

## Cultural Persistence and Adaptation: The Germans of Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, 1729-76

*Marianne Wokeck*  
Temple University

The 18th-century settlement of southeastern Pennsylvania has been described as an early example of a now familiar American pattern of ethnic and religious diversity in the context of economic growth and individual opportunity. (The most recent examples are J. T. Lemon's [16] and S. G. Wolf's [32] research on Chester and Lancaster Counties and Germantown.) Further study of how varied cultural and economic forces interacted in the early period, therefore, merits a high priority among efforts to understand how American society evolved. This study will advance such knowledge by focusing on cultural differences that affected the economic and social development of one particular county, Lancaster, where peoples of quite diverse origin encountered the potentials presented by the economy of southeastern Pennsylvania.

While local research has become a growing and important part of the historical interpretation of early America, the published literature focuses heavily on New England towns, where communities were atypically homogeneous in origin and way of life as well as unusually tightly knit in social organization. Such studies have, furthermore, stressed the earlier segments of the colonial period, touching little on the processes of transition to a more diversified, economically mature regional society later on, in the 18th century.<sup>1</sup> Local studies of the Chesapeake Bay area<sup>2</sup> deal with a society which in its own way, too, is less insightful concerning the evolution of "modern" America than the Middle Atlantic region.

Now further study is needed of how the various ingredients of settlement interacted to produce the social and economic structure that evolved in southeastern Pennsylvania. In a recent book on Germantown, Wolf [32] demonstrated how modern-appearing life in a relatively urban setting of the Middle Atlantic region could be. However, most of the people did not live in cities or "urban villages." Therefore, while challenging some of their work as well as building upon it to progress further, it is important to follow the lead of Lemon [16], E. D. Ball [4], and others to focus first on how rural and principally agricultural conditions

in the middle of the 18th century moved in directions that would contribute substantially toward forming a later way of life.

A brief survey of work to date shows the necessity for such an approach. Stressing the natural resources, the development of a regional market for agricultural produce, the impact of nearby urbanization on rural life, and the "typical" farming styles, Lemon [16] suggested that there were few differences in economic experience among colonial inhabitants of Chester and Lancaster counties even though they came from a wide range of ethnic and religious backgrounds. Lemon's method of identifying ethnic groups as well as his failure to distinguish further among Germans from distinctively different areas of origin may have impaired his results. With regard to economic differences because of religious background, he suggested a rather simplistic church-sect dichotomy by singling out Quakers and Mennonites. Ball [4] gave little regard to alternative explanations for settlement patterns in Chester County that might not be encompassed within his rather narrow, perhaps inflexible, focus on the development of economic efficiency and complexity. B. J. Levy [18] saw the effort of Welsh Quakers in Chester and Philadelphia Counties to preserve "Quakerness"; but he studied Quakers only, not comparing their economic adaptation and patterns of sustaining their culture with the experience of their neighbors. The susceptibility of Quakers to environmental pressures has been previously established by F. G. Tolles [30] and J. W. Frost [9]. Yet T. Archdeacon [2], A. P. Kenney [13] in New York, and others working on various other cities, have found important and durable differences in modes of life that were rooted in ethnic and religious origin. If these were not absorbed into or suppressed by a general pattern of local economic development, could economic life itself remain immune from consequences from such patent diversity? Even Lemon [16], within his concept of relatively uniform rural development, argued that southeastern Pennsylvania farmers were not economic "maximizers." Why? And were they all equally not so?

The settlement of distinct types of German-speaking peoples in a single county, Lancaster, in the middle of the 18th century provides an unusual opportunity to test the validity of various possible arguments about the degree to which living in a particular economic context of settlement did or did not involve people in a single, relatively homogeneous way of life. German-speaking people of widely different economic and cultural experience, such as the Swiss Mennonites, Reformed refugees from the Palatinate, peasants and artisans from a variety of territories in southwestern Germany, and Moravians from Saxony, came to Lancaster County. German immigrants can be found settling next to Englishmen (for example, Salisbury Township), Welshmen (Caernarvon Township), or Scotch-Irish settlers (Donegal Township). Among the Germans it is possible to distinguish, for instance, between the

Swiss settlers in the southeastern part of the county and the Palatines in the Tulpehocken area, but also among different denominations, such as the Mennonites (Conestoga Township) and Reformed Church people (Heidelberg Township), to name two geographically distant groups, with Lutherans, Baptists, Moravians, and those who were unchurched in between and among them. A. Blocher [5], L. Schelbert [24 and 25], and O. Langguth [15] have demonstrated convincingly this variety of backgrounds from which German-speaking immigrants in Pennsylvania originated. To what extent then, and by what means did these migrants impose their ways as variables upon the economic and social structure of southeastern Pennsylvania? To link German settlers of Lancaster County with such basic variation in preimmigration experience permits us to examine the extent to which, and the manner in which, settlers of different backgrounds used the available opportunities in Lancaster differently. Comparisons can be made among various German-speaking groups known to have come from differing European situations, and the Germans can in turn be examined against neighbors of the principal British origins: English, Welsh, and Scotch-Irish; and Quakers and other religious groups. Thus Lancaster County was in important ways a microcosm of the diverse experience of rural Pennsylvania.

If most recent interpretation is correct, we would expect a common context for making a living in the Pennsylvania countryside over the decades up to the Revolution to have pushed various German groups and their non-German neighbors all towards relatively comparable ways of developing and using economic resources and organizing their social life. Yet moving away from homogeneity it is clear already that German cultural identity was becoming more heavily promoted over this period and that there was considerable ethnic separatism in social institutions. The charity school movement, for example, became a controversial political issue only because it was seen as an attempt to integrate Germans more successfully into a society of English origin. The intimately related struggle to preserve the German language not only indicates wide usage of English but also a heightened sensitivity of German settlers about their identity.

In a more modern era of agricultural settlement, T. G. Jordan [12] found that in Texas distinctly German traits -- especially in matters which were not directly and immediately affected by market participation -- made an appearance after some years of initial parallelism with the practice of neighbors. K. N. Conzen [6] observed significant differences in structuring community life in mid-19th-century Milwaukee between German, Irish, and native settlers, the success of establishing and maintaining an "ethnic community" being largely dependent on the relative numerical strength and diversity of economic and social status within each ethnic group. In the context of Pennsylvania, however, it is im-

portant to bear in mind that the "host society" itself was only in the process of being formed and established; therefore, at times blurring the line between immigrants and native settlers, European and American ways of life, and possibly obscuring the process of mutual reaction and accommodation.

It will be interesting to find out if and in what ways the process of integration of the first major group of non-British immigrants followed the path generally outlined by social scientists. A period of initial accommodation, involving absorption of the immigrant into the economy, behavioral acculturation to the new society's roles, norms, and customs, and a satisfactory personal adjustment to the demands of coping with the new life, only later, if at all, were followed by assimilation, with the disappearance of measurable differences. Conzen [6] summarized that the manner and pace with which any individual or group moved along the scale of accommodation to assimilation are influenced by the personal attributes and skills of the immigrant, the motives and aspirations which accompany his move, his cultural and moral baggage as well as the demographic composition of the emigration, its rate, pattern of settlement, and the character and attitudes of the receiving society. Expectations widely different from the rules allowed in the new society, cultural differences in such areas as religion and language, relatively large numbers and rapid immigration, even particular age and sex distributions, or markedly deviant socioeconomic status, may all tend to isolate immigrants and encourage the formation of separate cultures, settlements, community institutions, either voluntarily or in reaction to exclusion from the dominant society. With such community activity, diverse individual immigrants become an ethnic group, sharing a sense of belonging and origin, and the progress of the group conditions further individual integration, easing the transition from European to American life.

In colonial Pennsylvania, religion, used as an organizational focus as well as a belief system, is of particular significance in any examination of the role of cultural traits in the integration process. Not only did many settlers declare religious motives as cause for emigration but, at a time when the concept of nationality was only beginning to emerge, religion was a strong and vital force of social interaction, perhaps more persuasive and decisive than those cultural differences merely based on the area of origin. In what ways was ethnic diversity related to denominational patterns? And in what ways did religion affect expectations, migration and settlement patterns, and the isolation or integration of German-speaking immigrants who settled in Lancaster County in the decades up to the Revolution?

The inquiry explores the economic life and social organization of various types of Germans who settled in Lancaster County from 1729-76,<sup>3</sup> making comparisons among the different groups of

German-speaking peoples and between them and their neighbors to determine how far a common life evolved in the area. Why did cultural convergence occur, or fail to take place, in some aspects of local existence and not in others? How did European background, religion, or social organization shape economic conditions or become submerged in a more general way of responding to the material opportunities of this promising agricultural setting?<sup>4</sup>

The largest number of Germans came to Pennsylvania relatively late in the history of local settlement (the peak of immigration occurred only in 1754-55 and decreased significantly thereafter)<sup>5</sup> after a way of making a living in the region had begun to be well established. Thus timing may have shaped their economic behavior and success. We know, however, that their own agricultural experience in northwestern Europe was not as similar to that of the British Isles as Lemon [16] implies, nor was a single background in how to make a living common to all German migrants to Pennsylvania. D. G. Allen's [1] comparison of five towns has shown significant impacts of the heterogeneous character of British settlers' background on local New England life. In Pennsylvania, B. J. Levy reminds us that the Quakers came from areas in England and Wales which were quite different from those where the Puritans in New England originated, and this preimmigration experience probably helped shape their pattern of settlement in Chester County and the Welsh Tract. M. Spufford [28] demonstrated a variety and diversity of ways of life among English villagers in the 16th and 17th centuries even within the relatively small area of one county.

Contemporaries thought they could see differences among groups in Pennsylvania. Were these stereotypical, superficial, or important functional differences that had an impact on the economic development of the area? Given established regional agricultural practices and modes of participating in the market by the time most Germans arrived, we should not expect drastic economic differences among immigrant groups in Pennsylvania; but that does not make it wise to oversimplify and say that differences did not exist. A recent study of prerevolutionary Lancaster County (in its present-day boundaries) already identified some agricultural variations between British and German settlers. A. C. Lord [21] controlled for ethnic diversity in geographically similar areas, and found differences in size of landholdings and patterns of livestock held between British and German neighbors. He did not, however, distinguish among subgroups of the two amorphous "nationality" blocs, and this is probably where the largest variations lie.

The first elements of analysis are to determine what the agricultural potential of various parts of Lancaster County was, when and how local areas were filled up by settlement, and then how these areas were actually exploited economically. In examining the history of the early settlement particular attention must

be given to two early German groups: the Swiss Mennonites, who took up a land grant in the eastern part of Lancaster County in 1710 after they had left the German-speaking cantons of Switzerland and spent an interim period of settlement in the Palatinate; and the Reformed Palatines, who settled in the Tulpehocken area in the northwestern part of Lancaster County in 1723, having fled in 1709 to London, from where they were settled in New York to produce naval stores until they migrated to Pennsylvania. These two groups pioneered German settlement in Lancaster County, establishing the first relationships with other inhabitants and providing a model of existence for larger, predominantly Lutheran and Reformed groups from southwestern Germany who came later and constituted most of the total "German" population in southeastern Pennsylvania by the middle of the 18th century. Local Baptists and Moravians give further perspective to the variety of German settlement patterns in Lancaster County.

There were approximately 35,000 inhabitants in Lancaster County by the time of the Revolution, roughly one-third of whom were German or of German descent, up to 3,000 adult men who might be participants in the local economy by the 1770s. However, given the nature of the records available the group studied will be smaller.<sup>6</sup> It will be necessary to engage in familiar evaluations of how unknowns might affect the interpretations,<sup>7</sup> but I have substantial groups of several different types of settlers in Lancaster County with which to shape a comparative analysis.

I am using the following sources to locate and evaluate ethnic differences which affected the economic and social development of Lancaster County. Because of the absence of any administrative category for "ethnicity" on the provincial, county, or township level the identification of settlers by native origin is difficult. My cardfile of Germans in Lancaster County,<sup>8</sup> therefore includes settlers identified first by church records, then complemented by last-name analysis from tax lists<sup>9</sup> and by data gathered from newspapers,<sup>10</sup> and finally supplemented by the ship lists.

The church records vary greatly in character and completeness. The denominations other than the Lutherans and Reformed are more likely to be overrepresented in such sources because they were smaller in numbers and more likely to emphasize group adherence. Also, they have invited more interest and comment from contemporaries and modern researchers alike. Ideally, however, the church records yield much more than only positive identification of Germans, such as names of parents, children, sponsors, and spouses; present and former place of residence; sometimes occupation; religious affiliation; dates of births, marriages, and deaths; and other personal information. Furthermore, the systematic exploration of the church records makes it possible to locate the different denominations in Lancaster County and in many

cases even establish the size and composition of their membership over time.<sup>11</sup> The ship lists give the signatures of newly arrived German immigrants in the port of Philadelphia, 1727-1808, in testimony to the required oath of allegiance and represent an extraordinary data source, providing us with a key to understanding of the volume, flow, and composition of a substantial segment of immigration into Pennsylvania. I shall use the ship lists in order to find out what proportion of the incoming Germans settled in Lancaster County, then if and how the volume and the composition of German immigration can be related to economic and social developments in southeastern Pennsylvania. The residual of typical German names on tax lists which cannot be linked to either church records or ship lists will help estimate the proportion of "un-churched" Germans and those who may have entered Pennsylvania prior to 1727 and via ports of entry other than Philadelphia.

The migration experience of German key groups in Lancaster County can be studied through a combination of information gathered from church records, tax lists, newspapers, and ship lists, in addition to emigrant lists, correspondence, and diaries. Presently, I am defining how major European areas of 18th-century outmigration differed from each other by using the literature, relying on secondary sources in German history, geography, and economics, which are ample and sufficiently detailed (for example, [5]). At a later stage, I intend to trace a substantial number of migrants to places from which they came in order to study the migration process itself more closely as well as to establish a more precise basis for comparisons of New World practices with those common in the areas of origin. A check of the published material and references to the unpublished sources concerning documentation of persons emigrating from Germany encourages the belief that many individuals can be traced.<sup>12</sup> Most German territories required some form of official permission for emigration or monitored their emigrating subject through already existing administrative channels. The County of Wertheim, for example, required at first 10 percent, later 20 percent of the value of the goods or money to be removed from the county, in addition to the regular fee for manumission for those who were legally bound to the lord of the land, while the Canton of Zürich ordered its ministers to report those of their parishioners who had emigrated to the American colonies over the last decade (1734-44), information that can be supplemented by data from the Canton Zürich "removal lists" which include all migrants. Those areas which have been studied intensively on the local level already will be used when comparing Lancaster County Germans with their compatriots who stayed at home.<sup>13</sup>

More directly in Lancaster County, tax lists, deeds and warranties, wills and inventories, indentures, account books, correspondence, diaries, and newspapers make it possible to ascer-

tain economic status of German settlers and to answer many questions about individual economic activity. Evidence of settlement patterns, size of landholdings, inheritance patterns, emphasis on grain or livestock, crop diversification, home manufacture, use of labor, consumption patterns, and capital formation will throw light on the extent of economic differences among British and German settlers in Lancaster County. How were settlement patterns determined by the flow and composition of incoming settlers and the availability of land? Plotting the locations of Lancaster County congregations, the emerging pattern indicates the earliest settlers to be of British origin (Quakers, Anglicans, and Presbyterians); the next "ring" to be predominantly German, especially Swiss Mennonite with some significant sprinklings of Reformed; and the following wave -- establishing itself in Lancaster County by the middle of the 18th century -- was much more mixed in its overall composition, with rapidly growing numbers of Lutherans and Reformed and quite distinct in its concentration of particular groups in certain townships. How many of those settlers in the western townships were "native," that is, children of earlier settlers, who did not stay on their fathers' farms although the ratio between the average size of landholding and acreage cleared remained high throughout the period [21]? Did inheritance practices change from Old World customs where areas of partial inheritance were generally congruent with areas of 18th-century outmigration? Why were there so few subdivisions of farms? Were profits from wheat -- Pennsylvania's cash crop -- large enough to allow re-investment in land further west as portions for younger children? Closely related are questions concerning the crops grown and livestock raised and which ones were consumed or sold. For example, British settlers on the average had more sheep than their German neighbors but why did the number of cattle decrease in prerevolutionary Lancaster County regardless of the settlers' ethnic origin [21]? How many of the German settlers cultivated industrial crops such as flax and hemp for the market, or had orchards combined with intensive vegetable gardening, features quite common in southwestern Germany, especially in those areas along the Rhine where landholdings were very small and farming therefore only supplementary in supporting a family? Did those part-time farmers in Germany become full-time farmers in Pennsylvania? Who were the artisans and who were their clients? (I have found no indications that Germans tried to imitate such German town government features as the guild system.) How were indentured servants employed and who were their employers? And how important an initiation was indentured service to those who had no previous knowledge of life in America? Aspects concerning differences in lifestyle are more subtle and difficult to grasp but inventories and wills provide us with clues well worth pursuing.<sup>14</sup> The findings concerning economic status and behavior of the German settlers in Lancaster



County will then be compared with data from a sample of British neighbors and their use of a comparable environment.

Given established practices and modes of participating in the market and a political system of English origin, German cultural traits might be expected to be most identifiable and durable in matters not directly and immediately related to the economic life and governmental policies. Religion, used as an organizational focus as well as a belief system, was central because of its importance in maintaining identity and life among familiar people, an experience shared by many other ethnic minorities historically.

First, I am establishing to what extent similar German groups -- under the aegis of religion, settlement opportunity, or mere accident -- settled together, shared a lifestyle not wholly that of other people nearby, intermarried, and practiced social exclusiveness. Then, what were the effects on political and even economic participation if social interaction was concentrated within a particular group? In this respect the Baptists of Ephrata Cloister and the Mennonites present two extreme inwardly turned cases that are worthwhile concentrating on for contrast with other groups.

In the realm of politics and public life in general, who were elected officers and how did they appeal and relate to their constituency? It will be interesting to find out -- correspondence, but especially ministers' diaries and reports as well as newspapers are most likely to answer this question -- if political participation in Lancaster County depended heavily on Germany-based experiences and expectations. J. Wood [33] in his traditional description of the political and economic development of the borough of Lancaster (the only inland town of consequence in the colonial period) found that although the German segment of the population constituted a majority, local and provincial officers of British origin overrepresented their ethnic constituency. How does this compare with townships which were less complex in their economic and social structure, which were settled early or which were late in their development?

Finally, with whom did various groups of Germans do their business? Business networks can be revealed through transactions evident in inventories and wills, account books, and newspaper advertisements. In addition, I intend to at least sample court records, which offer much information not only on what kinds of issues were disputed but also much about the people who brought those matters to court.

Particular denominational groups, such as the Baptists of Ephrata Cloister and possibly the Mennonites, can be expected to represent special cases because their beliefs and practices set them clearly apart from their German and British neighbors alike. More important to what happened in Lancaster County and eventu-

ally in the colony as a whole, however, may be the large groups of Lutheran and Reformed settlers whose organization and leadership were heavily dependent on European-based resources and expectations. The Lutheran and Reformed Churches in German territories were established state churches with a clear-cut structuring of services and participation, and in almost all cases church government was structured hierarchically, closely supervised, and in effect controlled by the state's authority. Consequently, state interest outside of the particular territory (in the American colonies, for example) was practically nonexistent.

Open denominational competition within a single territory as well as substantial, if not independent, lay participation and responsibility in almost all matters concerning the church were very unfamiliar concepts for the average parishioner of German state churches settling in Lancaster County. Except for those German groups who immigrated to Pennsylvania predominantly for religious reasons, often because of their denomination's difficulties with the state churches in the Old World, and who therefore brought all their assets, books, members, and ministers, German settlers in general found it difficult to organize and maintain congregations and churches along lines of familiar customs. There were relatively few German ministers who emigrated independently; congregations formed through lay efforts were unsure which authority in Europe to address with their requests for ministers and support; and most congregations were too poor, or claimed to be, to be able to maintain a minister on a decent and regular salary. Considering this situation, it is not surprising that the German Reformed and Lutherans turned to join other -- German as well as British -- denominations; that, throughout the colonial period, the German Reformed were supported and supplied by the Classis of Amsterdam; that the Lutherans were finally organized and administered to by Mühlenberg who had been sent by Halle of Saxony, an area sending but few settlers; that organization came only in response to the inroads made among Germans in Pennsylvania as a result of the Great Awakening by the rival Moravians; and that the charity school movement was a project conceived and directed under the auspices of the London-based Society of the Promotion of Christian Knowledge among the Germans, at least with the initial support from the leaders of the major German denominations. Analyses of the forms of religious organization that transcended particular group characteristics, such as the "union churches" and schooling, will also help explain patterns of settlement in Lancaster County.<sup>15</sup>

Many of the sources for identifying various types of Germans, their economic condition and activity, are the same as those that have to be gleaned to determine the nature of their social life; and findings of either substantial interaction or relative in-

dependence between these two broad areas of the settlers' existence are themselves of major importance in interpreting the impact of immigration from a variety of origins on life in south-eastern Pennsylvania.

This study will identify and evaluate, as the existing literature fails to do, cultural differences that affected the economic and social development of Lancaster County to explain why certain divergent practices occurred, how deeply they persisted, and what implications they had for broader lines of economic and social development of the very mixed settlement area of the Delaware Valley.<sup>16</sup> Even should -- contrary to expectation -- little that is distinctive appear in the rural life of the German settlers who composed a large part of Lancaster County's culturally diverse population, this finding would itself be valuable, since the interpretation along this line that is being challenged here is at present more assumed than well-documented. Either way, our understanding of life in the Delaware Valley in the 18th century should be advanced substantially.

#### NOTES

1. C. Grant [10], P. Greven [11], J. Demos [7], K. Lockridge [20], and M. Zuckerman [34] are perhaps the best known examples of New England local research. Only Zuckerman [34] deals substantially with the 18th century and with contrasts or generalizations among towns. Lockridge [19], D. S. Smith [26], and L. S. Auwers [3] are now pursuing their local research to the end of the colonial period and beyond, while Allen [1] has focused on how diversity of English origin created differences in New England towns.

2. A. Kulikoff: Prince George's County, Maryland [14]; L. S. Walsh: Charles County, Maryland [31]; and Darrett B. Rutman and Anita H. Rutman's investigation of community organization and lifestyle in Middlesex County, Virginia, 1650-1750.

3. Colonial Lancaster County encompassed the area of present-day Dauphin, Lancaster, and Lebanon Counties.

4. Until the very recent agricultural development of the California Valley, Lancaster County has been agriculturally the most productive county in the United States. During the colonial period, it was settled at a time when food stuffs, especially wheat, were well established as goods for export.

5. The French and Indian War in the American colonies and respectively the Seven Years War in Europe have traditionally been believed to be responsible for this timing of the decline of German immigration to America. A closer look at the areas of 18th-century outmigration, however indicates the concurrence of those events to be incidental rather than causal. Emigration

from Switzerland peaked in the 1740s [5] while the first of the "Schwabenzüge" to eastern Europe early in the 1760s suggests a redirection of migration from southwestern Germany, the reasons for which have to be yet explored.

6. Before 1750, materials on the county level as a whole are scarce and scattered, but Lemon [16] showed that township data for the earlier period can be exploited successfully, and Wolf [32] demonstrated admirably how incomplete and imperfect records of various types can be combined effectively. Furthermore, increasingly refined knowledge about the processes responsible for patterns of regional development will facilitate bridging the blank spaces of incomplete data on the county level, especially since relatively complete data series can be established for a number of townships. However, the information obtainable for the German settlers of Lancaster County varies enormously in quantity as well as quality, so that all identified Germans cannot possibly be included in the analyses of specific questions.

7. G. L. Main [22] addressed herself to that problem while comparing Massachusetts and Maryland probate records; D. S. Smith [27] did the same for one New England town; and a study by R. R. Menard, P. M. G. Harris, and L. G. Carr [23] on Maryland found the impact of incompleteness of records on the findings, through age bias and reporting rates, can be less than one must at first expect.

8. The record stripping for biographical information on Lancaster County settlers and all the linkages have to be done by hand, but the information is gathered in such a way as to be transcribable on computer cards for statistical analyses.

9. Lemon [16] identified ethnic groups in southeastern Pennsylvania by this difficult and not always reliable method. The linguistic categories established for the evaluation of German stock in the 1790 US population census are too crude a measure for one relatively small region, in addition to the general criticism that those categories do not adequately account for early anglicized names. As a complementary measure last-name analysis of typical German names on tax lists is indispensable.

10. Newspaper advertisements as a way to establish contacts with relatives and friends are not only extremely useful for identification purposes but are of great help in investigating patterns of communications among Germans in southeastern Pennsylvania [8].

11. The distribution of congregations in Lancaster County (28 Reformed; 26 Lutheran; 26 Mennonite; 4 Moravian; 2 Baptist; 16 Presbyterian; 4 Quaker; 3 Anglican; and 3 other) is not necessarily representative, partly because of the high proportion of Mennonites. In addition, it is important to bear in mind that "congregation" is very loosely defined here, ranging from the

Brethren of Ephrata Cloister to those settlers who had but one contact with a particular church or minister.

12. In Germany, commitment of local and state archives to local history research has been traditionally strong. However, the systematic exploitation of those resources focusing on specific questions, such as economic status, size of landholdings, and settlement patterns, may be difficult to obtain for larger regions, precisely because of the predominance of local emphasis as a result of the high degree of fragmentation in 18th-century Germany. A. Blocher [5], on the other hand, is an encouraging example.

13. For example, the "Heimatstelle Pfalz" is a regional research center for emigration from the Palatinate -- an area from which a large number of German settlers in Lancaster County originated.

14. One such clue, for instance, is the provision of a horse willed to Mennonite widows [17, p. 68], which suggests that the Mennonites considered the ability to move around freely and over longer distances a necessity, presumably to underline efforts to keep in close contact with fellow Mennonites.

15. Lemon [16] suggested differences between "sect" and "church" people rather than "national" background, but he did little to substantiate his conclusion and this hypothesis should be tested as part of my analysis.

16. The first part of my study, concerning the economic development, is funded by the Regional Economic History Research Center of the Eleutherian Mills-Hagley Foundation.

#### REFERENCES

1. D. G. Allen, "In English Ways. The Movements of Societies or the Transferal of English Local Law and Custom to Massachusetts Bay, 1600-1690," Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin, 1974.
2. T. Archdeacon, "'Distinguished for Nation Sake': The Age of Leisler in New York City" In S. L. Katz, ed., *Colonial America* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1971), pp. 144-54.
3. L. S. Auwers, "Family, Friends, and Neighbors: Society and Kinship in Windsor, Connecticut, 1635-1830," forthcoming.
4. E. D. Ball, "The Process of Settlement in 18th Century Chester County, Pa.: A Social and Economic History," Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1973.
5. A. Blocher, *Die Eigenart der Züricher Auswanderer nach Amerika, 1734-1744* (Zürich: Atlantis, 1976).
6. K. N. Conzen, *Immigrant Milwaukee, 1836-1860: Accommodation and Community in a Frontier City* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, c.1975, 1976).

7. J. Demos, *A Little Commonwealth: Family Life in Plymouth Colony* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1970).
8. A. L. Eyster, trans. and comp. "Notices by German and Swiss Settlers Seeking Information of Members of their Family, Kindred of Friends. Inserted between the years 1742 and 1761 in the *Pennsylvanische Berichte*, and between the years 1762 and 1779 in the *Pennsylvanische Staatsbote*," *The Pennsylvania German Folklore Society*, Vol. 3 (1938).
9. J. W. Frost, *The Quaker Family in Colonial America: A Portrait of the Society of Friends* (New York: St. Martin's, 1973).
10. C. Grant, *Democracy in the Connecticut Frontier Town of Kent* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1961).
11. P. Greven, *Four Generations: Population, Land, and Family in Colonial Andover, Massachusetts* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1970).
12. T. G. Jordan, *German Seed in Texan Soil. Immigrant Farmers in Nineteenth-Century Texas* (Austin: Texas University Press, 1966).
13. A. P. Kenney, *Stubborn for Liberty: The Dutch in New York* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press for the New York State American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, 1976).
14. A. Kulikoff, "Tobacco and Slaves: Population, Economy and Society in Eighteenth Century Prince George's County, Maryland," Ph.D. diss., Brandeis University, 1976.
15. O. Langguth, "Pennsylvania German Pioneers from the County of Wertheim," in D. Yoder, ed. and trans., *The Pennsylvania German Folklore Society*, Vol. 12 (1947), pp. 147-289.
16. J. T. Lemon, *The Best Poor Man's Country: A Geographical Study of Early Southeastern Pennsylvania* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1972).
17. \_\_\_\_\_, "Household Consumption in Eighteenth-Century America and Its Relation to Production and Trade: The Situation among Farmers in Southeastern Pennsylvania," *Agricultural History*, Vol. 41 (1967), pp. 59-70.
18. B. J. Levy, "The Light in the Valley: The Chester and Welsh Tract Quaker Communities and the Delaware Valley, 1681-1750," Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1976.
19. K. Lockridge, "Land, Population, and the Evolution of New England Society, 1630-1790, and an Afterthought," in S. L. Katz, ed., *Colonial America*, 2nd ed. (Boston: Little, Brown, 1976), pp. 490-520.
20. \_\_\_\_\_, *A New England Town: The First Hundred Years, Dedham, Massachusetts, 1636-1736* (New York: Norton, 1970).
21. A. C. Lord, "The Pre-Revolutionary Agriculture of Lancaster County, Pennsylvania," *Journal of Lancaster County Historical Society*, Vol. 79 (1975), pp. 23-42.
22. G. L. Main, "Probate Records as a Source for Early American History," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd ser. 32 (1975), pp. 89-99.

23. R. R. Menard, P. M. G. Harris, and L. G. Carr, "Opportunity and Inequality: The Distribution of Wealth in the Lower Western Shore of Maryland, 1638-1705," *Maryland Historical Magazine*, Vol. 69 (1974), pp. 169-84.
24. L. Schelbert, *Einführung in die schweizerische Auswanderungsgeschichte der Neuzeit* (Zürich: Leeman, 1976).
25. \_\_\_\_\_, "Swiss Migration to America: The Swiss Mennonites," Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1966.
26. D. S. Smith, "Population, Family, and Society in Hingham, Massachusetts, 1635-1880," Ph.D. diss., University of California, 1973.
27. \_\_\_\_\_, "Underregistration and Bias in Probate Records: An Analysis of Data from Eighteenth-Century Hingham, Massachusetts," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd ser. 32 (1975), pp. 100-10.
28. M. Spufford, *Contrasting Communities. English Villagers in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1974).
29. R. B. Strassburger, *Pennsylvania German Pioneers. A Publication of the Original Lists of Arrival in the Port of Philadelphia, from 1727-1808*, Edited by J. W. Hinke, 3 Vols. (Norristown, Pa.: Pennsylvania German Society, 1934).
30. F. G. Tolles, *Meetinghouse and Counting House: The Quaker Merchants of Colonial Philadelphia, 1682-1763* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press for Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1948).
31. L. S. Walsh, "Charles County, Maryland, 1658-1705: A Study of Chesapeake Social and Political Structure," Ph.D. diss., Michigan State University, 1977.
32. S. G. Wolf, *Urban Village. Population, Community, and Family Structure in Germantown, Pennsylvania, 1683-1800* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976).
33. J. Wood, "Conestoga Crossroads: The Development of Lancaster, 1730-1812," Ph.D. diss., Brown University, 1969.
34. M. Zuckerman, *Peaceable Kingdoms: New England Towns in the Eighteenth Century* (New York: Knopf, 1970).