wards &amp;c. a bolster, wheel, for 30</td>
<td>3 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>H. William Dickinson</strong></th>
<th><strong>Dr.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To drilling a gun</td>
<td>2 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To repairing the lock &amp;c. new one</td>
<td>2 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>H. Matthew Anderson</strong></th>
<th><strong>Dr.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To repairing an 80</td>
<td>1 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>H. Robert Walker</strong></th>
<th><strong>Dr.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To fashing a gun hammer</td>
<td>8 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>H. Matthew Anderson</strong></th>
<th><strong>Dr.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To 3 Iron Rim'd door locks &amp;c with handles</td>
<td>1 7 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To 2 pair of the longer D, 3/16, Mr. Garrett</td>
<td>7 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Norfolk latch with swaged handle (Author’s Collection)

Swaged in the middle. This middle area was frequently enlarged, both for decorative purposes and to make it better fitted to the hand. The thumb lifts of most Norfolk latches were attached to the strap and operated in a swivel manner. The remaining parts resembled those of the Suffolk latch described earlier.

About the middle of the nineteenth century, the demand for cheap goods and the lack of interest in objects made by hand led to the production of complete latches made of cast iron. This type of mass production demanded that only a few designs could be utilized, and each latch was a perfect duplication of the pattern from which it was made. The wide use of cheap mortise locks and the lack of interest in objects made by hand led to the demise of the Suffolk and Norfolk latch late in the nineteenth century.

In addition to the Suffolk and Norfolk latch, it is also very important to note the use throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries of the spring latch, the mechanism of which was attached to a single plate, either square or shaped to resemble a keyhole in a horizontal position. When the latch-bar was raised by turning a round or egg-shaped knob it fell into the catch by the action of a spring. A few of this type had a small night-latch that could be operated only on the inside of the door. There is no documentary evidence that this type was made in America; however, it is likely that some were made by blacksmiths working in those inland towns not having easy access to imports. The forms of these spring latches were quite standardized, and they lack the charm of handmade patterns; they were very efficient though, and widely used in America.

Close examination of a spring latch shows, however, that it could not be locked. This was rectified in some cases by extending a threaded iron bar through the iron plate fastened on the inside of the door and on through the door itself. Then, from the outside a handle with a matching interior thread could be slipped over the protruding bar,
Smokehouse lock stamped with the Rohrer name (Private Collection)

and when this handle was turned off the latch could be locked. Easily removed, there are stories of people leaving these handles on a shelf in the transom, or under the front-door mat.

Of course a locking device which uses a key—much easier to carry than a handle—is far superior to this spring latch system, and iron box locks (called rim locks because they were installed on the edge of the door) were used in Pennsylvania from the eighteenth through the twentieth centuries. (The house in which the author lived for thirty years was built in 1890 and had an iron box lock on the kitchen door.) Made by local locksmiths and blacksmiths, there was actually very little “smithing” involved in producing them if, as the dictionary claims, the word “smith” evolved from “smite,” meaning to strike or hit. The box itself was created by simply bending the edges of a piece of iron, probably in a vise, and that could have entailed a minimum amount of smithing, as could have the process of shaping and fitting the interior mechanism. This latter job, however, was more a matter of filing than smithing.

In Pennsylvania the earliest iron box locks found in situ are on the front and back doors of Rock Ford, the 1792 Georgian home of General Edward Hand in Lancaster. These are unusually large locks, and have the unusual feature of needing two revolutions of the key to work them. Very small and simple locks are installed on the house’s other doors.

The most magnificent iron box lock is found on a church located a few miles north of Palmyra, Pennsylvania. On its face is engraved “John Rohrer, 1808.” The filed edges of the lock are unique, as are the designs filed in the press handle, and the shape of its keeper. (While all locks have a keeper, most are missing when old locks are found). It is surprising to find that this lock is fastened to the door with screws, for one might have logically expected it to be nailed in place. The escutcheon on the outside of the door is not unique, but is one of the best examples extant.

Chest lock with key. These were known as “grab” locks. (Author’s Collection)

Back view of a 19th century iron lock with “Germany” stamped on the bolt. Such a stamp has led to calling all iron box locks “Germanic.” (Author’s Collection)

Iron box lock with a thin sheet of brass covering the front plate on which is engraved “Made by D. Rohrer, 1822”; this combination of two metals probably makes it unique. (Courtesy of Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Feemen)
Pennsylvania German iron box lock made in the Lancaster area by “M. Moyer” in the early 19th century.

Found on a church near Palmyra, Pa., this extremely rare German box lock is signed “John Rohrer Lebanon 1803.”

Name stamp on iron box lock (Courtesy of Rock Ford-Kauffman Museum)

Handle and escutcheon plate for the Rohrer box lock on the church north of Palmyra.
Clashes between the Puritan and the Libertine, the Bumpkin and the Sophisticate, the Traditionalist and the Iconoclast, the Conservative and the Liberal have long been the stuff of which amusing literature has been written. A humorous example, entitled “A Girl from Red Lion, P.A.,” from the pen of H. L. Mencken, poked fun at turn-of-the-century morality in small-town America as viewed by mid-century sophisticates.

“Girl” captures the special combination of tongue-in-cheek humor so beloved in Twain, the interest in particularizing a specific geographic area by use of regional speech patterns and customs, and the selection of ordinary (if not somewhat disreputable) characters and their localized thought processes. “Girl” also bears the nostalgic, sentimental tone characteristic of many local color pieces, and it creates the aura of authenticity produced by sharp concrete details drawn from a given locale.

A reporter like many of his local-color forebears, Mencken had long and disciplined training in capturing the telling detail. “A Girl from Red Lion, P.A.,” however, lacks the refined characterization and the evolving plot generally expected of the authentic short story genre; it is really a reminiscence or sketch.

Henry Louis Mencken did not begin his professional
life as a writer. The future embodiment of the urban Smart
Set was born on September 12, 1880, in Baltimore, Mary­
land, to parents who were first-generation German-Ameri­
cans. The family business, started by his immigrant grand­
father, was cigar manufacturing. After graduating in 1896
as valedictorian of his high school class at Baltimore
Polytechnic Institute, Mencken bowed to family pressure,
stifled his plans for a career in journalism, and entered
the family’s cigar manufacturing and selling business.

In the last quarter of the 19th century Baltimore had
a few large cigar factories — of which the Menckens
owned one — which succumbed quickly to worker-orga­
nized strikes and demands for higher wages. The big city
manufacturers envied the hundreds of small family-unit,
cottage-industry plants which existed in the rural counties
of southern Pennsylvania; these produced low cost cigars
and provided supplemental income to the families of farmers
and small-town tradesmen. As scion of a major cigar
manufacturer, Mencken was surely aware of tiny Red Lion,
Pennsylvania, barely fifty miles to the north and capital
of the local stogie industry. He would also have been aware
of the young women who came from its even more rural
surroundings to work in the numerous cigar factories.

Cigar manufacturing had begun in Red Lion in 1873.
More than thirty factories existed in the tiny town by 1886,
and the number had grown to sixty-five by 1914. A
county-wide count of cigar factories in 1907 turned up
more than 1200." Tobacco, for many local farmers in York
and Lancaster Counties, became the major cash crop. Cigar
manufacturing was clearly the main industry of the Red
Lion area, and Baltimore was the chief point of transship­
ment for most of this product.5

Mencken’s Baltimore residence, his home for more than
sixty-eight years, is a city museum today.

The three years (1896-1899) during which Mencken
reluctantly helped manage his family’s cigar factories taught
him a great deal about the business; about buying cured
tobacco from the farmers, about producing the less expen­
sive mold-made cigars, and about making/promoting the
Marguerite and La Princessa hand-made brands which were

A common interest in cigar manufacturing probably first
made Mencken aware of Red Lion where, in a factory on
Charles Street, these employees of the Fruiting Company
are shown making cigars. (Photo courtesy of Mary
Berkheiser and the Kaltreider Memorial Library of Red
Lion, Pa.)
the top of the Mencken line. A biographer has noted that most of the raw tobacco for the Mencken cigar factory was purchased directly from the farms and warehouses of York and Lancaster Counties. The Menckens were often in the Red Lion area on tobacco-buying trips. Upon the death of his father in 1899 Mencken felt freed from a moral obligation to the cigar business. The family cigar factory was sold, and Mencken joined the staff of the Baltimore Morning Herald as a cub reporter.

Although Mencken left the cigar industry, he adopted an affection for its product and remained a lifelong smoker. He visited and shared shop stories with the aging retired rollers who had worked in the factory. Even many years later his wife fondly recalled how Mencken, with vigorous hand gestures, reviewed the steps in rolling a good cigar.

In his new job at the Herald Mencken did everything required of a novice — the city desk, the obits, society page, feature writing, and editing — and he did it well.

By the age of twenty-five he was promoted to managing editor. From the beginning of his journalism career until 1948, when a stroke forced his retirement from the public arena (he died in 1956), he poured forth a steady stream of features, editorials, humor columns, political satire, short stories, poetry, plays, biographies, autobiographies, literary criticism, and pure bombast. In writing such a variety of material, he honed his pen to a cutting edge of incisive detail.

Raised in a home environment in which religion was simply not a living subject and schooled in the sophisticated urban materialism of the 1890s, Mencken developed a cynical agnosticism which permeated much of his literature. Very much an antiestablishment iconoclast, he poked fun at American Puritanism, at what he called “The Reverend Brethren,” at sexual prudery, at Prohibition, and indeed at the very pillars of small-town American social structure. The narrow religious ethos in which the focal character of “Girl” was fostered comes in for some sharp needling.
Mencken's acid tongue, his razor-sharp wit, and his skillful use of the English language made him a darling of the so-called "smart set" through the roaring 20s. He fell out of popularity in the Depression years but turned his literary talents to producing dictionaries, literary criticism, reviews of his earlier newspaper work, and collections of earlier sketches.

"A Girl from Red Lion, P.A.," set in the autumn of 1903, first appeared in print in the February 15, 1941, issue of the New Yorker as the lead article in a series called "Days of Innocence" which ran in that magazine over the next thirty months. The very title of this series picks up the humorously nostalgic tone of the local colorists. Simultaneously, Mencken included the sketch in his anthology, Newspaper Days: 1899-1906, which appeared later in 1941. That anthology contains a collection of twenty short pieces gathered from his days as a cub reporter.

Mencken doesn't claim these stories were written in that period: only that they derive from experiences he had at that time. In fact, he indicates: this "narrative has principally to do with my days as a reporter. . . . My adventures in that character, save maybe in one or two details, were hardly extraordinary; on the contrary they seem to me now, looking back upon them nostalgically, to have been marked by an excess of normalcy."

Mencken first discusses as fact the central incident in the story (unsophisticated small-town girl loses "good name" to aggressive beau and takes off for big city to become a prostitute) in a December 1934 letter he wrote to Edgar Lee Masters. His critics, however, having documented numerous embellishments and hoaxes from his pen, seem disinclined to see much truth in this particular story. Noting that Mencken himself introduces Newspaper Days with the claim that its stories are "mainly true, but with occasional stretchers," one critic remarked, "Absolutely and literally true they certainly were not, as for example his deathless story of "A Girl from Red Lion, P.A." Furthermore, since the text of "A Girl from Red Lion, P.A." includes prominent mention of Walter Winchell (1897-1972), who would have been a lad of six at the time of the story's setting, it appears certain that Mencken wrote it from recollection at a much later date. Even if the story had a core of truthfulness, committing it to paper after such a delay undoubtedly affected its veracity.

A significant number of local references within the story indicate that Mencken possessed factual information about Red Lion and the locale. Nevertheless, it is also probable that Mencken used the village prototypically as any pious American small town tainted with rampant hypocrisy. The simple unnamed milkmaid from a strict Dunkard family ("old rubes with whiskers") who lived on a farm between Red Lion and York loses "her honest name" in the heat of passionate necking with her boyfriend Elmer from York. She and Elmer had gotten excited by reading books about love given them by Elmer's brother, "a train butcher on the Northern Central [railroad]." After sinning with Elmer she decides to surrender herself to a life of lust, booze, and dope because, she recalls from the pulp novels she has read, that is the fate of every wayward girl who starts down the path of a loose moral life.

The girl, so Mencken relates, "hoofed in to York, P.A., and caught the milk-train to Baltimore." At the Baltimore terminus of the Maryland and Pennsylvania Railroad (affectionately known to all as the "Ma and Pa") she seeks passage from a kindly cabby to "a house of ill fame" of his choice where she plans to surrender her life to the dens of iniquity. The cabby, a street-smart reporter, and a sympathetic madam (Miss Nellie) talk her out of her plans, take up a collection for homeward train fare, pack a box

---

Sketch of the Ma and Pa's Red Lion train station in 1875 as published in the Red Lion Diamond Jubilee Book history of Red Lion (1955).

The Ma and Pa no longer connects York and Baltimore, and most of its trackage has been removed and sold for scrap. The Red Lion station is now a gift shop and minimall, but a segment of track is still in place to the right of the building.
lunch, and send her back to Red Lion. Her Baltimore confidants advise her to “take your beau to your pastor, and join him in indissoluble love. It is the safe, respectable, and hygienic course. Everyone agrees that it is moral, even moralists.”

Most of “A Girl from Red Lion, P.A.” is devoted to the conversation between the girl and her interrogators in Miss Nellie’s red-light palace. What emerges is a picture

of the small-mindedness of small-town America, the muddled views of religion and morals by the sin-bound milkmaid, and her kindly treatment at the hands of the big-city madam, the worldly wise reporter, and the helpful hack driver. The story gives Mencken an ideal vehicle for poking fun at unquestioned moral expectations. Christianity, morals, Pennsylvania Dutch clannishness, and church-going all come in for a good share of gentle ribbing.

Mencken had chosen his small town well. Located ten miles southeast of York along an old stage route to the lower Susquehanna, the municipality was dubbed, by the historians of Red Lion, a “church town.” Barely a thousand population in 1903 when Mencken set his story, the size of Red Lion grew slowly to 4,700 in 1930 and to roughly 6,000 in 1955. One author noted that on Sundays the collected Sunday schools of Red Lion enrolled 92.5% of the entire population and that “lofty religious ideals and devout feelings . . . live and reign within the hearts and minds of Red Lion’s sons and daughters.”

The Dunkard connection in Mencken’s story reaffirms his fidelity to the literal accuracy expected in local color writing. The Dunkards, otherwise known as German Seventh Day Baptists, had their main settlements in Lancaster and Lebanon Counties. However, about 1740, a small group split off from the Ephrata congregation and settled in southern York County, west of the settlement that was to become Red Lion. Known locally as Sieben Tagers (Seventh Dayers), their place of residence came to be known as Seven Valleys through a possible intermediate corruption of Sieben Thalers; there are not seven valleys in the area. Even today, Seven Valleys and Dunkard Valley survive as place names derived from this German Baptist settlement.
Mencken has the Dunkard milkmaid walk to York to catch the milk train to Baltimore. Dunkard Valley, located approximately mid-way between Red Lion and York, is actually nearest to the town of Dallastown, an even smaller community than Red Lion. Dallastown, however, had only a spur-line connection to a junction on the main York-to-Baltimore "Ma and Pa" Railroad. Not all trains connected to Dallastown, and the main line of the railroad ran around the town on its east side, away from Dunkard Valley. A walk to the York station would have indeed made sense for Mencken's guilt-stricken country girl.

As Mencken notes, the early morning Ma and Pa train to Baltimore was the so-called "milk train," and in the first decade of the century the entire line was affectionately

Map of the route of the Ma and Pa from York to Baltimore showing side spur to Dallastown. The Dunkard settlement at Seven Valleys is noted, and an arrow marks the approximate location of Dunkard Valley, just west of Red Lion. (Originally reproduced as part of the annual stockholder reports of the Maryland and Pennsylvania Railroad Co.; reprinted in G. W. Hilton's The Ma & Pa: A History of the Maryland and Pennsylvania Railroad, 2nd ed.)
called "The Milky Way" for the main product it hauled.\textsuperscript{22} Once, when Baltimore bound, the baggage car caught fire and the crew extinguished the blaze by pouring milk onto the flames.\textsuperscript{23} The Ma and Pa was that kind of railroad—a slow, winding seventy-seven-mile connector between York and Baltimore. Milk and cigars were chief among the items in the south-bound freight. Clearly, Mencken knew the Ma and Pa's features.

He also tells us that it was Elmer's brother, a trainman on the Northern Central, who brought to York "the books . . . all about love" that inflamed Elmer's passion. Here, too, Mencken is faithful to the facts of the time, for the Northern Central was the chief rail service for middle and western sections of York County with a main terminal in the city.\textsuperscript{24}

When Miss Nellie, the cabby, and the reporter talk the sin-burdened farm girl out of becoming a prostitute and send her back home on the Ma and Pa, she promises to send them all "a picture postcard of Red Lion, showing the new hall of the Knights of Pythias."\textsuperscript{25} Red Lion Lodge \#484 of the Knights of Pythias was instituted in March 1900 in a handsome building next to the train station. In 1903 it was definitely a Red Lion show place.\textsuperscript{26} Mencken chose his local color details carefully.

Could "A Girl from Red Lion, P.A." have been fact? Probably not. But, on the other hand, if it were pure Mencken fiction, why did he include so many historically accurate references? Although in his letter to Masters Mencken said it was factual,\textsuperscript{27} the critics didn't believe him.\textsuperscript{28} In truth, while it could have been set in any small town in rural America, cigar-man Mencken apparently chose Red Lion because of his familiarity with its customs, its strong religious traditions, and its proximity to the worldly fleshpots of turn-of-the-century Baltimore by a colorful back-country milk train. In Red Lion and Baltimore Mencken found the contrast of cultures that added charm and humor to this simple short story.
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A major contributor to folklore and folklife studies generally, and to Pennsylvania folklife research particularly, Mac E. Barrick, Ph.D., died at his home in Shippensburg, Pennsylvania, on December 8, 1991. He was fifty-eight years old. He is buried at Dublin Gap Church Cemetery, Newville, Pennsylvania.

Professor of Spanish at Shippensburg University where he had taught since 1968, he also offered courses on folklore and Pennsylvania folk culture. Previously he held positions at Lycoming and Dickinson colleges, also in Pennsylvania. In 1955, after graduating from Dickinson College, located in his birthplace of Cumberland County, he went on to the University of Illinois for his master’s degree. He received his Ph.D. from the University of Pennsylvania in 1965.

His collections from the 1960s covered central Pennsylvania, particularly Cumberland County, and he developed them into detailed articles on proverbs, riddles, rhymes, legends, tales, anecdotes, autograph verses, language, games, medicine, and beliefs. In these articles he showed his mastery of analyzing texts from comparative and contextual points of view. His archives bulged with field-recorded texts from central Pennsylvania, and with his knowledge of foreign languages, he scoured books from international libraries to annotate his sources. He appropriately wrote the chapter on “Folklore and the Verbal Text” for the American Folklore Society’s bicentennial publication, 100 Years of American Folklore Studies (1988).

He went on to develop a series of articles on popular joke cycles and regional folk humor, and offered one of the first inquiries into photocopied and typescript humor as folklore (“The Typescript Broadside,” 1972). He had memorable analyses of elephant jokes (1964), newspaper riddle-jokes (What’s black and white and red all over?) (1974), and Helen Keller jokes (1980). His scholarly interest in humor, both historic and contemporary, continued throughout his career, and before his death he was working on an essay considering the role of humor during the Persian Gulf War.

Returning to his native Pennsylvania to live and teach, Barrick had long been involved in the study of local history and folklife in central Pennsylvania. He was avidly interested in preindustrial tools and folk crafts, and their context of rural economy and community life. He developed this interest with carefully constructed articles on fishing spears, hay knives, corn knives, husking pegs, scrapers, folk toys, and log houses. He had a fondness, too, for central Pennsylvania’s oral tradition, and he had prepared a long manuscript to follow his short article on “Lewis the Robber” legends (see 1967). Indeed, he was planning to collaborate with me on a reader of Pennsylvania folklore and folklife studies. In central Pennsylvania, much of his collecting was from the Pennsylvania “Dutch,” the descendants of German settlers who came to Pennsylvania during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. He expanded his knowledge of German-American traditions across the country, and his research led to his book German-American Folklore (1987).
I remember Mac Barrick as the consummate collector. Always ready with notebook in hand, he recorded all manner of expression—from words to houses—that composed folk life. Abundant file cabinets brimming with data filled his office, and every space around him seemed to bulge with tools, notes, drawings, manuscripts, broadsides, and books. A passing reference to Mac about a story I heard in Carlisle could easily lead to his impressive exposition of variants stretching across the United States and Europe and back several centuries. A font of wit and wisdom, Mac explored a world of scholarship that was at once local and global.

His colleagues in Pennsylvania recognized his accomplishments by twice electing him president of the Pennsylvania Folklife Society. He also served on the editorial board of Pennsylvania Folklife, and was appointed to the Folklife Advisory Council of the Pennsylvania Heritage Affairs Commission. Devoted to the Pennsylvania field, he was a frequent contributor to Pennsylvania Folklife and Keystone Folklore Quarterly, and he performed the yeoman task of indexing Keystone's first fifteen volumes. His long record of publication reached well outside Pennsylvania, from regional journals, to the Journal of American Folklore, to topical journals such as Proverbium. His carefully crafted articles and books will continue to be an inspiration for the regional collector and folkloristic analyst.

The following selected bibliography, offered in tribute to Mac Barrick's folkloristic contributions, was compiled with the help of Alan Mays, also of Penn State Harrisburg.

**SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY**


Pennsylvania German Studies Courses Available

The following courses in Pennsylvania German Studies are now offered through the Evening Division of Ursinus College, Collegeville, Pa. 19426. Persons interested should write to the college or call (215) 489-4111 ext. 2218 for more information.

100. Pennsylvania German Culture
A study of the history, culture and societies of the Pennsylvania Germans, their influence on early American life and their adjustments to the modern world. Fall Semester. TUESDAY EVENINGS (7:00 p.m.). Three hours per week. Three semester hours.

203. Pennsylvania German Folklife
Classroom study and field techniques related to the folklore, folklife, and folk culture of the Pennsylvania Dutch country. Spring Semester. TUESDAY EVENINGS (7:00 p.m.). Prerequisite: PGS-100. Three hours per week. Three semester hours.
The Festival and its Sponsorship

The Kutztown Folk Festival is sponsored by the Pennsylvania Folklife Society, a nonprofit educational corporation affiliated with UR SINUS 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 UR SINUS COLLEGE.

FOR THE FOLK FESTIVAL BROCHURE WRITE TO:

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