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Cultural geography and historical folklife are both embodied in this study of a typically Pennsylvania-German landscape, located in the northeast quadrant of Lower Swatara Township, Dauphin County, Pennsylvania.
ASSIMILATION AND ACCULTURATION IN A PENNSYLVANIA-GERMAN LANDSCAPE:
The Nisley Family and its Architecture in the Lower Swatara Creek Basin

by Margaret Clark Reynolds

A recent trend in American Studies is for scholars to make use of architecture in order to try "to understand its makers and users, rather than making assumptions about people in order to understand their artifacts." Such artifacts "... are of value precisely to the extent that they are the unconscious, unintentional conveyers of attitudes and values, [and] of beliefs." In the northeast quadrant of Lower Swatara Township, Dauphin County, there are at least six German-Georgian limestone houses lived in by the members of one prolific early German immigrant family. That family, the Nisleys, took firm hold in the New World soil and grew and prospered during their gradual assimilation into the American mainstream.

In the past century, cultural geography and historical folk life are both embodied in the study of this pocket of Pennsylvania-German Mennonites living along the Swatara Creek. Their pattern of geographic isolation and eventual but inevitable assimilation is repeated over and over in other areas of the state. This house survey, then, is a study of vernacular architecture as a text illustrating the assimilation process. It is also a study of the assimilation process (and the factors which affected it) itself, for, as will be shown, one branch of the Nisley family was absorbed into mainstream society much more quickly than the other.

At least until the end of the nineteenth century, however, the term "acclimation"—the process of adopting the cultural traits or social patterns of another group—more aptly describes what was happening to the Nisleys. For evidence indicates that although outwardly they conformed to the larger society, at home and in family relationships they continued to hold fast to traditional ethnic and cultural ways.

JOHANNES NISLEY
The Nisley family story begins in Europe, specifically in the Swiss Emmanthumal regions and the cantons of Switzerland near the Italian border. The Nüssli family belonged to the Guild of Butchers, and its founder was one Martin Nüssli, a name often repeated down through the generations in the family. This family lived in Canton Berne, but because of religious persecution of the Mennonites in the 17th century fled Switzerland and settled in the German province of the Palatinate on the Rhine River. When persecution persisted there, they embarked for America in 1717, one of a group of families brought over by Martin Kendig, an emissary from the Hans Herr Mennonite group who had settled in Lancaster County in 1709.

The immigrant Nisley family consisted of the father, Ulrich, the mother, and two sons, Johannes and Jakob. Family tradition has it that the father died enroute and was buried at sea, since there is no mention of him after settlement in America. The 1717 colony of which the Nisleys were a part was well informed in the manner of going to Lancaster County's Conestoga region, and in the nature of the land itself. They came by whole families and brought household goods, horses, cattle, and implements along. When they reached the west side of the Conestoga Creek, they applied to the Provincial land office for warrants on the tracts selected, and requested that a surveyor be sent at once so they could patent deeds and be safe in clearing the land for houses.

There is much evidence that the group was composed of Mennonite families who acted together in the best interests of all. The land warrants are all dated the 27th day of July, 1717, and surveys of the eighteen warranted tracts show each family was granted some water frontage. One of the warrantees was Henry Funk, who had brought his eight children with him. Jakob Nisley married Mary, the older of the two unmarried Funk daughters, and Henry Funk gave them 150 acres of land (on which was a "Menist Graveyard"), part of his holding on the Conestoga. Assessment rolls for 1724-25 list "Jakob Nissley" and "Johannes Nissley" in Conestoga Township, Jacob never moved from this home.

Johannes Nisley, the progenitor of the Lower Swatara Nisleys, was several years younger than Jakob and a teenager
when he arrived in America; it must be assumed he resided with Jakob and Mary until he reached maturity. Johannes first took up tracts of land in Hempfield Township, Lancaster County, which he sold after they were patented. While traveling in the township he met Mary Siegrist, who was living on her father's Silver Spring homestead. Evidence suggests they were married around 1719-20.

After selling his holdings in Hempfield Township, Johannes Nisley acquired a tract of land in Donegal Township on the Conoy Creek near Elizabethtown—173 acres, warranted February 18, 1734. This ground was not as choice or as near the public road as tracts taken by earlier settlers, but it was well-watered and hilly, appealing to a Swiss German who valued broad meadows and valleys with spring water. He settled on it with his wife and acquired more land, adjoining tracts, until he eventually held about eight hundred acres. He built a mill and the family homestead which is still standing today on the grounds of the Masonic Homes on the outskirts of Elizabethtown Borough.

The dwelling built by Johannes Nisley was a house form brought over from the Continent; it was given articulation by the collective memory and cultural habits of this early wave of settlers in a wilderness largely devoid of other patterns of architecture. It reflects value systems that explain the Pennsylvania-German mind and spirit. Until the Revolutionary War, for example, it was usually only bishops and preachers who had houses built of stone; its use was a sign of achievement, of status. According to one scholar, there was, in the Swiss Mennonite community, "a deeply ingrained attitude about the overlapping aspects of class, power, and their material representation. ... [Their] houses are the first line of evidence of the patriarchal nature of early Pennsylvania-German culture." Because it is built of stone, it is very likely that Johannes Nisley's house was used by the Mennonites for worship.

Unlike many other Pennsylvania-German houses, the Johannes Nisley house never had the large central chimney of the tripartite German house plan, but was rather a Continental-style, one-and-a-half story, four-room Flurkitchenhaus (hall-kitchen house). The upstairs chimney support in the cellar is evidence that this house always had one (east) gable-end chimney. It is a mystery then, as to how the Stube (stove room) was heated, unless the protrusion of the inner wall between the Küche (kitchen) and the Stube was a flue to vent a stove into the Stube. This is an early departure from traditional German heating and cooking practices.

In addition to the Küche and Stube the Nisley house had a Kammer (bedroom) and a small room behind the kitchen called a Kammerli. This meant there were two possible sleeping chambers on the first floor and four more—
reached by a sheathed staircase—were created when a second story was added to the building, probably when it was owned by Johannes’s son Martin. The attic level gave additional sleeping space, so this very small structure could house a large family.

On the first floor a simple mantel tops the fireplace opening, and the summer beam that supports the second floor is exposed over the doorway. In the *stube* (used as the main room or parlor), just beneath the summer beam in the wall that separates the *stube* and kammer, is a small, recessed wall cupboard. It was probably used to store valuables such as a Bible or Communion items, especially if the house was used as a Mennonite meeting place. All the interior doors are batten doors with simple iron latches.

The entrance door is in the southwestern bay on the front facade. A shed-roofed porch, supported by round wooden posts, shelters it and benches. This stoep, a small covered platform with a bench on either side of the door, is a typical early-German porch treatment. A large, double-articulated batten door set into the east wall below ground level was originally the only entrance into the cellar. Inside, it was adjacent to the fireplace with its massive lintel. The original earthen cellar floor has been covered with concrete, but it appears that a spring came in along the north corner of the house (which is slightly banked) and ran along the north and west cellar walls. Each of these walls has a thirteen-by-thirteen-inch opening, which some say were grease niches for fat lamps or candles, and others say were used to cool food and dairy products. In the cellar the original summer beam is shored up by supports, and where a cellar door was cut into the first-story floor there is still evidence of the original two-to-three-inch thick tongue-and-groove flooring.
A small chimney closet and an enclosed staircase to the second story are found just to the right of the front door in the Johannes Nisley house.

In the cellar of the Johannes Nisley house a large fireplace is located directly to the left of the double exterior door.

Batten doors are found throughout the Johannes Nisley house.

Cellar fireplace with a small opening in the rear hearth wall; Johannes Nisley house.

Cutaway of original first-floor floorboards nailed to cellar beam in the Johannes Nisley house.
Johannes and Mary Nisley reared six sons on their Donegal Township homestead. A few years before his death, Johannes deeded parts of his more than eight hundred acres to his sons. Michael, the eldest, received 137 acres; John 112 acres; Abraham, 28 acres and the mill across the road from the house; Jakob, 137 acres; and Samuel, 109 acres. As the youngest, Martin received a double portion: 113 acres and the stone house. In exchange, he was given the responsibility of caring for his parents; according to the deed he was required to reserve “part of the dwelling and [the] use of the orchard” for them for as long as they lived. In addition he would be charged with the care and keeping of his widowed mother, since she was allotted no portion in the division of the estate. This custom persisted in the Nisley family well into the 19th century, as evidenced by their wills and deeds.

Witnessed and executed by Michael Nisley, all the deeds were written in German and signed “Hans Nisli” and “Mary (X) Neesly (Her Mark).” Nisley deeds up to the end of the 19th century had a mark for female signers, indicating that Nisley women may have been able to read but not write, a not uncommon situation. When the deeds were recorded in 1783, Johannes Nisely had been in America for sixty-six years, yet he was still communicating entirely in German. Surrounded by kinsmen and neighbors who were themselves Pennsylvania German, he may never have learned to speak English at all, although he may have understood it.

THE NISLEYS IN LOWER SWATARA TOWNSHIP

In 1783, the same year he received 112 acres of land in Donegal Township from his father Johannes, John Nisley purchased 202 acres in what would become Lower Swatara Township, Dauphin County. (In 1785 Dauphin County was created from what had been Paxtang Township, Lancaster County.) John’s older brother, Michael, also migrated to Lower Swatara Township, but since there is no record of his ever owning land there, there is no way to know when he arrived. In fact, all that is known about Michael is that in addition to livestock and farm implements (he may have been a tenant farmer), he owned the furnishings for a house; he never married and died without issue. Martin, the youngest Nisley brother, moved to the township in 1804, some twenty years after John.

John and Martin Nisley settled in a relatively small area of Lower Swatara Township situated between Hummelstown and Middletown. Although both of these settlements were essentially German towns, they were very different. Eighteenth-century Hummelstown was described as “fifty little houses, of logs and mortar ... inhabited by workmen who work for the farmers around; and a large retail store and four tavernkeepers.” Middletown, on the other hand, was located at the confluence of the Swatara Creek and Susquehanna River, and was a transfer point for goods shipped from the northern and western areas of the state. The King’s Road, laid out about 1730, was the overland connection with points east, and by the end of the 18th century, Middletown was a pivotal location on the great Conestoga Road between Philadelphia and Harrisburg. In the early 19th century the advent of the Pennsylvania Canal and the Union Canal (1827) and the arrival of the railroad (1835), meant that, compared to Hummelstown, Middletown was a cosmopolitan area. The difference was important, for it was to have a significant impact on the assimilation patterns of the two Lower Swatara Township branches—John’s and Martin’s—of the Nisley family.

THE JOHN NISLEY FAMILY

John Nisley bought his 202 acres in Dauphin County from one John McClure in 1782, but it was not surveyed until 1783 and not patented to him until September 1, 1795; he named it “Richland.” In the years between 1783 and 1795, John Nisley married Barbara Hertzler and erected a stately mansion on his plantation. While it was being built, he may have lived in an early stone house already existing on the property. This had been built on an outcropping of bedrock close to a stream that runs through the property. The house, a curious combination of English folk style and Georgian elements, indicates a builder who wanted the comfort of traditional folk design and the convenience and style of Georgian design. That builder may have been the Scotch-Irish Richard McClure, so for the sake of convenience the house will be referred to as the McClure house.

The verticality of the west gable and the steeply pitched roof of the McClure house mark it as an early structure. A bank house—the only cellar entrance is an exterior one—the north facade is at ground level, while the south side is four feet above ground level. In the cellar, the north portion of which is only partially excavated because of a massive outcropping of bedrock, a great summer beam runs the length of the house. In the east end is a vaulted fireplace support, and on the west side a full arched fireplace; both were probably used for summer cooking. Iron hooks still in place on a crossbeam no doubt held meats and cheeses. The only source of light are two vaulted windows on the south wall, although there is evidence that at one time there was a third window on the west cellar wall. A dirt floor shows no signs of the existence of a spring, and there is no well or pump; neither are there remnants of outbuildings nearby outside.

The McClure house is a four-bay, hall-and-parlor-style house, with a stair and two small chambers at the rear on the first floor. The first and second levels of the front facade exhibit classic Georgian symmetry in the placement of the door and windows; the latter are double-hung, with six-over-six fenestration and thin muntins. The raised doorway shows that originally the front entrance had steps or a small stoop. The rear entrance door is directly opposite the front door, but otherwise the rear facade lacks the symmetry of the front, for only half of it has windows;
the remainder is plain stone wall. On the upper level of the east gable-end wall a window opening has been filled in with stone, as has an opening (either a window or a narrow door) on the lower level; the west gable-end wall never had any openings. A water course at eave level on both gable-end walls is unique among the houses in this survey.

Inside the house, winding, enclosed stairs lead from a shortened central hall to the attic eave. Attic framing is gable-to-gable paired-rafter trusses shored up by two king posts. The attic floor is made of thirteen-inch-wide tongue-and-groove-joint boards, as is the floor in the upstairs hall, the only floor remaining (because of vandalism) upstairs. (Downstairs, the original floors have been covered with hardwood.) There is a flue in the corner of each upstairs room, but these rooms were probably not heated originally. Later, stovepipe openings were cut through these flues and the flue in the left-rear room downstairs, making it possible to heat all the rooms in the house with stoves. There is no evidence that there was ever a cellar furnace, although the house was electrified and plastered, probably early this century.

* * * *
Rear facade of the McClure house

Looking through the rear door at the enclosed stairway to the second floor of the McClure house.

Two of the openings have been filled in with stone on the east elevation of the McClure house; note the watercourse at eave level.

View through rear entry showing the front door of the McClure house; on the left is a small closet door.

Detail of attic framing, McClure house.

Detail of roof framing, McClure house. Tin sheeting now covers the original red cedar shakes.

Part of the front facade of the McClure house was stuccoed and whitewashed. Windows have red sandstone keystone arches.

West gable-end chimney flue in McClure house attic.
The house that John Nisley built for his own family is a ruin today, but even in decay its magnificent proportions are evident. Oriented south and facing a natural pasture, it was a three-bay, Georgian-style, two-and-a-half-story mansion on whose front and west side the first floor is raised about five feet above ground level; the north and east sides are built into a bank.26 (In fact, all Nisley houses have some aspects of this bank arrangement with its relatively direct entrance to two floors. This is a distinguishing feature of the Rhenish house in America27) Evidence of floor outriders above the first level in the front shows that there may have been a porch roof or pent at one time. Then, too, since the front door was five feet above ground level, there must also have been steps or a small porch. The front and back doors, hung on pintles, both had transoms. No evidence of window fenestration remains, but window and door openings are generously proportioned, and have flat, red sandstone, segmented, keystone arches above them. These, and red sandstone quoins, contrast with the limestone used in the rest of the house.28 A watercourse encircles the house at the first-floor level.

Due to deterioration it is impossible now to tell what kind of roof framing the house had. And, since floors are missing, one can only speculate about room function. It is apparent that chimneys were gable end, and that fireplaces were angled into the corner in rooms on the first and second floors. The inside walls were plastered, and there is still evidence of wide chair rails and higher, wide molding with clothes hooks. Probably built so that the original kitchen in the main house could be used for other purposes, a kitchen addition had a northeast-corner fireplace, as is evident from the remains of a raised brick hearth. This was another German feature, added after original construction since the keystone arches exist inside the rear wall of the back addition. The addition appears to have been only one story, although a second story may have collapsed. On the west, rear side of the addition, what appears to be a root cellar is built into the bank, and the remnants of its batten door remain.

A cellar excavated under all the original first-floor rooms has two separate areas. One of these, a nearly circular Rhenish arch cellar (die g’welb keller29) is undoubtedly the most distinctively German feature of the John Nisley house. Measuring ten feet, five inches by twenty-eight feet, four inches, this storage area has, embedded in its ceiling, three iron hooks upon which a pole was suspended to hang meats and cheeses. Cool (about sixty degrees Fahrenheit year round) and dry, it was also used to store fruit, vegetables, dairy products, and baked goods. Two dressed logs the length of the cellar lay parallel to each other on the floor, and these might have held barrels of cider, wine, vinegar, and beer.30 There are also two thirteen-inch-square wall niches, similar to those found in the Donegal Township house of Johannes Nisley.

To provide ventilation so that mold and moisture would not be a problem, the vaulted ceiling has two small, vaulted windows tapered toward the exterior west wall. A third ventilator on the north wall is bricked up. There are two cellar entrances exposed on the front facade, and a short flight of steps leads down to them. The one into the vaulted arch cellar originally probably had a large, herringbone-style wooden door in its curved archway.31 Inside, there was a doorway between the two cellars. Outside, directly behind and attached to the arch cellar was another structure, possibly a combination smokehouse and dairy cellar. Charred bricks suggest a chimney, yet the depth of the cellar suggests a food-storage function, perhaps a spring room since the arch cellar would have served to preserve food.
Carrying on the strong Mennonite tradition he brought from Lancaster County, John Nisley probably worshiped in his own house or in the houses of his neighbors when he first settled in Lower Swatara Township. In 1815, however, a log building to be used as a church and schoolhouse was erected in Walnut Bottom, on land from the farm ("Freshford") of John and Elizabeth Mumma, Nisley's neighbors. John Nisley and his brother Martin both contributed money toward construction, and the Mummas stipulated they were giving the ground to them "as long as they and their heirs and successors possess and confess to the Old Mennonite Creed or Society." 32 John's gravestone is inscribed "Rev. Johannes Nissli," 33 and he is believed to have been the first deacon of this Mennonite church, since he gave valuable assistance in the formation of its congregation. (In this, as in many other Anabaptist groups of Swiss origin, ministers were chosen by "casting the lot." 34)

Apparently John Nisley's neighbors wanted a school
Front view of the remains of John Nisley's mansion.

View of the west side of the John Nisley house showing the windows of the arch cellar and the watercourse at the first-floor level.

Charred bricks seem to indicate the presence of a smokehouse behind the root cellar of the John Nisley house.

Red sandstone quoins and three-part keystone arches contrast with limestone walls on the John Nisley house.

A batten door led to this root cellar in the bank adjacent to the kitchen addition at the back of the John Nisley mansion.

Detail of kitchen-wing interior door surround, the only remaining woodwork in the John Nisley house.
Interior of the arch cellar in the John Nisley house, looking back to the entrance, five steps down from ground level.

A view of the north end of the arch cellar; the large logs were probably used to keep containers off the dirt floor.

Visible at the right rear is the narrow entrance from the main cellar to the arch cellar of the John Nisley house.

Vaulted, barred arch cellar window

Meats and cheeses were hung from hickory poles secured on these iron hooks embedded in the arch cellar ceiling.

This vaulted window on the north wall of the arch cellar was probably bricked up when the root cellar was added.

Thirteen-inch-square wall niche, about a foot from the floor in the John Nisley house arch cellar.
closer to their farms, and perhaps one less conservative than the Mennonite Church School. So, for these and perhaps other reasons, in a deed dated May 4, 1818, John Nisley allotted a section of his land to be the site for a school for subscribing neighborhood families. In the school, which helped speed the assimilation of John Nisley's children into mainstream society, students were taught German and probably English, and were instructed in the principles of the church.

In the Pennsylvania-German tradition, John Nisley provided in great detail for his wife's welfare, and divided his estate equally among his five children. Listed in his inventory is a "lot of books," indicating he was literate; "one clock case" (left to his wife), a sign of wealth among many Pennsylvania Germans; and many notes and bonds showing that he was generous in lending money, probably to relatives and neighbors since the wealthiest members of a family or community served as bankers to younger and poorer members. His wealth and his propensity to invest and be involved in local civic projects involving the larger society are shown by his having cash in the bank, and more than £799 in cash at home, along with "some gold to be weighed"; and by his owning, in addition to household and farm goods, shares in the Harrisburg and Middletown Turnpike.

Of all John Nisley's children his youngest son, Martin (1786-1869; not to be confused with John's brother of the same name), best exemplifies the rapid acculturation which took place in his branch of the Nisley family beginning in the second quarter of the 19th century. A farmer who acquired tracts of land in Lower Swatara Township and reared his family there, he married Fanny Landis, daughter of a Middletown family. This may have been a deciding factor in decisions Martin Nisley made later in life concerning religion and lifestyle.

Martin Nisley prospered financially; records in his own hand show that he had three tenants on four township farms. Educated in the little subscription school on his father's property, he wrote legible, grammatically correct English. Because he was no doubt bilingual, he could converse with the local people who were largely Pennsylvania German, yet since he was able to conduct business in standard English he was able to take part in local government: the tax assessment records of 1835 show that this grandson of an early 18th-century immigrant served for a time as tax collector of Lower Swatara Township.

In 1842, after cultivating and improving his farms and raising his ten children, Martin Nisley bought a lot fronting on Ann Street in Middletown for his and his wife's declining years. This was a new development for this Pennsylvania-German family; no longer did one remain on the farm and live with a son as had always been the custom. Even more surprising, perhaps, was Martin Nisley's abandonment of his strong Mennonite heritage, for he and Fanny became members of the United Brethren Church; Martin is mentioned in the church history as a trustee of the church, located on Water and Spruce Streets in Middletown.

In another break with tradition, Martin and Fanny Nisley were buried in Middletown Cemetery, instead of in a burial plot on the family farm.

Martin Nisley, son of a Mennonite deacon, grandson of an immigrant German farmer, amassed a sizable estate. His inventory lists silver, gold, bank shares, certificates of deposit, and interest on scores of personal notes; a total worth of $29,136.70; a considerable sum in 1868. In his will dated May 27, 1862, he left his wife the Middletown house, its contents, and interest income of $5,000 a year. This, too, was a departure from the Pennsylvania-German custom of bequeathing the care of the mother to a son.

No single room and a place in the parlor for Fanny Nisley; she was able to live the remainder of her life in fine Victorian style in her own town house.

For Martin Nisley's children (and grandchildren) the pull of the town—as evidenced by their social, business, commercial, and political ties—became even stronger. More and more they sought their mates from farther afield than did their relatives living near and dealing in the more rural Hummelstown; they married instead into the Middletown population. This influx of new blood with new ideas further speeded up the assimilation of John's branch of the Nisley family into mainstream society.

In fact, even though Martin's son Felix elected to stay on the farm, he became a judge; another son, Isaac, became treasurer of Dauphin County. But perhaps the best example of fourth generation assimilation is Martin's son Joseph, "one of the highly honored and esteemed citizens of Middletown ... educated in the public schools adjacent to his home and reared in agricultural pursuits." Socially prominent and active, Joseph Nisley was a lifetime member of a very mainstream Lutheran Church; belonged to the Prince Edward Lodge, a Middletown fraternal organization; and was secretary of the Middletown Cemetery Association, where he and his entire family and descendants are buried. A telling example of how completely he had shed the religious beliefs and practices of his forebears is the fact that he and two of his brothers volunteered to serve in the Union cause in 1862. In colonial records a list of Non-Associators (those who refused to bear arms for religious reasons) of 1777 included "John and Martin Nissley," Joseph Nisley's grandfather and great-uncle.

A partner with his brother Jacob in the hardware business, the History of Dauphin County lists Joseph's many achievements: connected to the Middletown furniture factory; engaged in the insurance business; a member of Governor Pollock's staff, 1855-59; United States assessor in 1865; elected prothonotary of Dauphin County, 1867-73; represented Dauphin County in the state legislature, 1875-78; and served on the town school board and the Emmaus Orphans Home. An impressive array of accomplishments, proving that by the third generation in Lower Swatara Township, the assimilation of John Nisley's branch of the Nisley family into the larger society was complete.
Floor plans, Christian and Nancy Nisley Swartz house.
The Christian and Nancy Nisley Swartz house is a five-bay, Georgian-style, stucco-over-limestone structure with a slate roof.

THE CHRISTIAN AND NANCY NISLEY SWARTZ HOUSE

Of the six stone houses in Lower Swatara Township under consideration in this study, three have connections with John Nisley or his direct descendants: The McClure house, on the property when John bought it and in which he may have lived for a time; the house he built himself; and a house owned by Christian Swartz, III, and his wife, Nancy, daughter of Martin, granddaughter of John, great-granddaughter of Johannes Nisley. Built in 1799, the Swartz house is a five-bay, two-and-a-half story limestone structure with red sandstone keystone arches. It has a partial basement and a two-story addition on the back that houses a large kitchen with fireplace downstairs, and a bedroom above. The house is a combination of Georgian and German features—a deliberate blend of both styles—built to display the affluence of a Pennsylvania German who took pride in his wealth. Outstanding architectural elements are the built-in corner cupboard and the mantel and overmantel in the formal parlor. The overmantel has a keystone and “dog-ear” (projecting) corners, while the mantel carving has delicate reeded columns and the same corners as the overmantel; all are late-Georgian features. Typical of Germanic architecture, graceful curves distinguish the mantel molding and echo the heavy curves of the ceiling molding over the fireplace and corner cupboard. That cupboard has six lights—most the original wavy green glass—in each of its two arched, upper doors; these enclose three beautifully carved “butterfly” shelves, scored to hold dishes. Hidden spoon notches up under the plaster were probably used to conceal the family silver; another indication of the family’s wealth. The bottom of the cupboard has two plain doors enclosing two plain corner shelves.
The formal parlor’s cupboard has curved, “butterfly” shelves and notches out of sight inside, at the top of the arch under the plaster, to conceal valuable silverware.

The stairway, definitely not a Georgian showpiece, is rather disappointing after the workmanship of the formal parlor. A plain, heavy railing follows two flights of stairs with a central landing. In the left-front family parlor the original molding has been replaced with black faux marble molding carved in the Eastlake style; a late Victorian addition. Downstairs doors in formal areas are raised-panel, chamfered doors with late Georgian “eared” surrounds. In the family rooms, however, plain, heavy doors with long strap hinges set on pintles are the norm. An odd feature, though, is a heavily chamfered panel just inside the cellar door. Surrounding the door is a delicate reeding in the woodwork, unexpected in an area which should call for even plainer, cheaper construction than that found in the family parlor at the front of the house.

Attached to the rear of the house, the full-two-story kitchen wing has a large cooking fireplace which occupies most of the rear west wall; its mantel has faux marble molding, again probably a Victorian addition. On the south wall is a chair rail and an upper molding for clothes hooks. A back stair leads to the second level, which has been partitioned, making it difficult to determine exactly how the original space was used. It may have been extra bedroom space for tenants, servants, or relatives. A small fireplace in this second-floor addition has been walled up, but on the second floor in the main part of the house the right-front bedroom has a fireplace with the same graceful curves on the corners of the moldings and the same delicate reeding on the sides as the fireplace in the formal parlor; it does not, however, have an overmantel.

The el-shaped cellar is reached by steps leading down from the interior wall of the kitchen; the walls of the stairway are straw-and-mud daubing over hand-cut lath. In the area under the original kitchen (the room behind the
family parlor) is a small arched fireplace and a bin for food storage. The cellar room along the front of the house has large, undressed-log beams, and a stone shelf (probably used for keeping food cool) running the length of the building. It does not appear that these cellar rooms ever had a spring. This once great Georgian residence, now home to two families, has been partitioned off at the central hallway, and doors have been boarded shut. (The attic door is nailed shut, so the condition of the attic framing cannot be determined.) Walls, painted over many times, have some of their plaster missing, and original cupboards have been removed from the kitchen addition. Upstairs floors are marred by holes which once housed stovetubes; the most recent additions are registers for heat from a large coal furnace in the cellar. The beautiful limestone and red sandstone exterior is covered with brown stucco. Only in its massive and stately proportions can one see, outside, hints of the former elegance of this 18th-century house.

THE MARTIN NISLEY FAMILY: A CONSERVATIVE PATTERN OF ACCULTURATION AND ASSIMILATION

John and Michael, the eldest sons of Johannes Nisley, had been living in Lower Swatara Township for twenty years when Martin, the youngest son, moved there. Probably it was John who told Martin about a choice tract of land—222 acres—available for purchase from his neighbor. Called by the Proprietors “Greenbanks,” in 1775 it was sold by them to one Abraham Raiguell, who sold it to Jacob Ricker in 1779; Ricker, in turn, willed it to his son John. At some time during this period the house known today as Elbow Farm was built, probably by Raiguell. On April 11, 1804, the house and all the land was sold for £3,500 to Martin Nisley of Donegal Township, Lancaster County.

Clearly Martin had prospered in the years since the death of his father, and in his new home he would continue to do so: In 1811 he bought thirty-four acres along the Swatara Creek from Adam Hammacher of Derry Township for $120; in 1814, he bought another fifteen acres for $500 from a neighboring tract owned by Henry Beber; and in the same year he acquired eight more acres from neighbor John Fisher for $872.50. Some time after his arrival in the township Martin Nisley married Elizabeth Lehman of nearby Paxton; they reared four children at Elbow Farm, perhaps the earliest German-Georgian farmhouse in Lower Swatara Township. Constructed of fine white limestone, it is two-and-a-half stories with five bays and a partial cellar; the roof has a small bell tower and a clay chimney pot from the old Hummelstown pottery works by the creek. A one-and-a-half story lean-to addition has a large kitchen with a fireplace on the west wall on the first floor and in the cellar below, and an unfinished room immediately under the roof which was probably used for storage or for tenants or servants.

On the north gable was a date stone, now gone and with it the chance to know exactly when the house was built. Certain architectural elements, however, allow us to hazard a guess at its age and builder. For instance, typical of many early German buildings (Lancaster County’s 1769 Christian Stauffer house is one example) is the insulation in the cellar ceiling: laths wrapped with a mixture of clay and straw (and perhaps some manure) were wedged, still wet, into rabbets and ledges cut into the sides of the joists. Attic framing of undressed logs four-to-six-inches in diameter, and uprights and crossbeams are similar to those in Johannes Nisley’s house in Donegal Township, built sometime during the third quarter of the 18th century. Also, Elbow Farm’s twenty-two-inch wide attic floorboards, and partition boards of the same size between the second-floor bedrooms, were only available for construction in the 18th-century before a general clearing of the land took place.

Little has been altered outside or inside at Elbow Farm. On the first floor, wide-board partitions separate the front and back rooms, in contrast to the plaster partition walls of the other houses in this survey. Those houses also have plaster ceilings. At Elbow Farm all the ceilings are white oak. The only major change downstairs is the hardwood flooring which was laid over the original wide floorboards, probably sometime in the late 19th century. All the rooms have chair rail and simple ceiling moldings. Some doors have tulip-shaped iron latches and lock mechanisms. An unusual, typically German sunburst design (found on the ceiling in the 1769 Stauffer house) is carved in the transom over the center hall front door.

In the formal parlor the fireplace has a shield-shaped decoration carved under its beautifully curved mantel. The reeding on this mantel is similar to that found on the fireplace in the already discussed Christian Schwartz house, but there are no “dog-ear” corners and no overmantel. Opposite the fireplace is an impressive arched corner cupboard with twenty lights; again, this is very much like the one found in the Schwartz house. There is also a small, built-in wall cupboard with a single shelf and a door (similar to that found in Johannes Nisley’s house) in this room and in the room behind it, which may originally have been a bedroom. In this room the fireplace mantel is not as elaborate as that in the formal parlor, but is nonetheless elegant. In the front, family parlor, is yet another impressive mantel, this one with a curious diamond-shape design carved into the center. In the room behind this parlor, the original kitchen, is a cooking fireplace that had a bake oven.

The cellar is excavated only in the northern half of the house. It has exceedingly large summer beams, and large, vaulted fireplace supports which take up a large part of the space. Before the kitchen addition was built there was a window and an exterior door on the west wall; the latter now opens into the cellar underneath that addition. This newer cellar has a cooking fireplace for summer or butchering use; an exterior door, four-feet wide with large strap hinges, is large enough to admit the barrels used for liquid or food storage.
All of the house's architectural details point to a German builder (probably, as already noted, the ground's first owner), and Martin Nisley must have felt very much at home in it. The property was closer to Hummelstown than Middletown, and he and his family tended to deal mostly in that more rural settlement. Like his brother John, Martin was a member of the Old Mennonite Society, and a subscriber to the building fund of the Walnut Bottom Mennonite Church. When he died in 1825, Martin Nisley was buried in the family burial plot on a high hill overlooking Elbow Farm. His, and later his wife Elizabeth's, gravestone was inscribed in German, indicating that it was their primary...
Elbow Farm, home of Martin Nisley; note clay chimney pot and Victorian bell tower. A 20th-century porch obscures the five-bay Georgian facade.

North elevation of Elbow Farm showing attached kitchen wing, bank cellar entrance, segmental window arches, and depression for missing date stone.

A portion of the cellar ceiling near the summer beam has broken away to reveal the mud-and-straw insulation of Elbow Farm.

Interior view of four-foot wide batten cellar door with three-foot wide strap hinges hung on pintles.

Attic framing detail, Elbow Farm.

Attic door with latch, Elbow Farm.

Language.

Martin left his eldest son a two-hundred-acre tract “Situated on the Turnpike Road near Middletown.”51 Samuel, the youngest son, received the house and “two hundred acres near to the place I now live on.”52 Samuel, therefore, had the care of his mother, as was the Pennsylvania-German custom. And, as also was customary, Martin Nisley made careful provision for his wife’s welfare even though he disinherited her. Samuel was obligated to give her cider, apples, and firewood, as well as grain, hay, and pasturage for her horse and cows. She had cellar and garret privileges, and was guaranteed “the first room to the left of the entry downstairs with the kitchen” and given a sum of money annually.53
A small wall cupboard in the northwest corner of the room behind the formal parlor at Elbow Farm.

Elbow Farm’s center-hall front door has a rare and unusual sunburst motif carved in its transom.

Massive corner cupboard in the formal parlor of Elbow Farm. Note the details of the arched doors, the molding above them, and the oak ceiling, found throughout the house.

Corner fireplace opposite the cupboard in the formal parlor, at Elbow Farm. Note the delicate reeding and shield-shaped carving just under the mantel.

Cooking fireplace in the room behind the family parlor, the original kitchen at Elbow Farm; its bake oven has been bricked up. Mantel detail of the fireplace shows plain but graceful curves.

The original cooking fireplace at Elbow Farm was replaced by this now shuttered fireplace located on the west wall of the kitchen addition.

THE 1846 SAMUEL NISLEY HOUSE

Samuel, the second generation of the Martin Nisley family in Lower Swatara Township, married Nancy Wisler; the two lived on Elbow Farm and he continued to add to the land he inherited from his father. Samuel’s sister Maria had married Johannes Heichert, who owned a neighboring farm. In 1836 when their son Johannes, Samuel’s nephew, died intestate leaving no issue, his aunts and uncles petitioned the court in Harrisburg to settle his estate. At the resulting public sale, Samuel Nisley, the “highest and best bidder” paid $2191.29 for a fifty-four acre tract that lay south of his own land and bordered it the entire length. Now fronting on Longview Drive, Samuel Nisley’s property was directly opposite the property of his cousin Martin (son of John Nisley). In 1848 when his neighbor on the west, Jacob Fisher, decided to sell and move to Middletown, Samuel bought his tract of about thirty-four acres for $1,092.50.55

At the time of this last acquisition Samuel and Nancy Nisley were no longer living at Elbow Farm. In 1846, with their family grown, they decided to build a grand Georgian-Georgian stone house on an embankment overlooking Elbow Farm. This old homestead Samuel gave to his daughter Anna and her husband, Isaac Ober; he and his wife and their son Martin moved across the road to their new, “modern” house which nonetheless retained features charact-
eristic of the German cultural background of its well-to-do owner. In fact, this new house "demonstrates a willingness [by Samuel Nisley] to abide by plans, pattern, and formulas from the past."56 Constructed of local blue-gray limestone (covered with stucco at some subsequent time), the 1846 Samuel Nisley house fits neatly into the profile of the Pennsylvania Culture Region farmhouse with its two-and-a-half story, five-bay front facade with central door, and its two horizontal rows of openings on each floor of the gable-end walls.57

Floor plans, Samuel Nisley house

The 1846 Samuel Nisley house was entirely stuccoed at one time and whitewashed at ground level. Note outriders for double porches; top center window was once a door.

Rear view, Samuel Nisley house.

South gable side of the Samuel Nisley house showing date stone, attic ventilators, and cellar door.
Windows on the first floor are traditional German nine-over-six fenestration with thin muntins; on the second floor they are six-over-six. All first-story windows are slightly taller than those above. Gable-end walls have fan-shaped attic windows and horizontal pairs of windows on the first and second floors. These tend to give a look of solidarity and width, imparting the idea of a secure and substantial people;\(^{28}\) they are a major visual symbol of the Middle Atlantic Region.\(^{29}\) In a departure from other Nisley houses which preceded it, and reflecting an early Victorian trend, the house was built with two front porches. A flight of steps led to the first-story porch, and a door opened out from the house onto the second-story porch. Both porches were removed at some later date, and then the upstairs door was converted to a window. The gable roof has twelve trusses with purlins for slate shingles. The ridge is open at the apex with a thirteen-inch-board nailed to the beams at either side of the ridge. Mortised beams are pegged at each joint near the eaves. On each gable-end wall two chimney flues join in the attic to form a single flue through the roof. There are gable-end fireplaces in three of the first-floor rooms, with stovetops vented into the flues for the bedrooms on the second floor; a mid-nineteenth century improvement in convenience and comfort. This double-flue construction meant each room could be heated by a stove connected into the flue. The cellar also had fireplaces on each gable-end wall; the larger one on the north wall was probably used for cooking, and possibly for butchering.

Inside, the house is a typical German design: squarish rooms flanking both sides of a central five-foot-wide hallway, with the two front rooms used as parlors, and rear rooms sequestered behind doors as family privacy demanded. The right rear room with its large, walk-in fireplace was the kitchen; the left rear room may have been used as a bedroom, since it is the only first-floor room
without a fireplace. All the rooms have chair rail and molding a few feet above it for pegs to hang clothing. Cupboards beside each fireplace downstairs, and beside each flue in the two front upstairs bedrooms, are the only built-in furniture; their plain utilitarianism is in marked contrast to the elaborate German corner cupboards of the Swartz house and Elbow Farm.

This is the most extensively altered of all the houses in this survey; only the original woodwork has been left largely untouched, with some of it still having traces of the original blue paint. A few of the 1846 doors remain, too, although several are missing. The right front parlor has been partitioned to make a bathroom; a pipe to the septic tank runs at right angles out the stone front to the ground. The wall between the present-day kitchen and living room on the south side has been cut through, and a counter top installed. The interior parlor wall on the hallway side has also been cut through, perhaps to admit more light, or to give a feeling of spaciousness.

Although only the remains of a smokehouse are still visible on the north side of the house, the placement of other outbuildings would also reveal Pennsylvania-German patterns. Fortunately, this Nisley property (and one still to be discussed, built in 1871) was depicted in the 1875 Combination Atlas Map of Dauphin County (Everts and Steward, Philadelphia). From that print it is obvious the property was maintained in meticulous Victorian style. The entire appearance of the farmstead indicates a desire for order, for bringing nature under the control of man. Evidences are the rectilinear fencing, erected to keep livestock out of the lawn area and which also enclosed the barnyard and flanked the lane down to the road; the on-axis (lining up, gable to gable) siting of the house and barn; and the neat arrangement of the outbuildings—a smokehouse, pumphouse, and corncrib. Dominating the
ridge on which it is built and commanding a view of all
the surrounding area, it is obvious that this is the property
of a man who has made his mark financially, and who
wants his neighbors to know it.
Samuel Nisley’s wealth is reflected in the 1859 inven-
tory of his estate, which lists, among other items, a settle,
an armchair, a tall clock, two secretaries, bureaus, a chest,
lookingglasses, and stoves. His was not an unusual case:

Mennonites generally were more affluent than other de-
nominal groups in Pennsylvania, perhaps because of
the paradox which exists between their desire to remain
“plain” and separate from the world, and the drive for
material well-being; an evidence of their desire for per-
fection. Possibly to prove their salvation to the world,
“worldly success became a goal for those who officially
eschewed worldliness.”

THE 1871 “BIG MART” AND MARY NISLEY
HOUSE
Samuel Nisley’s only son was named Martin, and since
he was commonly known as “Big Mart” in Lower Swatara
Township, that is how he will be referred to hereafter, to
distinguish him from his grandfather and his great-uncle
John’s son of the same name. In his will Samuel gave his
son “all my Plantation whereon I now live [the 1846
house]”; and his daughter Anna his “other Plantation [Elbow
Farm].” Each bequest included somewhere between 160–
200 acres. Big Mart, as executor of the estate, was charged
to pay out of it $1,500 to each of the daughters of his
dead sister, Elizabeth Nisley Mumma. It was common
in Nisley wills in both branches of the family to remember
the children of deceased sons and daughters with a bequest
of money when they reached age twenty-one. This shows
a deep concern for the welfare of minor Nisley children
and grandchildren.
Sometime during the last half of the 19th century, Big Mart Nisley married neighbor Mary Roop, and it is likely they went to housekeeping in the 1846 house. They had four children, of whom only Anna and Mary survived to adulthood. A farmer like his father, Big Mart also added to his real estate holdings. At a public sale in 1862 he bought 119 acres for $199.50 from neighbor Jonathon Fisher.63 In 1869 he built a large bank barn on this land, on a rise overlooking Longview Drive. Then, two years later, a majestic Georgian-style bank house was—according to the date stone still on it—"Built by Martin and Mary Nisley [in] 1871." This house is a copy of his father’s 1846 house, including even the bank cellar; apparently the ways of his forefathers were good enough for the conservative Big Mart, for instead of "modernizing," he imitated.

The most striking characteristic of this 1871 Nisley house is its great height: three stories in front; two-and-a-half stories in the back, which is built into a bank; and three-and-a-half stories on the east gable end where the cellar is completely above ground. A fine Victorian porch still perches high above the ground on the front second story, but the steps which originally led up to it are gone. The porch’s lacy woodwork frames a panoramic view of the Lower Swatara landscape.

The floor plan of the house is typical center-hall Georgian. The hall itself is wider and has a more elaborate staircase than the hall in the 1846 house it is patterned after. Upstairs, part of it has been partitioned to make a small, fifth bedroom in the front of the house. The right-rear room in the downstairs has also been partitioned, and it is impossible now to tell whether it or the room across from it was the original kitchen, although, since it faces the barnyard, it was probably the latter.64 Apart from these partitions and the addition of baseboard heating to replace coal stoves, the house looks much as it did when it was built. It retains its original flooring, woodwork, and panel doors, including those on the built-in wall closets which replaced clothes rails on the second floor.

There is evidence that an out-kitchen once existed just to the rear of the house, but there is no evidence that any of the three cellar rooms were ever used for cooking or butchering. An unusual Germanic feature of this cellar is a deep pit in the northeast corner. An impressive thirty feet deep, it is reached by ladders suspended from ceiling joists. Its vaulted windows are sealed shut, and large bins line its inside wall. Exactly what this space was used for is not clear, since its great depth would seem to make it impractical for ordinary food storage, and there is no evidence of a spring or shelves to hold dairy products.

That Big Mart Nisley would choose to build a house much like his father’s was not unusual; the Georgian design was the prevalent one in the heart of the Pennsylvania Culture Region even as late as 1871.65 It had been so
Attic framing in Big Mart's house shows technological advances; the mortise-and-joints are no longer pegged, but have machine-made nails.

This flue support on the west gable-end wall indicates that the family parlor was heated by a wood or coal stove. The bedrooms also have stovepipe openings into the flue.

Well “accepted into the vernacular, that examples were [still] being built a century after the Georgian form had been decreed out of fashion.”66 Like many Pennsylvania Germans, the Nisleys felt comfortable in them, for the bilateral symmetry of the center-hall Georgian design allowed them to use interior spaces much as their ancestors had done: close off the formal parlor and you still had a family “hearth room” (stube) and a chamber (kammer) for use as a bedroom or for storage; add a bank cellar and you still had Georgian style, but with German spatial usage.

“When change occurs in folk building, it is slow, modest change.”67 As we have seen, this was certainly true for the Nisleys, with their gradual shift from the strongly vernacular folk house of Johannes to the less vernacular yet still strongly German bank house of Big Mart, the last builder. While they would allow the outward appearance of their houses to be changed,68 they were much more conservative when it came to interior spaces; change the proportions or the arrangement of rooms and you disrupt the entire folk pattern of living and working. The Nisleys—and many of their neighbors—wanted a house that would conform outwardly with the houses being built by those in the larger society, but which would still allow them to go about their business in the “old way,”69 inside. To them,

Steps from the main cellar to the area of the cellar hole or pit. Bins were used for food storage.

The bottom of the cellar pit, thirty feet deep, was reached from long, ladder-like structures suspended from the ceiling joists.
This gable-end cellar door on the Big Mart Nisley house is completely above ground. Its average width indicated that no butchering activities took place in the cellar.

One of the two front cellar doors in the Big Mart Nisley house.

A kitchen garden between Big Mart Nisley's house and barn looks like it must have in his time. Details show barn date stone ("1869") and ventilator.

"home" meant a German-Georgian stone farmhouse and a barn surrounded by rolling farmland.

The 1871 house and farm and its owners, Big Mart and Mary Nisley, were depicted in the 1875 Combination Atlas Map of Dauphin County, along with the 1846 Joseph Nisley property which they also owned. It was a fitting tribute to Big Mart's prominence in the area, and to his husbandry and custodianship of the land. Described as "one of the most reliable men this township has produced," he was so trusted and revered by his neighbors that he was frequently called upon to be the executor of their wills and the guardian of their widows and children. When neighbor Nathaniel Swope died, for example, Big Mart was made guardian of his son and daughter, when they came of age he saw to it that they each received the monies entrusted to him by their father.

While his great-uncle John's children and grandchildren were moving to Middletown and becoming fully assimilated into mainstream society and into commercial and professional occupations, Big Mart Nisley and his wife were still maintaining their deep Pennsylvania-German commitment to the land. As for their social and business connections, they are made obvious by the newspaper notices of Big Mart's death. When that occurred in 1892, the Middletown Daily Journal took note of the fact in a terse announcement. The Hummelstown Sun, however, was much more informative, describing him as a member of the Mennonite Church and noting that he was "a prominent citizen of Swatara Township and a gentleman well known throughout the county. ...[A man] esteemed by all who knew him."

Samuel Nisley's will had specifically mentioned the "graveyard on said Plantation [on the 1846 farm] which shall be kept in good fence at all times hereafter by my son, Martin." It was here that Samuel's father and mother, Martin and Elizabeth Nisley, were buried, and where he and his wife Nancy would be interred. The stones for the first two are inscribed entirely in German, and although Samuel's stone cannot be found, since he died in 1859 it is likely his stone was inscribed in English since he probably used it as a first language or was bilingual. Remaining conservative to the end, Big Mart Nisley was also buried in this little graveyard behind his 1846 childhood home, overlooking the beautiful Swatara Creek and the surrounding land of his forebears.

THE NISLEY PROPERTIES AND LANDSCAPE

Following his conservative traditions, Big Mart Nisley's daughters married men from neighboring farms. After their father's death, Anna and Adam Shope inherited the 1846 farm, and Mary and Samuel Good received the 1871 property. By the turn of the century, though, what had been his properties (and the properties that had been owned by the family of his great-uncle, John Nisley), had been divided and sold; no Nisley owns or farms land in Lower Swatara Township today. The Nisley family story does not end there, however. On the brink of the 21st century, their isolated community of limestone houses and farms remains, the legacy of devout Old Order Mennonites only one generation removed from the horrors of religious persecution in Europe. Their religious heritage left a mark on the landscape of the township, and such landscapes, when
The headstone of Martin Nisley, one of the few stones remaining upright in the 1846 Nisley burial ground. All that is left of the Nisley-Swartz burial ground. John Nisley and his descendants (including Nancy Nisley Swartz) are interred here. Vandals have smashed some of the stones and flung others into the Swatara Creek.

North Union Street in Lower Swatara Township, unchanged since colonial times, now marked for widening and straightening so it can accommodate truck traffic.

Signs of the times: much farm ground in Lower Swatara Township is being sold for commercial, residential, and industrial development.

studied, help us “unravel threads of culture which make up a particular region.”

The families of John and Martin Nisley maintained a cultural-geographical pattern in keeping with Mennonite ideals of separation. The sectarian groups settled in rural clusters, claimed their territory, and put down deep roots. Mennonites continued to live on family farms rather than agricultural villages, and, “intertwined through marriage,” they were a community of family, close in life and close even in death, as the Martin Nisley family cemetery makes plain.

It is ironic that the very feature—the topography—which drew the Nisleys and Mennonite families like them to the Swatara area in the 18th century, will probably be the cause of the disappearance of their artifacts in the century to come. Mennonite farmers always looked for fertile soil, and often settled in areas where the soil was limestone. In Lower Swatara Township the major geographic feature is the Swatara Creek, which forms the township’s eastern boundary. The land is defined by lush meadows and steeply rolling hills with deeply etched, curving streams running down to the creek. The creek itself is rimmed by high, craggy bluffs of limestone which drop abruptly to the limestone creek bed. There are quarries along the creek which have been worked since the early settlement of the area; probably the earliest and largest is the one above the creek on Elbow Farm. The Nisley houses were built of limestone taken from these local quarries, and their gravestones were cut from them as well.

In fact, the entire northeast quadrant of Lower Swatara Township is underlaid with ribbons of limestone, and today almost the entire area is zoned industrial or residential. In an era when agricultural conservatorship is being implemented in some areas of the state, this ancient section of limestone farmland has no such protection in Dauphin County. Indeed, the fate of the Nisley settlement area today is being determined by industrial and business concerns which have crept into the township since the middle of the 20th century. As a result of zoning changes, several key industries have taken over Nisley tracts and irreparably damaged the landscape.

The present owners of Elbow Farm are Mr. and Mrs. Aaron Hoffer. According to Mrs. Hoffer, when they were given the farm by Mr. Hoffer’s father, a company from the Philadelphia area offered to buy it for the limestone quarry. The Hoffers declined to sell, thereby preserving one 18th-century Nisley limestone farmhouse, but did agree to lease to them the quarries on the ridge overlooking the creek. Later, the same company bought another quarry lease along the creek, strengthening their hold on the perimeters of the Martin Nisley homestead.

In 1979 the heirs of the last private owner of the 1846 Samuel Nisley farm sold it to a company which manufactures cinder blocks. The property was a windfall for the company since the entire farm is underlaid with limestone, a major ingredient of their product. They are holding the tract as a future source of stone for their plant in the township, so it is conceivable that someday much of the area could become an open pit limestone quarry. In the meantime, the cinder-block company rents part of the land to farmer Aaron Hoffer, and part to a company that raises Christmas trees. Each year, according to Mrs. Hoffer, the company takes more land for trees, leaving less for tillage. In August of 1990, the first trees matured, and the last tenant vacated the 1846 house in preparation for the opening of the Christmas tree business in December. Thus, after 145 years of continuous occupancy, the house sits, empty and abandoned, a ruin; it is only a matter of time before it is torn down or falls down from neglect.

The remaining Nisley properties—the Christian Swartz house, the McClure house, the John Nisley house ruin, and the 1871 Big Mart Nisley house—are all owned by a company that runs a large commercial chicken farming operation. The Swartz house has been partitioned and is
It seems likely that, in the not-too-distant future, most of the Nisley landscape will disappear from Lower Swatara Township. Presently occupied by two tenant families. These or former tenants have removed some of the original architectural elements, compromising the structure's historical integrity. Nearby, the Nisley-Christian Swartz graveyard has been vandalized, some of its gravestones thrown into the Swatara Creek. The McClure house stands empty and decaying, exposed to weather and vandals who have already completely removed the white-pine flooring from the second-floor bedrooms; the windows and doors are also gone. Commendably, the owners of the chicken-farming operation have seen fit to restore the 1871 Nisley house by pointing the stone, painting the woodwork, and keeping it in good repair for the tenants. All the tracts around these houses are currently rented for farming, helping to at least preserve the appearance of the Nisley landscape.

The potential for destruction is there, however, since zoning permits the land to be used for residential housing, if and when the present owner decides to sell. He spoke of the political and social groups who object to the odor and unsightliness of the chicken farms; of the need for irrigation water and for water-pollution controls; and of the fact that he was getting older and his sons might tire of the business, in which case the land could be sold to any business concern if the price were right. Several new housing developments have already sprung up in the township, altering the historic landscape and diminishing the remaining farmscape. A proposal for one of these developments—163 single-family houses on what was formerly a family farm—claims that "the tract's sloping terrain will add to [its] attractive setting by creating rolling hills and winding curves in the streets." The current residential-agricultural zoning of the Samuel and Big Mart Nisley tracts would allow residential development there, while the Martin Nisley house, Elbow Farm, zoned residential-rural, is bordered by quarries in the residential-limited zone. This zoning could easily be changed if Elbow Farm were ever sold to a quarrying firm. Most of the John Nisley tract ("Richland") with the Swartz and McClure houses is also zoned residential-agricultural, and for the present these will remain. But a township supervisor believes that in the future (when a new on-ramp to Route 283 is built) this land will probably be an industrial park.

In fact, because the area is so accessible to major traffic arteries and transportation facilities, it is a prime area, with its present zoning, for commercial, industrial, and residential development. Unless steps are taken by the township and its residents, it seems likely that, in the century to come, the hollows and hills of Pennsylvania-German Nisley landscape in the Swatara Creek basin will disappear forever.
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ENDNOTES

4. There are various ways of spelling the family name, but there is no difference in pronunciation. Over the years several different spellings are found in documents—official and unofficial—pertaining to the family of Johannes the immigrant. To avoid confusion, it will henceforth in this account be spelled "Nisley."
7. The relationship between these groups of Mennonite families was close, as they established neighboring farms and intermarried.
11. A short distance south between the house and the mill location is a small burial plot in the left-hand corner of the yard at 820 East Bainbridge St., probably the resting place of Johannes and Mary Nisley.
14. ibid.
16. These tripartite houses had a rather squarish plan with a centrally located, off-center fireplace, a Küche or kitchen, a somewhat square room, the Stube, in the front end, and a smaller rectangular room to the rear, the Kammer, whose axis is perpendicular to that of the kitchen.
18. Perhaps this cupboard is an outgrowth of the Germanic or Teutonic "Holy Corner," before the Reformation, a place to keep sacred articles of the Catholic faith. After the Reformation things like the Bible, prayer books and hymn and communion items were kept there. Eventually, it may have been used to keep family heirlooms and valuables, losing its religious significance.
21. Long, Amos. Pennsylvania German Family Farm, pp. 82-85.
assessors. The United Brethren, a sect which emphasized a heartfelt piety, made inroads in the ranks of the Mennonites. In 1846 the trustees of the United Brethren congregation of which Martin Niels was a trustee, moved to "Christ's Church on Water Street in Middletown. Isaac H. Nissly, a grandson, contributed a stained glass window in the building of the present edifice in 1899.


"Middletown Journal," 3 April 1879.

Keller, Luther Reiley, History of Dauphin County, pp. 463-464.

"Chronicls of Middletown lists Joseph, along with his two brothers, Jacob and Martin Luther Nisly, as privates in the Middletown Cavalry volunteer guards, September 7, 1862.


Eills and Evans, History of Lancaster County, p. 991.

Eills, Note and Queries, p. 463.

See the examples of "cared" mantel and ornament treatment and the "cared" architecture of the Georgian doorway in Hugh Morrison's Early American Architecture. The elegantly cared doorways of the Swartz house contrast with the vernacular large strap hinges and pinles of the doors themselves, a German feature.


Extra bedrooms were probably necessitated by budding notions of individuality and privacy during the nineteenth century.


Record of Deeds, Dauphin County Courthouse, Vol. 0-1-41.

Record of Deeds, Dauphin County Courthouse, Vol. 0-1-41.


Their use is uncertain, but they are an indication of early construction.
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Kniffen, Fred, pp. 553-555.

Inventory of Samuel Nisly, 15 Feb. 1859.


Record of Deeds, Dauphin County Courthouse, Book G, p. 33.


Glass's theory is that barnyard visibility could be most effectively obtained from the kitchen, thus influencing kitchen placement relative to the barnyard ... although absence of data prevents confirmation of this theory. Random checking confirms this, however, and this is where the twentieth-century kitchen is located in the 1871 house.

Ibid., p. 176.
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The Sun (Hummelstown), No date, clipping courtesy of Hummelstown Historical Society.
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Mrs. Aaron Hoffer, Personal interview by Margaret Reynolds, 12 December 1990.

Noah Kreider, Phone interview by Margaret Reynolds, 28 July 1991.


When his educational program for the workers of the New Lanark cotton mills in Scotland was halted by his partners, Robert Owen (1771-1858) bought the town of Harmony, Indiana, from George Rapp and the Harmony Society. Rapp and his followers had left Württemberg, Germany, to settle in Butler County, Pennsylvania, where they built their first Utopian Community in 1805. Outgrowing that location, they began looking for new land in 1814, and soon relocated to the banks of the Wabash River in southwestern Indiana. This was the settlement sold to Owen in January, 1825. A philanthropist and reformer, Owen planned to put into effect his ideas for a new moral world based on education. Although New Harmony—as Owen renamed the town—was destined to be an economic failure (Owen returned to Great Britain in 1828), it did become a center for educational experimentation and scientific studies. The headquarters of the first U.S. Geological Survey, it was visited by many of the great men of science of the time. It was, in fact, the western outpost of science in America in the first half of the 19th century.

Just as Pennsylvania had a close connection with the Rapp colony in Indiana, so did it with the Owen settlement. Owen’s financial partner in New Harmony was geologist William Maclure, who was a reformer as well as a scientist. Maclure (1763-1840), born in Scotland, had made a fortune before settling in Philadelphia, where he was a benefactor of the Academy of Natural Sciences and its president from 1817-1840. He planned to establish a school of industry in New Harmony to promote the welfare of the laboring classes by bringing the knowledge of science and a useful education within their reach.

Among Maclure’s colleagues in Philadelphia who followed him to New Harmony were Dr. Gerard Troost, a founder and first president of the Academy; John Speakman, another founder and the Academy’s treasurer and librarian; Thomas Say, yet another founder and the Academy’s first curator; and the subject of this study, artist-naturalist Charles-Alexandre Lesueur—called by some the Raphael of natural history—the Academy’s curator from 1817-1825.

The Philadelphia Academy of Sciences, the oldest institution of its kind in continuous existence in America, had a direct connection with the Royal Museum of Natural History in Paris: Lesueur, Troost, and Maclure had all had associations with it. Founded in 1635 by Louis XIII as the Jardin du Roi, it was organized as the Museum of Natural History in 1792. From a house and twenty-four acres of land used mainly for the culture of medicinal plants, it had reached its enviable position as the mecca of the scientific world by the 1820s. With its stated objective the teaching of natural history in all its branches, it presented in its amphitheater twelve courses of lectures, with the most learned men in France appointed professors to head each branch. It maintained its original mandate to promote popular education by exhibiting actual specimens, and demonstrators assisted professors in the laboratory and in interrelating the gardens and zoo with the lectures. The Museum’s publication, the "Annals," found its counterpart in Philadelphia in 1817, when the Academy of Natural Sciences issued its first "Journal;" and in New Harmony in 1830 when Maclure’s School Press began printing scientific works.
Charles-Alexandre Lesueur’s connection with the Paris museum is well documented in Royer’s History and Description of the Royal Museum of Natural History. (The tattered remains of Lesueur’s own inscribed copy of this book was found in New Harmony in 1969, tucked between the rafters of an old Harmonist house there.)19 The son of an officer in the Admiralty, Lesueur (1778-1846) was born in Le Havre, and, after serving briefly on a dispatch boat in the English Channel, found employment as a draftsman.11 At age twenty-two, having passed a competitive examination, he was given a minor post with a French scientific expedition.

This expedition, taken on behalf of the Royal Museum, came about when the “first consul” [Napoleon] was persuaded “to send two vessels to Australasia for the purpose of discovery in geography and the natural sciences. ... [As a result], two ships, the Geographer and the Naturalist, ... sailed from Havre on the 19th of October 1800.”12 The ships “touched at the Isle of France ... reconnoitered the western shore of New Holland, and repaired to Timor, where they lay six weeks. They then revisited the same coast, made the circuit of Van Diemen’s Land, and steering northwards to Port Jackson, lay in that harbor for five months; thence they resumed their course to Timor, by Bass’s Straits, and returning to France entered the port of Lorient the 25th of March 1804.”13

It was an expedition plagued by scurvy, dysentery and other diseases that “extended their ravages among the crew of both vessels. Near Port Jackson ... only twelve men out of one hundred and seventy were in a condition to do their duty.”14 Lesueur, who had begun the voyage as a member of the crew, was given “the honorable station of painter of natural history”15 after his talents were discovered. Together Lesueur and François Péron, the only zoologist remaining of the five who had started the trip, “amassed an infinite variety of objects”16 which, in sheer numbers alone, exceeded all that had been previously assembled by the Museum. There were more than 100,000 specimens of animals of all classes, several of which had been recognized as important genera: the number of new species exceeded 2,500. And the botanical collection was just as impressive, for they brought back “a great number of seeds and preserved species, of which three-fourths were new.”17 The two “indefatigable young men”18 had brought home everything it was possible to preserve, “either dried, carefully stuffed, or in spirits”19 (using their daily rum rations as a preservative); even skeletons were prepared and preserved whenever practical.

In 1806, when a complete summary of the voyage was made, it was noted that “fifteen hundred drawings or paintings executed by Lesueur with extreme precision, reproduce[d] the principal objects which were collected by his careful industry, and that of his friend.”20 Speaking of Lesueur’s paintings, the chief zoologist on the Naturalist, Bory de St. Vincent, who was “himself no mean artist,”21 described them as “masterpieces of art.”22 The results of the expedition had more than fulfilled the expectations of its sponsors, and for their work Lesueur and Péron were awarded pensions by Napoleon.23

After the death of Péron in December, 1810, Lesueur traveled to Philadelphia, the starting point for a geological tour of the Great Lakes and northeastern United States.24 Living afterward in Philadelphia, Lesueur had trouble making ends meet. “I’m doing enough to keep alive,” he wrote, “I cover fifteen miles on foot (during which I rest three times) in order to give drawing lessons to some very pleasant young ladies who speak Greek and Latin ... and study botany.”25 In 1825 he joined the scientists under Maclure at New Harmony where, working as naturalist, artist, and teacher, he met many of the influential men of the time.

One of these men, Karl Bernhard, Duke of Saxe-Weimar- Eisenach, visited New Harmony during his tour of the United States in 1825-26. Knowledgeable about the work of the 1800-04 scientific expedition, he recorded in his journal that Lesueur “possessed all the illuminated designs of the animals which were discovered for the first time upon this voyage,” adding, “I count myself fortunate to have seen them.”26

Karl Bodmer’s “Lesueur in New Harmony,” 1833. (Courtesy of James A. Sanders, Dir. Historic New Harmony, Inc.)

In the winter of 1832-33 Lesueur and Thomas Say—the only scientists then remaining in New Harmony—were visited by Maximilian, Prince of Wied. He noted that “Mr. Lesueur’s labors were chiefly in the higher orders of the animal kingdom; he had explored the country in many directions, was acquainted with everything remarkable, [had] collected and prepared all interesting objects, and had already sent considerable collections to France. He was a skillful draughtsman, and his portfolios of drawings, made during his voyage around the world, and in his residence
in America, afforded us much gratification.” After his journey into western lands, Maximilian returned to New Harmony and, joined by Lesueur, traveled by wagon across Indiana, northward to Lake Erie and eastward to Niagara Falls—exploring all the way—and on to Boston.

In New Harmony, just as in Philadelphia, Lesueur experienced financial problems because he still did not receive a salary, but was only supplied with the barest necessities in exchange for his work. He was dependent on his meager (1,500 francs per year) pension from the French government, and in order to collect it made five trips to New Orleans to prove to the French consul there that he was still alive. Still, life in New Harmony was not all work, for there were dances and the theater to be enjoyed. For the latter Lesueur painted scenery for the Thespian Society, including a drop curtain appropriately entitled “Two Scientific Wonders of the New World, Niagara Falls and the Rattlesnake.”

Possessed of an amicable disposition, Lesueur had a rare capacity for making close friends. One of those friends was his colleague in New Harmony, Thomas Say (1787-1834), who has been called the father of descriptive entomology in America. Born in Philadelphia, Say had accompanied Maclure on his scientific explorations of Florida and eastern Georgia, and had also been on two scientific expeditions to the Rocky Mountains. In New Harmony he and his wife Lucy lived in the mansion which had been home first to George Rapp, and then to William Maclure, before Maclure’s departure for Mexico. Say, the great-grandson of John Bartram, the first native American botanist, had collected specimens for the Bartram botanical gardens as a child. In New Harmony, too, “Mr. Say’s house was in a garden, where he cultivated many interesting plants of the interior of Western America.” That observation was made by Maximilian, who added: “I saw there a large Maclura auranriaca (Nuttall), the bow or yellow wood, or Osage orange, from the river Arkansas, of the wood of which many Indian tribes make their bows. ... In Mr. Say’s garden I likewise saw Euphorbia marginata, from Arkansas, several beautiful Phlox; and the Lonicera sempervirens was laden with fruit.”

Lesueur painted a picture of the Rapp-Maclure Mansion—“Thomas Say’s House in New Harmony”—which is now in the Kennedy Collection at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, and the existence of which I discovered quite by chance. I immediately requested a photograph of the painting, and the watercolor caused quite a stir.
Lesueur’s “Lesueur’s House in New Harmony.” (Courtesy of Jacqueline Bonnemains, curator, and the Muséum D’Histoire Naturelle du Havre)

among restoration historians in New Harmony, as no one had seen a picture of the mansion when it was two storied: partially destroyed by fire in 1844, it was rebuilt as a one-story structure.

Lesueur’s painting shows Thomas Say standing on the portico of the Rapp-Maclure mansion, looking over his scientific garden which included the Koelreuteria paniculata (varnish tree), a limb of which is seen in the upper right-hand corner. Called because of its sprays of yellow flowers the “tree of the golden rain” by the Chinese, in New Harmony it was known as the “gate tree” since the first one, grown from seed sent to Say from Maclure in Mexico, flourished by the gate of Maclure’s house. (The original gate tree no longer exists, but its descendants fill the town today.) Through the branches of the tree in the painting’s upper left-hand corner can be seen the north wing of the Harmonist brick church, built by the Rappites in 1822. Lesueur made a sketch of his own New Harmony residence from this wing, through what was known as the “Door of Promise,” with its distinctive fanlight.

Thomas Say’s tombstone in the garden of the Rapp-Maclure-Owen house in New Harmony.

When Thomas Say died in New Harmony his wife placed a marble slab on the grave. Later, however, Alexander Maclure, William’s brother and the executor of his estate, arranged for Say’s remains to be placed in a vault within the grounds on the left of the mansion. Then, “the members of the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia raised money for a stone in Say’s memory, to be erected in New Harmony. It was cut by the best stone cutter in Philadelphia, J. Struthers, who also carved the sarcophagus into which [George] Washington’s body was transferred in 1832.”

The antiquity of man in America has long been a subject of interest to scholars and Lesueur is credited with making the first scientific anthropological explorations in Indiana. Indeed, his descriptions are among the earliest of such surveys in the New World. Of these explorations, Maximilian had recorded: “About fifteen miles from New Harmony, lower down the Wabash, is a part of a bank known by the name of the Bone Bank, where the river has partly cut through a hill, or laid it bare, in which there are a number of human bones seen imbedded in the bank. ... An old tree having fallen down on this place, he [Lesueur] saw under the roots an entire human skeleton ...”
Lesueur himself described the finding of a Mound Builder’s skull on the Bone Bank at a place where “bones from several skeletons ... were hanging over the collapsed bank. We found two heads side by side, [but] one had reached [such] a degree of decay that it fell to pieces as soon as touched. The other had its upper jaw uncovered, all teeth showing. In our excitement we were not cautious enough and the lower jaw fell to the ground and broke to pieces when picked up.” Lesueur sent the skull to the Museum of Natural History in Paris in 1829, and, using Lesueur resources there and in Le Havre, professor of natural science Dr. Ernest-Théodore Hamy wrote in 1904: “If attention had been called to it on its arrival at the Museum, this skull from Bone Bank would have been found to be the prototype of that quite unusual race which is found in the mounds, pueblos, and cliffs, and of which the Scioto Skull of Squier and Davis is the best known to the anthropologists.”

In 1975, in connection with another study, I decided to ask the Paris museum to check the book of accessions for information concerning the whereabouts of the Bone Bank skull. After some correspondence with various officials, I received a letter from art historian Dr. Marie-Louise Hemphill, who was “trying to collect all the information [available] on Lesueur in view of eventually publishing a biography, which has, as yet, never been done.” In exchange for such Lesueur material as I was able to supply, Dr. Hemphill undertook a search for the Mound Builder’s skull found by Lesueur. After an unproductive search at Le Havre (Lesueur was the first curator of the museum there), she found the Bone Bank skull “at the top of a large case” in the Musée de l’Homme, a department of the National Museum of Natural History in Paris.

Dr. Hany had noted in 1904 that the skull was deformed, and now it was examined by an anthropologist at the Museum, Paule Reichlen, who specializes in such skull deformities. She explained that they had been artificially obtained, pointing out that “the skull is flattened not only at the back but mostly in the front. This was probably achieved by weight pressure or by the traditional pad on the forehead.” Such deformities were not uncommon since, “for the North American Indian, the practice of mutilating or deforming parts of the body in accordance with certain preconceived ideals of beauty, or for the attachment of ornaments,” was widespread. Mme. Reichlen notes that “the mastoid was hardly developed,” and concludes that that, “and many other points show that it is probably the skull of a woman, a young adult, the teeth being in fair condition.”

A sketch of the Bone Bank which formed “the east bank of the Wabash River for fifteen hundred feet,” was published in Professor Edward T. Cox’s Fifth Indiana Report in 1873. At that time Cox predicted that, “unless there is a change in the current of the river, all trace of the Bone Bank will be obliterated.” Cox was proved right, and today no one in New Harmony whom I asked was able to tell me its location. But, with both a map and directions from a county courthouse clerk, my husband, a pathfinder, and I made our way to a deep bend in the Wabash River. There we met Charlie Robinson, known as the Bone Bank hermit. We had heard about this gentle man, the son of a Cherokee woman and a member of that nation moved by Federal troops from Georgia along the “Trail of Tears” to Oklahoma.

Brought to Indiana by his father in 1917 after his mother’s death, Robinson pointed out Bone Bank sandbar on the Illinois side of the Wabash River. “That’s all that’s left of the old cemetery,” he said, “Someday an Illinois farmer will be plowing that field. When the water is high it destroys the banks. ... Up towards Mackey’s Bend, two farms have gone over to the Illinois side since I’ve been here.” Robinson also talked about the flood of 1937. “Then,” he recalls, “the water was fifteen feet above the top of the Bank. That was the end of the Mound Builders cemetery.”
When the last remnant of that vanished civilization dropped into the raging torrent, it was exactly one hundred years since Charles-Alexandre Lesueur had passed that way for the last time, traveling to New Orleans and then to Philadelphia on his way to Paris. Lonely in New Harmony after the departure, one by one, of his colleagues, he had begun shipping boxes to Le Havre as early as 1832, and finally made the return journey in 1837. In Paris he taught painting, studied at the Museum of Natural History, and learned lithography. In 1843 he returned to Le Havre and investigated the cliffs at the mouth of the Seine. He became the first director of the Museum du Havre (1845-46), and deposited there forty boxes containing specimens together with manuscripts and sketches. (The museum was destroyed during World War II; only Lesueur's manuscripts and sketchbooks were saved.)

Described in his last years as "a hardworking old man," Lesueur died on December 12, 1846. He was buried near Le Havre, "an appropriate resting place for the ashes of one, who, after many wanderings in distant regions, was permitted ... to breathe his last sigh ... amidst those very scenes which had awakened the aspirations of his youthful heart."

The year that Lesueur left New Harmony marked only the end of the First Period (1826-1837) of scientific discovery there. The work of Lesueur—and Lesueur's colleagues—would continue in the Second Period (1837-1869), as would the connections with Philadelphia and Paris. The work was now led by Dr. David Dale Owen (the son of Robert Owen), who discussed fossil palm trees found near New Harmony before the Philadelphia Academy of Natural Sciences when he was appointed correspondent for the Academy in 1840. Owen gave the Academy a model of one of the fossil tree stumps (their presence suggesting a tropical or subtropical climate at an earlier period), explaining that "from twenty to twenty-five" of them had been "discovered twelve miles from New Harmony [Blairsville] in excavating in a slaty clay in the bank of Big Creek, a tributary of the Wabash. ... [Broken off at the top], the largest of these was about three feet in height and sixteen inches in diameter." In 1846 Owen was visited by the British geologist Sir Charles Lyell (the man considered "to have laid the foundations for evolutionary biology as well as for an understanding of the earth"), on Lyell's second tour of North America in 1846. The last of the great 19th-century scientists to visit New Harmony, he had become interested in Owen through an abstract of Owen's work read before

---

The Rapp-Maclure Mansion (Say's house) in 1844, after the top story was destroyed in a fire. (Photographed by Homer Fauntleroy; courtesy of Robson Papers)
the British Association for the Advancement of Science in 1842. In New Harmony Lyell spent much time in Owen’s laboratory studying the fossil and mineral cabinets; however, a trip to the Blairsville matrix where Owen had sketched the excavation of the upright trunks of the fossil palm trees was certainly the highlight of his visit.

In his *Tour of North America* (1846) Lyell recorded a glimpse of social life in the small community which had been home to Charles-Alexandre Lesueur for more than a decade: “... [I visited] the principal edifice being now appropriated as a public museum, in which I found a good geological collection, both fossils and minerals. ... Lectures on chemistry and geology are given here in the winter. Many families are of superior intelligence; English, Swiss, and German have settled in the place. ... They are very sociable, and there are many private parties, where there was music and dancing, and a public assembly once a week ...”

Lyell also visited the Rapp-Maclure mansion, then reduced to a one-story structure by the 1844 fire. Sometime in the early 1850s that building, painted by Lesueur as “Thomas Say’s House in New Harmony,” became the Rapp-Maclure-Owen house, completing the circle of the three early historic periods of the town.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Acknowledgments and thanks to: Dept. of Natural Resources, Geological Survey, Dr. John B. Patton, State Geologist, Ind. Univ.; Dr. James H. Kellar, IU, Dr. Glenn A. Black Laboratory of Archaeology, Monmouth; Dr. Dorothy Donald, emeritus, Museum D’Histoire du Havre, Andre Maury, Jacqueline Bonnemais, Curator of Lesueur Papers; Museum National D’Histoire Naturelle, Yves Laisset, Mme. Paule Reichlen; Academy of Natural Sciences, Philadelphia, Carol M. Spawn, Karen Stevens; The Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Robert A. Harman, Janice Dickey; William Henry Smith Memorial Library, Indiana Historical Society, L. Johnson; Working Men’s Institute, New Harmony, Aline B. Cook, Rosemary Alsop; Indiana State Museum and Historic Sites, Old Fauntleroy Home, Mary Emily Fauntleroy Collectors, Erna Mac Culver, Jean Graham Lee, Curator; Gloria M. Cox.

ENDNOTES

1See Samuel G. Morton, M.D., *Memoir of William Maclure*, Esq., Phila. Acad. of Nat. Hist., 1841. Maclure made a fortune as a member of the commission appointed to settle American citizens’ claims for spoliations due to the French revolution. In Paris he came into contact with the Museum of Natural History and became a geologist. As a result he made the first geological survey of the U.S.A. In Switzerland he met Pestalozzi. Convinced that the ruling classes kept the lower classes under control by denying them a useful education, he used his fortune to promote Pestalozzism combined with science. See also Alberto Gil Novales, *William Maclure in Spain*, Madrid, 1981.

2Maclure had sent to New Harmony his private library, philosophical instruments and collections in natural history. In 1835 he sent Dr. Pickering, librarian of the Academy, to superintend the conveyance of the books (2259 vols.) to the Academy in Philadelphia. He gave $5000 for a fireproof building, and in 1837 a second gift of the same amount. In 1838 the Academy received a third endowment of $10,000. (Say’s library and collections in New Harmony were also given to the Academy after his death in 1834.)

3Both Owen and Maclure were admirers of Swiss educator Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi (1746-1827). In Philadelphia Maclure recruited the Pestalozzian teachers Marie Dueil Fretatge and Phœquép d’Arusmont, and on the journey down the Ohio River to New Harmony stopped at Louisville to recruit Joseph Neef, to organize the school in the new community. Neef, former co-worker with Pestalozzi had, under the aegis of Maclure, conducted the first Pestalozian school in America on the Schuykill outside Philadelphia. (See Dr. C. W. Hackensmith, *Biography of Joseph Neef, Educator in the Ohio Valley*, 1809-1854, N.Y.C., 1973.)

4See Acad. of Sci., Phila., Coll. 372, and *A Portrait of Dr. Gerard Troost*, M.D., Peabody Coll. for Teachers, 1906. Bleg. data, Nashville Univ. Bull., v.5, no. 6, Jan. 1907. Troost (1776-1850), native of Holland; educated in Universities of Leyden and Amsterdam; studied mineralogy with Abbe Just Rene Haus, Mus. of N.H.; Paris; a founder and first pres. of Acad. of N.S., Phila.; 1828, prof. of chem., geol., mineralogy at Univ. of Nashville; in 1831, first state geologist of Tenn. Library of Congress Free Public Library purchased his mineral and geological cabinets after his death; has catalog of over 1300 items.


7The twelve courses of lectures given by the Museum were mineralogy (Daubencon); general chemistry (Fourcroy, Bronniant); chemistry applied to the arts; botany (Desfontaines, Dejussieu); rural botany; agriculture; two courses in zoology; human anatomy, (Porte); comparative anatomy; geology; and ichnography. From A. Royer, *History and Description of the Royal Museum of Natural History*, Published by the Order of the Administration of the Establishment. Translated from the French by M. Deleuze, With Three Plans and Fourteen Views of the Galleries, Gardens, and Menagerie, Paris: Printed for A. Royer at the Jardin du Roi, 1823, pp. 67-69.

8Prof. Fourcroy “persuaded his colleagues to unite in publishing their observations in the *Annals* to diffuse the knowledge of which it is the source.” (Royer, p. 87.)

9For the Press, Phiquepal taught his boys to set type, and Cornelius Tiebout of Philadelphia taught engraving. “Lesueur’s work on fish, the first great project, was never completed, but Thomas Say’s *American Conchology* ... began to issue from the School Press in 1830, along with the newspaper, *Dissenter*, and Maclure’s *Opinions on Various Subjects*. In 1841, a year after Maclure’s death in Mexico, the *North American Sybyl* by Francois Michaux [which Maclure had purchased from Michaux in 1825] was published in three handsome volumes with 156 plates.


11Dr. Michaux had published his journal, *Travels to the Westward of the Allegheny Mountains*, as a travel guide in 1805 and had sent plants and seeds from his journey through Pennsylvania to the Paris Museum. Both Michaux and his son are mentioned in Royer’s *History*, with their contribution of “samples of North American wood” to the Museum’s botanical galleries duly noted. (Royer, p. 103.)

12On the final day of my two years reading in the archives of the Old Fauntleroy Home Museum.

13Lesueur information is mainly taken from Geo. Ord, *“A Memoir of Charles Alexander Lesueur,”* Amer. Philosophical Soc., *The American Journal of Science and Arts*, Second Series, Vol. VII, New Haven, May 1844; and from page 9 of the *Phil. Acad. of Natural Sciences*, Lesueur was a member of the American Philosophical Society in Phila., 1817; of the Lyceum of Natural History of N.Y.; and he also held a membership in the Société Phlumatique de Paris, 1814. (Morton, p. 15.)


15Upon the return of the expedition, Péron immediately began “writing his report from the departure to November 18, 1802. The accompanying atlas comprised of a detailed map, twenty-two woodcuts by Lesueur representing landscapes, animals, or ethnographic subjects, and ten pictures of natives by Petit. At the time of his death in December 1810, Péron was writing the second volume and had reached Chapter 30. In his will Péron left his manuscripts to his most intimate friend ... the...

13Hamy, p. 17.

14Ibid., pp. 29-30. These young ladies included Princesses Zénédde and Charlotte, daughters of Joseph Bonaparte. Lesueur had kept his old tri-colored cockade.

15Duke of Saxe-Weimar-Eisenach, Travels through North America, during the years 1825 and 1826, 1828.


17The disposition of Mr. Lesueur was social and amicable; and knowing how to accommodate himself to circumstances, he everywhere met that welcome which his simple, unobtrusive manners could not fail to secure. Accustomed, from early life, to abstemiousness, his economical habits became confirmed, when the means of indulgence were placed within his reach. But although little inclined to self-gratification, he was liberal to others, even in cases where prudence would justly reserve." (Ord, p. 214.)

18Thwaites, p. 186.

19In 1871 American Heritage (Vol. XXVIII, no. 1, Dec. 1971, pp. 17-32) published an article, "Centennial City," by Edgar P. Richardson in which an illustration, "Thomas Say's tomb" by David F. Kennedy is used. In this illustration, a familiar look, but, in the obelisk more than twice the height of the figures in the painting, it could not be Say's tomb in New Harmony. The flat land with autumn trees suggests a park-like setting. A memorial perhaps in Philadelphia, his native city? In a letter from Philadelphia dated Feb. 18, 1972, Dr. Richardson kindly answered that question: "I do not believe the Say monument was ever erected in the Say family cemetery in Philadelphia. Kennedy's watercolor of it is dated 1874. Mrs. Say returned to Philadelphia and in 1870 gave Kennedy a charming watercolor by P. [sic] A. Lesueur of Say's house in New Harmony (which is in the Kennedy collection, No. K: 2-130). She evidently gave Kennedy a lot of information about the tomb and its inscription ... Probably she had a photo, which Kennedy copied in watercolor, exaggerating its size a little." Dr. Richardson also explained that David F. Kennedy's wife's mother was Thomas Say's sister.

20The vault was constructed when the house was rebuilt after the 1844 fire; the new tombstone was placed on it. Alexander and his two sisters were interred in the Say vault, as was D. D. Owen in 1860; later, Owen's remains were removed to Maple Hill Cemetery.

21Richardson to Fleming, Feb. 18, 1972.


23Thwaites, p. 17.

24Dr. Marie-Louise Hemphill quoting from Louise papers in Le Sueur, "The Thomas Lesueur of the Say House," in the Archives of the New Harmony Museum of Architecture, such a placed on it. Alexander the tombstone was a familiar look, but, in the obelisk more than twice the height of the figures in the painting, it could not be Say's tomb in New Harmony. The flat land with autumn trees suggests a park-like setting. A memorial perhaps in Philadelphia, his native city? In a letter from Philadelphia dated Feb. 18, 1972, Dr. Richardson kindly answered that question: "I do not believe the Say monument was ever erected in the Say family cemetery in Philadelphia. Kennedy's watercolor of it is dated 1874. Mrs. Say returned to Philadelphia and in 1870 gave Kennedy a charming watercolor by P. [sic] A. Lesueur of Say's house in New Harmony (which is in the Kennedy collection, No. K: 2-130). She evidently gave Kennedy a lot of information about the tomb and its inscription ... Probably she had a photo, which Kennedy copied in watercolor, exaggerating its size a little." Dr. Richardson also explained that David F. Kennedy's wife's mother was Thomas Say's sister.

25The vault was constructed when the house was rebuilt after the 1844 fire; the new tombstone was placed on it. Alexander and his two sisters were interred in the Say vault, as was D. D. Owen in 1860; later, Owen's remains were removed to Maple Hill Cemetery.

26Richardson to Fleming, Feb. 18, 1972.


28Thwaites, p. 17.


30Hamy, p. 57.

31A study of the life and times of Edward T. Cox, the most outstanding student in Maclure's School of Industry in New Harmony. In 1969 Dr. John B. Patton, Ind. state geologist, Ind. Univ., asked WMI for biographical information re Edward T. Cox, the first state geologist of the permanent IN Survey (1869-1879) for the Centennial. As the author had read Cox papers in OFH Archives, she sent material she had found. Since there is no Cox biography, she gathered information on Cox and the scientists who influenced him. In 1972 she shared the ms. with Dr. Patton—including a rare map of coal in the U.S. by Dr. D. D. Owen, found in Shawneetown, IL, and later given to HNH, INC. for use in the D. D. Owen Museum. (Another copy is found in Reston, Smithsonian Institute Arch. in VA.) Dr. Patton submitted her name to U.S. Bicentennial Com., INHIGEO, meeting at Univ. of New Hampshire, Oct. 1976. Slides of the restoration and science museums being established in New Harmony by Ralph C. Schwarz, pres. of HNH, INC. (1972-1984), were shown.

32Dr. Hemphill to Mrs. James M. Fleming, Jr., Paris, Dec. 28, 1975. Dr. Hemphill explained that her father, "Adrien Loir, M.D., was curator of old, of the N. H. Museum of Le Havre, founded by Lesueur, hence my mother's published thesis as far back as 1920 on Lesueur's story in the States in 1816 to 1836 ... I have myself ... given a paper at the Louvre on Lesueur's unpublished sketchbook in Britain on his way to the States in 1815 and lectured with slides on Le Voyage de Decouvertes in Australia in 1800-1804." (Mme. Adrien Loir's book on Lesueur was given to New Harmony's Working Men's Institute in 1920.)

33Hemphill to Fleming, Paris, April 4, 1976. I suggested to Dr. Hemphill that she might be interested in the INHIGEO conference scheduled for Oct., 1976. Like all pioneer scientists, Lesueur had dabbled in all the so-called disciplines of the day and could be classified as a geologist since he had spent two years with Maclure, the "father of American geology," on the expedition to update Maclure's Geology in the United States. She was interested, and suggested she might give a paper on Lesueur, "although I am an art historian and not a geologist."

34Hamy, p. 57.

35Hemphill Paper op. cit.

36Quoted in the Hemphill Paper from British Museum, 1910, "Handbook to Ethnology," Coll., British Museum, 24. It was Dr. Hemphill who established the date of Lesueur's finding of the Mound Builder's skull (1828), and the date of his sending it to the Paris Museum (1829) from Lesueur papers in the Museum at Le Havre.

37Hemphill Paper op. cit.

38Prof. E. T. Cox, Fifth Annual Report of the Geological Survey of Indiana Made During the Year 1873, p. 128.

39Dr. D. D. Owen, Pioneer Geologist of the Midwest, Indianapolis, 1943. Owen (1807-1860), third son of Robert Owen; chemist and geologist; made surveys of three states plus Federal surveys of mineral lands in old Northwest Territory. Educated at Fellenberg's in Switzerland; studied chemistry under Dr. Andrew Ure in Glasgow; studied medicine in Cincinnati; first field work under Dr. Gerard Troost in Tenn.; separated Maclure's geological collection into sets for distribution; trained a number of scientists, including Edward T. Cox; brought important scientists to assist in surveys, including Leo Lesqueroux.

40Academy of Natural Sciences of Phila., Proceedings, 1 (1841-43): p. 270. The study of "the epoch of great lakes or slow-flowing lagoons, with a warm climate succeeding the glacial times," in Goodspeed's History of Posey County; Indiana (Chicago, 1886, pp. 256-270)—based on Richard B. Hendrickson's 1873 report of fossil palm trees, Sigillaria oweni, Lesu.—was compiled by Prof. Z. T. Emerson. Evidence of an ancient lake bed were mollusks found in shafts at depths of 40 to 70 feet at Evansville and along the Ohio River at Henderson, Ky. These mollusks, common on the northern shore of the Gulf of Mexico, exist only in a sub-tropic climate. Shells—found abundantly at New Harmony and equivalent to those of Cuba and Mexico—enabled scientists to determine the thermal conditions. The land species of mollusca indicated a deposit formed in a fresh-water lake, surrounded by land and fed by rivers and streams, when the climate was tropic or sub-tropic. After his visit to New Harmony, Lyell identified this loess deposit as the equivalent of loess of the Rhine.

41Encyclopaedia Britannica, Macro. 11, Chicago, 1977, 208.

42Owen had sent his paper to Britain by an emissary, Hendrickson, p. 79.


44In 1841 the Maclure heirs, executors of William's estate, gave Owen the Harmonist three-storied stone granary in the grounds of the Rapp-Maclure mansion to house his growing geological collection, and to use as a chemical laboratory as his surveys escalated. Sometime later, Owen received the mansion itself as a gift. But in 1855, before Alexander Maclure's death, the administrator of William's estate was questioned in court. A new administrator was appointed to recover all property possible, and Owen was forced to pay over $3,000 for the property he received. He began construction on a new laboratory immediately behind the mansion, which was completed just before his death in 1860. See Hendrickson, pp. 122-123.
The Protestant Reformation begun at Wittenberg, Germany, in 1517 soon consisted of three major divisions: conservative Lutheranism, liberal Calvinism, and ultra-conservative Anabaptism. Developed outside the mainstream of Protestantism and said to be neither Protestant nor Catholic, Anabaptism—"the Radical Reformation"—has been called "left wing Protestantism." In its initial stages Anabaptism was dominated by two opposing ideologies. There were Old Testament oriented revolutionaries called Schwertler (men of the sword) because they did not object to the use of force, and pacifists known as Stäbler (men of the staff).

Two militant Anabaptist groups emerged in 16th century Germany. The first, at Zwickau in 1523, was the Puritan Reformation Movement under the leadership of Thomas Müntzer; the second, in 1535, was the Mellenarian Movement at Münster led by Melchior Hoffman. The Peasants War ignited by Müntzer resulted in the destruction of his movement at the battle of Mulhausen in 1525, and the Melchorite Mellenarian Movement suffered the same fate at the Battle of Münster in 1536. Although these and other violent Anabaptist movements were brief, they did have a profound impact on the development of peaceful Anabaptism since the civil and religious authorities soon equated all branches of Anabaptism with revolutionary violence and persecuted believers mercilessly. The atrocities they suffered as a result of the activities of the Old Testament revolutionaries intensified and solidified the New Testament Anabaptists' commitment to pacifism and opposition to the use of force.

Although the subjects of this study, the Hutterian Brethren—commonly called Hutterites—trace their religious and geographical origins to these pacifist groups, theirs was a relatively separate development, and they differ from other Anabaptist denominations in their practice of communal living.

During the early 1520s many Protestant theologians and lay preachers across Germanic Europe were becoming increasingly impatient with the conservative character of Lutheranism and Zwinglianism. These dissidents, who probably subscribed to the common belief that the true Reformation meant the "fall" of the Medieval church and the "restoration" of the ancient Apostolic church, began emigrating from various parts of Germany, Austria, Bohemia, Carinthia, and the Tyrol to northern Switzerland. There, along with native Swiss preachers, they began organizing lay Bible-study groups for the purpose of teaching the concepts of Anabaptism. Conrad Grebel, Felix Mann, Wilhelm Reublin, George Blaurock, and Balthasar Hubmaier were leaders in the work.

Then, Grebel, a Swiss Anabaptist, and several associates—with Grebel taking the lead—rebaptized each other at Zollikon, a suburb of Zürich, in January, 1525. Since most of these men were committed to pacifism they are generally credited with establishing the peaceful Anabaptist movement. Their adherents soon took the name "Swiss Brethren," and the group promulgated the Schleitheim Con-
professed Faith at Schaffhausen, Switzerland, in 1527.

The movement grew with remarkable speed, and by 1529 Brethren congregations were firmly established in a number of cities and towns across northern Switzerland. Alarmed by the popularity and growth of Anabaptism (and the resultant decline in state-church membership), the authorities enacted a policy of unrelenting persecution, even going so far as to hire bounty hunters to locate and kill the peaceful Brethren. With the movement near extinction by 1530, some survivors fled to remote mountain retreats, while others traveled down the Rhine River Valley and were scattered through Baden, Württemberg, Alsace, Lorraine, the Palatinate, and the Rhineland; a few continued on to the Netherlands. Menno Simons, a brilliant Dutch priest disenchanted with Catholicism, became acquainted with these Swiss Brethren and, impressed with the precepts of the movement and the behaviour of its adherents, accepted Anabaptism at Gronigen in 1536. Simons reorganized the fragmentary movement and became the recognized leader of Dutch Anabaptists, who were soon named Menists, and then Mennonites.

**HUTTERIAN BRETHREN ORIGINS IN MORAVIA, 1523–1536**

Not all of the Anabaptists who left northern Switzerland moved through the Rhine Valley area. Some traveled east and were scattered through the Hapsburg domains—

the Tyrol, Carinthia, Austria, Bohemia, and Moravia. Those arriving in Moravia found it already experiencing religious revival, for several German preachers had been spreading the precepts of peaceful Anabaptism there since before 1525. Specifically, Hans Denck's humanistic teachings and writings had a positive influence on Moravian Anabaptism, while Hans Hut, traveling and preaching around Nikolsburg, urged his listeners "to sell [their] house[s] and goods," thus introducing in Moravia the concept of communal living. And the theological treatises of Ambrose Spittelmaier, Leonard Schilder, and Hans Schlaffer (all associates of Hut) strongly emphasized the imminence of Christ's second coming; of personal suffering as an essential condition for following Christ; and the necessity for the sharing of goods. These precepts were soon adopted by those Moravian Anabaptists who came to be known as Hutterian Brethren, and whose hallmark would be communal living.

The years ahead would not be without conflict, however, and it centered around Swiss Anabaptist preachers Balthasar Hubmaier and Wilhelm Reublin. The former, to avoid martyrdom in Switzerland, fled to Moravia in 1526, and the latter, also fleeing persecution, arrived in 1527. The two did not completely reject the use of force, and though they were not Old Testament revolutionaries, the pacifists called them and their followers Schwertler. By 1528 pacifist groups (led by Jakob Wiedemann and Phillip Jäger, supported by Hans Hut), and non-pacifist groups (led by
Hubmaier and Spittelmaier) were centered around Nikolsburg.

When a dispute concerning the use of force and the levying of taxes to support military force developed between the factions, Wiedemann arranged a disputation between the parties. During the conference "Hut's fervent advocacy of nonresistance sounded seditious," and he was detained temporarily by the authorities. Hubmaier then arranged another meeting between the disputants, and this time his defense of a state's right to use force to protect its citizenry, coupled with his earlier book on the legitimate use of force, terrified the authorities. He was arrested, tried, convicted, and burned at the stake in Vienna in 1528. The foregoing dispute—and many others which followed—fragmented the Moravian Anabaptist movement into fourteen small groups; this, in turn, separated peripheral followers from fervent adherents, facilitating the unifying of the major ideological forces several years later.

In the same year Hubmaier was executed the Turks invaded the Hapsburg domains. To meet the threat King Ferdinand (1503-1564) ordered Moravian nobles to levy and collect taxes, and to supply him with troops. The nobility, Anabaptist sympathizers, sought to protect the sectarians from taxation and military service, while they, in turn, to protect their benefactors decided to seek refuge elsewhere. The king then instituted a policy of suppression to force the Anabaptists to comply with his edicts.

One of the most significant events in the history of Moravian Anabaptism occurred as a defensive response to this oppression. In the spring of 1528, after persuading some two hundred Anabaptists to sell all their private property and pool their resources, Jacob Wiedemann organized the first communal Peaceful Anabaptist group in Moravia, in the village of Bogenitz, about six miles northwest of Nikolsburg. He then proceeded to negotiate a contract (which recognized the Anabaptists' objections to war and taxes) with a nobleman whose lands included Austerlitz and the surrounding area, and the communal group moved there. Sometime later a refugee immigrant arrived in Austerlitz with a constitution for communal living supposedly written by Leonard Schiemer; it was adopted by the Wiedemann communal Anabaptists in 1529.

Wiedemann's group was not the only Anabaptist community in Moravia. Small colonies were organized at Rossitz by Gabriel Ascherham and Philip Plener, respectively, in 1527. These colonies and the Austerlitz community experienced substantial growth in 1529, when the Anabaptists then being expelled from Silesia and Austria emigrated to them.

But the paramount event in the religious-geographical history of peaceful Anabaptism in Moravia was the arrival of Jakob Hutter in Austerlitz in 1529. Born in the Tyrolian village of Moos, Hutter was principal pastor of the ruthlessly oppressed Tyrolian and Carinthian Anabaptists. Searching for a new home for his followers, he was favorably impressed with Wiedemann's colony and returned to Tyrol to organize the migration of his congregation to Austerlitz. Migration was dangerous, and the Tyrolese moved at night in small groups to avoid detection. When they reached Austerlitz, Hutter arranged for an associate, George Zaunring, to be responsible for the refugees and then returned to his native land.

In addition to Wiedemann and Zaunring, Wilhelm Reublin had an important leadership role at Austerlitz. In 1530 he became the spokesman of a faction opposed to Wiedemann's somewhat authoritarian leadership. In collaboration with Reublin, George Zaunring drew up a number of charges against Wiedemann. When a membership vote failed to give either side a significant majority, Reublin and Zaunring, with about three hundred followers, moved to the Auspitz colony; some two hundred and fifty members remained with Wiedemann at Austerlitz. Still dissatisfied, the several leaders appealed to Hutter to come arbitrate the dispute, which he did. After finding a satisfactory solution to the disagreement, Hutter again returned to Tyrolia.

Soon after his departure, however, further difficulties developed, this time resulting in Reublin being removed from office and Zaunring being excommunicated. Hutter, this time with one Simon Schützinger, again came to mediate, and placed the Auspitz colonies under Schützinger's care; Wiedemann retained leadership of the Austerlitz colony. Also with Hutter's help, the Rossitz colony under Gabriel Ascherham was brought into this affiliation Ascherham was appointed overseer of the several groups, and Hutter returned home once more.

In 1533 Hutter decided to make Moravia his home, and arrived to take up residence there on August 11. Feeling compelled by God to provide leadership for the fragmented Anabaptist groups, his authority was initially rejected when he told them their failings were due, at least in part, to their failure to sever their worldly ties. But his opportunity to take control came quickly, when Schützinger, Ascherham, and Plener were accused of hiding personal possessions and deposed. Hutter was then elected Vorsteher (chief leader) and the Moravian Anabaptists gradually adopted the name "Hutterian Brethren."

A brilliant leader with exceptional organizational skills, Hutter quickly resolved the sect's divisive internal disputes and unified most of the fourteen splinter groups. Guiding Moravian Anabaptism from a diverse to a unified theology; from a fragmented to an integrated social structure; and from a heterogeneous to a homogeneous membership, Hutter organized and formalized the precepts of the faith, "building an economically durable and socially cohesive Gütergemeinschaft (community-of-goods) organization."

Hutter referred to himself as an apostle of Christ, and taught absolute obedience to God. He consistently and passionately preached that a complete breaking with the past—leaving home and family—to share all possessions was a necessary form of resignation and submission to Christ (Gelassenheit). He also had a fervent belief in the eventual "fall" of the medieval church, followed by a "restoration" of the apostolic church and Christ's second
coming. In his view, the only alternative to Gütergemeinschaft and Gelassenheit in preparation for Christ's return was sorrow, suffering, and damnation.

Although it is logical to assume that Hutter's convictions concerning the church and the millennium preceded those relating to communal living, the sequence of events suggests instead an interwoven, simultaneous development, the result being four fundamental precepts: 1) the community of believers is the true Gemein (church) which is a provisional paradise; 2) brotherly love is expressed through communal sharing; 3) Gelassenheit—the absolute submission or surrender to God—leads to "conquest of self" and "correct" Christian living; and 4) without complete obedience to God there can be no salvation in the outside world. Thus, in evangelical communism, man, separated and freed from the profane outside world and from self-love and indulgence, is able to strive to attain his true nature.  

As with the other Peaceful Anabaptist groups, some of the essential beliefs and practices of the Hutterites are embodied in the Schleitheim Confession of Faith. Thus, in addition to a set of community rules for Christian living and the principle of worldly separation, the Hutterites, in accordance with the Schleitheim Articles, subscribe to the faith baptism of sin-conscious adults; the universal spiritual church of believers; the complete separation of church and state; pacifism and the refusal to bear arms; and the rejection of oaths of allegiance. For Hutterites, the Bible is the final authority, and they insist on strict and absolute obedience to the teachings of the apostles and prophets through whom God spoke.

THE BRUDERHOFs

The membership rigidly practiced the Hutterite faith within and through isolated communal settlements called Bruderhofs. Each of these "dwelling places of the brothers"—self-sustaining units where all spiritual and temporal needs were met—developed and adhered to a special local set of rules (the Ordnung) which supplemented the universal principles and practices of the faith. Bruderhofs gradually evolved as religious, patriarchal democracies, governed by elected spiritual and temporal leaders known as Diener am Wort (ministers of the word), and Diener der Notdurft (stewards), respectively.  

Although by the end of the 16th century distinctions between clerical and secular offices were minimal, the church was the ruling body, and the Hutterites recognized at least four different clerical offices: apostles (Sendboten), missionaries sent out into the world by God to establish by the word and baptism the obedience of faith in Christ; pastors (preachers), shepherds who have the same duties as apostles, but who stayed in the Bruderhof; helpers, who assisted the pastor in exhorting members to remain true; and elders, who considered the good of the church and helped the pastor bear the burdens of the work. From among the baptized male members of the community the group nominated candidates for preacher, and one of these candidates was chosen by lot for the position. Then, from all the Bruderhof preachers one was chosen to serve as Vorsteher (bishop, moderator, or chief elder) for the entire brotherhood.

There were also at least four separate categories of temporal leaders (stewards): the Haushalter, or general manager of the Bruderhof; the Einkäufer, or buyer; the Furgestellte, or foreman of trades and shops; and the Meier, or overseer of farm activities. Working under the direction of the stewards were agricultural laborers, tanners, leather-workers, metalsmiths, shoemakers, weavers and dyers, tailors, bookbinders, clockmakers, carpenters, masons, millers, carriage and wagon makers, brewers and vintners, wheelwrights, thatchers, potters, and various other craftsmen.  

As the foregoing makes clear, each Bruderhof was an elaborate community—the focus of Hutterite life. According to a contemporary traveler, by the late 16th century there were seventy-two Bruderhofs in southern Moravia, each accommodating between five and six hundred inhabitants in forty or more well-kept dwellings. The church or meetinghouse was the most important edifice, and the
pivot of communal life. The principal additional structures were a dining hall-kitchen, a bathhouse, a school, craft shops, barns and other farm buildings, storage facilities, and sheds. The ground floors of the larger buildings were used for laundering, sewing, spinning, weaving, and other communal functions.

THE HUTTERIAN BRETHREN IN MORAVIA AND SLOVAKIA, 1536-c. 1700

Jakob Hutter, however, did not live to see the full flowering of the Bruderhof communities. In 1535, alarmed by the Münster rebellion, Ferdinand repeated his 1528 demands, insisting that unless the nobles taxed the Hutterites he would forcibly expel the sectarian immigrants from Moravia. The Silesian and Lower Austrian Anabaptist immigrants who had earlier sought refuge in Austria were expelled, and a reign of terror against Hutter’s followers began. More than 2,000 were killed by a variety of methods unusually barbaric even for those times. Many more were arrested and sold as galley slaves when they refused to recant their beliefs and pay taxes.

Hutter, with a price on his head, and his associate, Hans Amon, were hunted by the authorities and Hutter was captured in Austria and taken to Innsbruck. There he was tortured, tried, convicted and burned on February 25, 1636. Vorsteher for less than three years, his manifold accomplishments in that short period of time are eloquent testimony to his outstanding abilities and leadership qualities.

Fortunately, Hutter was succeeded by a series of able leaders, and the old problems of internal divisiveness did not recur, although persecution did continue for two more decades. During this period the remaining Hutterites survived by living in hiding, some kept secretly by the nobility. Hans Amon had avoided arrest and was elected Vorsteher to succeed Hutter. He guided the Brethren through six years of oppression, and before he died in 1542 named Leonard Lanzensteil as his successor.

Lanzensteil asked that Peter Riedemann, then in prison in Germany, serve as co-leader. Riedemann was first imprisoned in Germany for his Anabaptist beliefs in 1524, but escaped to Moravia in 1533. He was recaptured when he returned to Germany as a missionary, and in 1545 escaped a second time and again returned to Moravia. It was during his second imprisonment that he wrote his great Rechenschaft, a definitive statement of faith in force to the present time. Intensely interested in practical organization, he strongly influenced the internal workings of the communal system. Because of these and other contributions, Riedemann is called “the second founder of the Hutterites.”

Together Lanzensteil and Riedemann led the Brethren through another period of severe repression in the years from 1545 through 1551. In 1551-52, political tension in Moravia began to subside, and between 1552 and 1554 the nobles reasserted their right to administer their domains, ushering in an era of peace that lasted almost four decades. For the Hutterites, these years would be known as the “good period” (1554-65), and the “golden period”
(1565-1592). Peter Riedemann died in 1556 and Lanzenstein in 1565, the end of the first tranquil period. Three exceptionally competent men would guide them through the second: Peter Walpot (1565-1578), especially noted for his organization of the educational system; Hans Kräh (1578-1583); and Claus Braidl (1583-1611).

The golden age was an era conducive to uninterrupted religious development, to the establishment of Bruderhofs, and to sustained population growth. During the period, Hutterite membership grew from several thousand to between 25,000 and 30,000 (some estimates are as high as 70,000) due to natural increase; to zealous missionary activity; to the return of the Silesian and Lower Austrian Anabaptists; and to an influx of immigrants from less tolerant lands who converted to the faith.

The fact that most states were considerably less tolerant than Moravia—known as the “Land of Promise” accounts for the large numbers who emigrated there. It also explains why the Hutterian Brethren were reluctant to leave their Moravian haven. In addition to the original four colonies, approximately 117 Bruderhofs were built between 1536 and 1621: eighty-five in Moravia, with the largest and most important at Altenmarkt, Austerlitz, Eibenschitz, Neumühl, Nikolsburg, and Rossitz; thirty in relatively nearby sections of Slovakia, the major ones at Sabatisch, Schachtitz, and St. Georgen; and six dispersed across adjacent parts of Lower Austria. Seventy-nine were situated in an area of about 3800 square miles (see Fig. 2). The golden age came to an abrupt end in 1593 when war erupted between the Austrian and Turkish empires and raged until 1606. During the conflict the Hutterites were forced to quarter troops, and the belligerent forces confiscated their food supplies, pillaged and burned their property, took hostages, and raped and cold-bloodedly murdered the defenseless sectarians. Singled out for persecution by the monarchy as “Anabaptist heretics,” they had sixteen Bruderhofs completely destroyed and dozens more extensively damaged. Their population declined by half, to about 15,000 members.

The Hutterites had not recovered from that struggle when the catastrophic Thirty Years War broke out in 1618. Fighting had erupted in Bohemia when Bohemian Protestants rebelled against their Catholic rulers, then exploded across Moravia and Slovakia and spread quickly over large sections of Europe. This time the Hutterites not only endured all the ravages and depredations of the Austrian-Turkish War, but also suffered additional casualties caused by famine, pestilence, and exposure. By 1621 twelve Bruderhofs had been destroyed and seventeen others seriously damaged.

In that year, too, the Hapsburg monarch, encouraged by early victories, decided to expel all Hutterites who refused to recant their faith and accept Catholicism; Franz Cardinal Dietrichstein, who held the Brethren in special contempt, was empowered to enforce the decree. Toward that end, some women were drowned and some men were burned at the stake; others were jailed, beaten, starved, and stretched on the rack. Still others had their eyes plucked out; their limbs pierced by nails; their fingers or toes amputated or their feet burned by charcoal; and their flesh branded with hot irons. When, astonishingly, most still refused to recant, Dietrichstein changed tactics, saying the Brethren could remain in Moravia if they would accept instruction in the Catholic faith. If they refused to attend Mass and have their children instructed in the faith, the children were abducted.

When even this treatment failed to convert the Hutterites, the cardinal ordered and supervised their expulsion in 1621-22. Confiscating twenty-four Bruderhofs, he forced 2500 homeless Brethren to move across the border to Slovakia, where most were sheltered in the Bruderhofs at Sabatisch, Schachtitz, and St. Georgen. A small remnant group remained in Moravia, and survived by living in hiding.

The plight of the Hutterian Brethren was now critical. Since 1593 they had had twenty-eight Bruderhofs destroyed, twenty-four sealed by Dietrichstein, and dozens seriously damaged; by 1622 their population had declined to around 3,000. Unfortunately, the Treaty of Westphalia, which ended the Thirty Years War in 1648, did not mean peace for them. They would suffer from periodic wars and their accompanying religious persecution for decades to come. Persecution was always provoked by the refusal of the Brethren to bear arms and pay taxes; consequently, the severity of repression corresponded with the length and cost of each war.

Their problems were compounded because Klaus Braidl was succeeded by a series of mediocre leaders: Sebastian Dietrich (1611-19); Ulrich Jaussling (1619-21); Valentin Winter (1622-31); and Heinrich Hartmann (1631-39). The exemplary leadership of Andreas Erenpriess (1639-62) did slow the decline, which then accelerated under his successor, Johannes Rieger (1662-87). Finally, disconsolate because of their vulnerability and inferior leadership, the Hutterites dissolved the community-of-goods in 1685 and appealed to the authorities to consider them as individual families; their appeal was rejected and Leopold Cardinal von Kolonitsch was authorized to exterminate the Hutterite faith in the Hapsburg domains.

In 1688 Kolonitsch, whose disdain of Anabaptism equaled that of Dietrichstein, began a systematic persecution designed to destroy the Hutterites’ will to resist. Meetinghouses were sealed, adults were required to attend Mass, and infants and children were baptized and instructed in the Catholic faith. Other forms of mental abuse were also used to force the Brethren to recant, with torture the penalty for resistance. This time their physical strength and mental endurance gradually deteriorated, and one after another the Moravian and Slovakian Brethren consented to indoctrination in the Catholic faith. Although a few survived living in hiding, most were assimilated into the general society, and for all practical purposes, Hutterite religious-geographical history came to an end in those two countries in the early 18th century.
When the Hutterites were being expelled from Moravia in 1621-22, Gabor Bethlen, prince of Transylvania, sent a delegation to visit them at Neumühl, Schachitz, and several other places. The delegation carried a letter inviting the Brethren to settle in Transylvania. Bethlen was interested in their agricultural and craft skills and impressed by their thrift; he wanted them to serve as a model for his own people. Although he promised religious and civil freedoms and the resources to construct a Bruderhof, the Hutterites thought his letter sounded more like a threatening command than an invitation; they were apprehensive about his intentions.
The Transylvanian contingent then almost forcibly seized 186 reluctant Brethren and left Slovakia for Alwinz, Transylvania, on April 2, 1621. In Alwinz they were given temporary quarters and the materials necessary to build a commune. Keeping his word, Bethlen issued a charter of religious and civil freedoms; it was made more comprehensive in 1625, and then several hundred more Hutterites emigrated to Alwinz in the next few years.

Under the protection of the benevolent Prince Bethlen, the Hutterites lived in peace and prosperity there for more than three decades. But conditions changed dramatically when yet another war was fought between the Austrian and Turkish empires (1658-61). During the hostilities the Hutterite settlements were ruthlessly plundered and believers killed by rampaging, vigilante-like forces; the Alwinz Bruderhof was demolished and the Transylvanian Hutterite population decimated. The war also provided the impetus for a relentless persecution; fortunately, some sectarianists were able to find safety in remote mountainous regions.

Unable to recover from the catastrophic consequences of the war and burdened by continuous oppression, the Brethren abandoned communal living in 1690. Many of the remaining Hutterites affiliated with German-speaking Protestant churches, and a few managed to live inconspicuously in individual households in and around Alwinz for more than fifty years.

The next significant event in Hutterite history occurred as a result of the Empress Maria Theresa’s campaign to banish all Anabaptists to the remote “corners” of the Hapsburg empire. The purge began in the Archduchy of Carinthia, where a religious revival was taking place. In 1755 all of the archduchy’s Anabaptists were banished: loaded into waggons, their forced journey began at Klagenfurt and proceeded through Styria and Lower Austria to Ybbs (along the Danube), where they waited two months for a contingent of Austrian and Styrian Anabaptists. Finally, 270 Anabaptists were forced to resume the trek from Ybbs to Alwinz, passing through Vienna, Pressburg, Budapest, Petervă red and Temesvar.

In October, 1755, they arrived in Alwinz, where they were required to work as laborers. This immigrant group soon united with the few remaining Hutterites in the region, and together they succeeded in reestablishing communal living at Alwinz in 1761, by which time another forty-six Brethren had arrived from Carinthia. When overpopulation and continuing mistreatment by the authorities at Alwinz resulted in the establishment of Bruderhofs at Kreuz and Stein, an enraged Maria Theresa—whose policy had unwittingly revived the Hutterian Brethren movement—ordered the Jesuit cleric Delphini to obliterate the Hutterites. Delphini imprisoned all who refused to accept Catholicism, seized their property, and placed their children in orphanages.

Still, rather than submit to government demands, the surviving Hutterites applied for passports to leave Transylvania. Their request was denied, so after a period of intense discussion and careful planning they decided to emigrate secretly to the Bukharest area in Wallachia. After several delays, eighty-three Brethren left Transylvania on October 3, 1767, crossed the rugged Carpathian Mountain passes on October 13, and arrived in Bukharest in mid-November. There they negotiated for a tract of land at Krăbach, about four miles south of Bukharest, and began building shelters. In the spring of 1768 some of the group obtained a parcel of land at Presetschecin, about three miles northwest of Krăbach.

Unfortunately for the hapless Brethren, Krăbach and Presetschecin were situated in an area being contested in the Russo-Turkish War then raging. So again the defenseless Hutterites were trampled by military forces who plundered, robbed, beat, and killed them. Again they were forced to choose between emigration and extinction. This time they sought the advice of the Russian military commander at Bukharest, for he was aware of their predicament and seemed sympathetic to their cause. He suggested to the Brethren delegation that they move to Russia and settle near Kiev. He also arranged for them to meet the Russian field commander, Count Rumiantsev, at the Russo-Polish border, and gave them a letter of protection and a military escort for the trip.

Following some discussion, on April 10, 1770, the sixty surviving Wallachian Hutterites left Bukharest and traveled through Buzau and Roman to Chotin, where they met Rumiantsev. They negotiated a contract with the count to settle on his estate at Vishenka, along the Desna River northeast of Kiev. The agreement guaranteed them religious freedom, exemption from military service and the pledging of oaths, and freedom from the payment of taxes for three years; a property tax would be levied after that. The decision to move to Russia after less than three years in Wallachia effectively brought the 242-year (1528-1770) religious-geographical history of the Hutterian Brethren in Europe to an end.
Hutterite house in Sabatisch (Photograph by Jan Gleysteen, 1970; Hosteler, p. 66.)

THE HUTTERIAN BRETHREN IN RUSSIA, 1770-1879

The Hutterites reached Vishenka on August 10, 1770, exactly four months after leaving Wallachia. Supplied with all the immediate necessities, they began building dwellings, a meetinghouse, a dining hall-kitchen, a school, a wash house, an icehouse, a distillery, craft shops, a blacksmith shop, barns and other farm buildings, and windmills. General farming, begun in the spring of 1771, prospered, and all the usual craft industries were well established by 1778.

The Brethren thanked God for leading them to their "new haven" in czarist Russia, and soon after moving there turned their attention toward rescuing the few surviving Brethren scattered across the Hapsburg lands in Europe. Between 1771 and 1795 they conducted seven missions to Europe, where some Hutterian Brethren had become apostates, others had been imprisoned, and a few still lived secretly. Visiting Moravia, Slovakia, Tyrolia, Carinthia, Upper and Lower Austria, Transylvania, and Wallachia, they persuaded some to renew their faith; negotiated the release of some of the imprisoned; and located most of those living in hiding. Altogether another fifty-six European Brethren moved to Vishenka, bringing the number of immigrants there to 116 by 1795.

* * *

During their long European history the Hutterian Brethren were continually reacting to destructive external forces—the unrelenting persecution suffered during most of their years there. In Russia they enjoyed religious freedom, civil peace, and economic prosperity, yet they still experienced conflict. This time, however, the problems were internal, caused by three seemingly inconsequential religious quarrels.

The incidents which led to disunity were provoked by three men. The first, Mathias Hofer, claimed singing and praying silently while working was satanical. Vorsteher Hans Kleinsasser and a small segment of the membership agreed, but the majority did not and tension developed. Kleinsasser’s death greatly diminished Hofer’s influence, and he left Vishenka, ending his life among the Mennonites. The second religious malcontent, Hans Hofer, insisted that spiritual matters and missionary activity superseded physical work. Again, a small part of the population agreed and a second rift developed, for this belief was contrary to the Brethren work ethic and the principle of communal living. Fearing expulsion for refusing to fulfill his occupational duties, Hans Hofer conducted a mission to Slovakia and disappeared. The third man, Christian Wurz, was one of the most faithful and intelligent of the Hutterite young people and so was apprenticed to an eminent French physician in 1780. But Wurz soon adopted “the ways of the world,” and because the other youth envied and considered emulating him, he was excommunicated.

These incidents, trivial in themselves, greatly influenced Hutterite life in the 19th century by dividing the Vishenka Brethren into a conservative majority and a liberal minority. For although collectively the supporters of the dissidents were few, the general response by the many was to now focus on perpetuating the traditional values and practices of their Moravian forefathers.

Another and more serious problem developed in 1796 when Count Rumiantsev died and his sons immediately tried to abrogate the Hutterites’ charter and reduce them to the status of serfs. An appeal to Czar Paul I not only reaffirmed the charter, it expanded Hutterite privileges (giving them the same status as the Mennonites) by permitting them to leave the Rumiantsev estate, and entitling each family to receive 175.5 acres of land and to have a percentage of the annual land tax remitted.

This enhanced status led to a desire to move to a larger, more desirable site, and the Brethren petitioned the government for a new tract of land. They were allowed to relocate to Radichev, on the bank of the Desna River about eight miles northeast of Vishenka; there they had access to some 2000 fertile acres rich in timber, water, and other resources. Forty-four families—201 people—moved there from Vishenka in 1802. The internal organization of the Radichev Bruderhof was similar to the traditional pattern described earlier, but now lucrative mulberry-silk and whiskey industries supported the traditional occupations.

The Radichev Brotherhood was prosperous, resourceful, and secure. This civil peace and economic well-being led to population growth and a serious land shortage. The land crisis coincided with a growing religious conflict between the conservative and liberal factions. By now, however, the liberals—most of them Russian born—were in the majority and committed to liberalizing the faith and dissolving communal living. The few surviving first-generation Russian immigrants, though, were just as determined to preserve tradition and communal life.

As the land shortage led to an increasingly stagnant economy, the widening generation gap polarized the membership. Preacher Johannes Waldner considered communal living the hallmark of the faith. Assistant preacher Jacob Walther just as firmly believed the concept obsolete,
and argued for its abolition. Among the fifty Radichev families, twenty supported Waldner and continued to live communally, while the remainder began constructing individual dwellings on another section of the Bruderhof. Despite the division, bickering and agitation continued, and the Hutterites finally appealed to the government to mediate the dispute. The czarist representative recommended division of the property, with one group remaining at Radichev and the other moving to a Mennonite settlement.

In 1817 the Walther group did emigrate to the Chortitza Mennonite colony, located on the west bank of the Dnepr River about 350 miles south of Radichev. But general dissatisfaction with life there, coupled with a disastrous and demoralizing fire at Radichev, led to renewed communications between Walther and Waldner. The two amicably negotiated a mutually satisfactory compromise, the essence of which placed religious and secular affairs under separate authorities, and the Chortitza group returned to Radichev. With the appointment of Walther as financial manager and Waldner as spiritual leader, communal living came to an end there in 1819.

The Walther-Waldner accord brought stability and prosperity, resulting in substantial population growth during the next two decades. By 1840 the Radichev colony faced a serious land shortage, and following an unsuccessful appeal to settle on new crown lands, the Brethren asked Johann Cornies, a Mennonite trustee of the government, for assistance. Because of his intervention the Hutterites were permitted to settle near the Molotschna Mennonite community north of the Sea of Azov, about 450 miles south of Radichev. Sixty-nine families—384 people—moved to the site in 1842, and, with the help of the Mennonites, established a new settlement, Huttertal, several miles east of Melitopol.

Within a decade the identical sequence of events—civil peace, economic prosperity, and population growth—caused a shortage of farmland at Huttertal. This time the Brethren established three additional settlements: Johannisruh (1852), about three miles north of Huttertal, named for Johann Cornies; and Hutterdorf (1856) and Neu-Huttertal (1857), both located between fifty and seventy miles north of Huttertal, and between twenty-five and forty miles east of the Dnepr River.

The founding of each new settlement provoked discussions about the advantages and disadvantages of communal living, and internal stress coupled with a fear of being assimilated by the larger Mennonite settlements brought the issue into sharp focus in 1857. In that year George Waldner, the preacher at Hutteral, made an unsuccessful attempt to restore communal living. When he died during the year he was succeeded by three preachers: Michael Waldner, Darius Walter, and Jakob Hofer. Waldner and Hofer, who claimed to have experienced trances while immersed in intense Bible study or deep prayer, insisted that a "heavenly Angel" directed them to reinstate communal life. After ordaining each other at Hutterdorf in 1857, they spent the next two years visiting each settlement and teaching the religious precepts of communal life, for after a lapse of nearly thirty years, most Brethren knew little about the principles of Gütergemeinschaft.

Waldner and Hofer gradually developed a following and restored communal living at one end of Hutterdorf in 1859. Darius Walter organized another communal group at the other end of the settlement the following year. Waldner, a much more forceful personality than his collaborator, became the leader of the Waldner-Hofer group. A blacksmith and so known as Schmied-Michael, he and his followers (called Schmiedeleut, the blacksmith's people) sold their property and established a Bruderhof named Scheromet about ten miles north of Hutterdorf; they were joined there by a group from Johannisruh. Walter remained the leader of the Hutterdorf communal group which was soon named Dariusleut.

Meanwhile, in the 1860s czarist Russia was becoming increasingly nationalistic. The Russo-Turkish War, peasant unrest, and a number of events taking place in western Europe which are beyond the scope of this study were responsible for a change in attitude toward the Hutterites and Mennonites. Between 1864 and 1871 nearly all their special privileges were revoked and a "Russification" policy was imposed upon them. As a result, both groups sent delegations to the United States and Canada to investigate the possibility of emigration.

Paul and Lorenz Tschetter, the Hutterite delegates to "the land of promise," left for New York on April 14, 1873. From there, with an American Mennonite to serve as guide and translator, they set out for the Dakota Territory visiting, among other cities, Elkhart, Chicago, St. Paul, Duluth, Fargo, Moorhead, Sioux Falls, Omaha, and Lincoln. Declining an offer to buy land near Lincoln, Nebraska, for $3.60 an acre because they were concerned about religious freedom, they petitioned President Grant for an audience. After a Mennonite railroad representative made the arrangements, they met with the Chief Executive in New York City on July 27, 1873. After a rather discouraging interview the Tschetters returned to Russia, where they received a letter from the President stating that the Constitution delegates "these matters" (religious and other freedoms) to the states. The letter—which also said that the United States would not be involved in war for at least the next fifty years—gave impetus to the emigration movement, and preparations began for the move to South Dakota.

Emigration proceeded in several stages between 1874 and 1879. The Schmiedeleuts sold their Scheromet property to the Mennonites, and on June 7, 1874, 113 adherents traveled by train from Zaprozh'ye to Hamburg, Germany. There they joined a Dariusleut group of about the same size, and about forty families left Hamburg on July 19 and docked at New York on July 5. Although they were hampered by immigration problems in New York, and thirty-six children died of dysentery in Lincoln, Nebraska, they reached the Dakota Territory on August 8, 1874.

In 1877 a group of thirteen families left Johannisruh,
where they had been unsuccessful in establishing a Bruderhof, and moved to the Dakota Territory, where they began to live communally. Their leader, Jacob Wipf, was a respected teacher (Lehrer), and this group was soon named Lehrerleut. By 1879, almost all the Hutterites (communal and non-communal, at least 1265 people) had left Russia and settled in South Dakota, where the non-communal groups (called Prairieleut) were gradually absorbed into Mennonite society.

The emigration brought to an end 351 years of Hutterite religious-geographical history in the Old World. But it was also the beginning of more than eleven decades of sustained growth and development in the New World. Today the Hutterian Brethren prosper and continue to live communally in the United States and Canada representing the most enduring and successful experiment in evangelical communism.
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Small scale maps embracing large amounts of territory sacrifice detail, precision of place location, and boundary line accuracy. Because of normal publication limitations, the graphics included in this study are extremely small scale maps and are selective in number and contents; the many boundary changes through the centuries cannot be shown. Sources: Cosmopolitan World Atlas (N.Y.: Rand McNally, 1959), Figs. 3-4; Geographical Manual and New Atlas (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, Page & Co., 1918), Hammond's Home and Office Atlas of the World (N.Y.: C.S. Hammond and Co., 1944), Mitchell's Modern Atlas (Phila.: E.H. Butler and Co., 1860), New International Atlas of the World (Chicago: Geographical Publishing Co., 1930), Fig. 1; Gross, The Hutterite Way, Figs. 2, 3, 4; Horsch, The Hutterian Brethren 1528-1931, Fig. 3; and History of the Hutterite Mennonites, Emill J. Waltner, ed. Published in connection with the Centennial Observance of the Hutterites in South Dakota (Freeman, S.D.: River Hill Press, 1974), Fig. 4.
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The Festival and its Sponsorship

The Kutztown Folk Festival is sponsored by the Pennsylvania Folklore 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