PART TWO

AMERICAN APPRAISALS OF SWITZERLAND

A. G. Roeber

Henry Miller's *Staatsbote:* A Revolutionary Journalist's Use of the Swiss Past

On 6 July 1776 the first printing of the Declaration of Independence in German came from the Philadelphia press of Melchior Steiner and Charles Cist. Three days later, Heinrich Miller issued a second version of the Declaration, although he had given out the first news of the Declaration's imminent appearance in his newspaper the *Philadelphische Staatsbote* on 5 July, beating the English-language press by a day. In both instances, the translation of the seminal document was the work of Charles Cist, a Halle-educated pharmacist and physician who had fled from St. Petersburg to North America in 1769. The conjunction of a Halle-educated translator for the Declaration and its printing by Miller, a German-born immigrant of Swiss ancestry, symbolized the forging of a politically self-conscious German-American readership. The language used to convey the meaning of the Declaration built upon Miller's highly politicized international perspective he had developed since the early 1760s as a printer in Pennsylvania. Unlike his competitors the Sauers, father and son, Miller eschewed treating the domestic and local concerns of transplanted German speakers in his paper and almanac. Instead, he purposefully addressed himself to the local leadership groups who were already in contact with English speakers in trade and in local politics.[1]

We still puzzle over how the German reader perceived the significance of terms such as "freedom," "privileges," "property," and "law" for which Miller rarely provided parallels and translations. Most of the time, he took the acculturated status of his readers for granted, although other hints in his newspaper suggest that he knew that most of his readership did not share the cosmopolitan Swiss perspective he himself possessed that allowed him to praise the North American quality of life he and Cist translated as *Glückseligkeit.* The truism legal scholars urge students to consider is doubly true where the German-language readership of the British colonies was concerned: "Property rights are a cultural creation and a legal conclusion."[2] Miller's cultural

creation reflected his own pilgrimage from German birth to Swiss apprenticeship, from which he drew the figures and images he wished transplanted German speakers in British North America to adopt as their own.

In this regard, Miller set out to distance himself from his major competitors, the Sauers. The Sauer family, after 1758 involved in the internal life of the Dunkard Church as bishops and convinced pacifists, had studiously attempted under Christopher Sauer I to avoid present-day disputes, adopting the semblance of being impartial *(unpartheyisch).* Naturally, Sauer's writings were anything but impartial. Ironically, the Sauer almanac that shortly after Christopher I's death had begun a long series of biographical sketches on the British monarchs beginning in the 1760s, ended both the series and publication itself in 1776 with a sketch of the revolutionary Oliver Cromwell. We cannot indulge a deep comparison between Sauer's approach to the problem of a self-concept and imagery he suggested for German speakers and Miller's. But where Sauer consistently concentrated upon domestic imagery and eschewed political issues and involvement, Miller immediately seized just this approach, perhaps reflecting his own impatience with the domestic-religious culture of the Moravians to whose faith he had been converted after his second arrival in North America in 1741.[3]

Sauer had resolutely focused his paper on the key concept of *das ganze Haus.*[4] The *Hoch-Deutsch Pennsylvanisch Geschichts-Schreiber,* from 1739 until Sauer's death in 1758 devoted itself primarily and openly to the "Collection of Credible News, from the Realm of Nature and the Churches; and also Useful Knowledge for the Common Good." The interests of an agricultural, religious society therefore determined what Sauer would choose to define as "useful" for his definition of the common weal. Sauer rarely encouraged self-reflective, political engagement by German speakers; his essential message to his patrons was one of non-involvement except when other groups threatened the dominance of the Quakers in the proprietary government. By continuing to emphasize the centrality of the household and the father's responsibility for its preservation, Sauer perpetuated the culturally transferred village traditions of German speakers which had rarely exceeded the bounds of the village and the kinship network in which they lived. Even for the relatively mobile population of the German southwest, the guiding principles of behavior remained those that tied one to extended family and securing one's rights in the locale in which one lived. Allegiances further abroad—to the duke, prince, or count, or to the political entity of a "state"—were scarcely thought of. The primary appeal of the North American context for Sauer remained its "liberty" that meant precisely the absence of constraint upon conscience, and the accompanying absence of compulsory civic obligations as well.

Thus, when Conrad Weiser printed a circular letter in 1741 urging German support for a tax to be levied for defense funds, Sauer openly attacked the German-speaking justice of the peace. Yet even Weiser himself, like Sauer a wanderer in religious opinions who dabbled at Ephrata and tried on many religious vestures before returning to

Lutheran practice, had only reminded the German speakers that their possessions "of temporal goods" were best protected under the "priviledges & liberties" secured under British law. Weiser used the Biblical metaphor of "a house divided against itself shall not stand" to urge German-speaking Pennsylvanians to "trust" the English, who were more "jealous and Carefull of their Laws" than any other nation. But even Weiser had not contemplated long-term involvement, but instead support for this one-time, only short-term, necessary defense measure. Weiser's own pragmatism, perhaps honed by his years of cross-cultural mediating between Pennsylvania and Native Americans among whom he spent his youth, inspired his writing more than any reflection upon how German speakers should contemplate the problem of liberty and property.[5] Sauer, by contrast, consistently attacked any form of taxation that touched the hearth and promoted either the interests of the wealthy few or those with designs upon Indian lands.[6]

The physical presentation of Sauer's paper also did little to encourage in his readers the development of a critical sense and reflective judgment which the literature of the day began to develop among English speakers. The actual layout of printed texts could convey different messages to readers depending upon the associations triggered from seeing regularly arranged blocks of print. In Great Britain, the alteration in the stamp tax law that after 1725 levied new charges on six-sided weeklies that had previously only been required to pay the pamphlet tax, immediately drove some marginal papers from the market and altered the physical looks of others. Double-columned, regularized blocks of texts, readily identified in the popular mind with the Bible, religious pamphlets, and officially sanctioned political pamphlets thus conveyed a different sense of "truth" than more hastily assembled papers, struggling for financial survival and unable to command the battery of typesetters and printers available to the cautious, conservative press conscious of the need to avoid censorship and potential financial ruin.[7]

The simple need to be economically successful explains why Sauer largely avoided complex typesetting, for example, not putting editorial remarks or commentary on news reports and texts in italics, and avoiding as well the doubling of German consonants. Instead, his paper presented to the reader both news from Europe, provincial and local developments, and his own comments, all in uninterrupted double columns that closely resembled the printing of Bibles, religious pamphlets, and other forms of officially sanctioned, printed truth. Between 1739 and 1750 a year's subscription to the paper cost three shillings and was not sustained by paid advertisements; these were instead inserted gratis. Neither did many of Sauer's "subscribers" actually pay what they owed, as he complained to his readers. Perhaps reflecting the rapidly expanding circulation created by German immigration, Sauer finally began charging his four to ten thousand readers for placing advertisements in the paper. Not too surprisingly, eminent brokers and agents like Heinrich Keppele, and other Philadelphia worshippers at St. Michael's like David Schaeffer and Ernst Ludwig Baisch used the paper

to remind people to pay what they owed. Since all mortals must die, debts should be paid so that heirs will not have to be troubled by creditors, Keppele warned. Irresponsible people had already cost him much money. Sauer, too, heartily recommended avoiding courts and indebtedness, on moral grounds.[8]

Perhaps even more important in creating a community of readers familiar with a vocabulary shaped by cultural transfer and adaptation to a British-American context, was Sauer's almanac. *Der Hoch-Deutsch Americanische Calender,* begun in 1738, was equally forthright in telling readers that it concentrated on the domestic core of a transferred German culture, regaling purchasers with treatments of "various needful and edifying theological topics, and also household remedies." The reliance of Sauer's readership upon the absolute truth of the printed word in both theology and domestic culture was testified to by irate farmers who berated the publisher when his astrological and weather tables failed to match what happened in Pennsylvania. Just as oral customs and received traditions in the German southwest had long been thought safer when committed to paper and provable charters, so too, in the New World context, the truths promulgated in Sauer's almanac assumed deeper dimensions precisely because they were printed and could be referred to, just as one turned to printed Scripture.

Against the time-honored reverence in which Sauer's publications were held by German speakers in North America, Henry Miller offered his own perspective. Born in 1702 and baptized Johann Heinrich Möller in Rhoden/Waldeck, Miller was of Swiss ancestry, his father a stonemason in Altstätten near Zurich, where the young boy lived, serving an apprenticeship in Basel before going to London, and eventually landing in New York and settling in Philadelphia in 1741. Beginning his career under Franklin's tutelage, Miller returned to Europe a year later since he had converted from Lutheranism to the Moravian faith and was instructed to aid in setting up a printing shop for the Moravians at The Hague. Wanderings in the late 1740s took him through Great Britain until in 1751 he came again to Pennsylvania and began publishing the *Lancastersche Zeitung*. Again returning to Europe in 1754, he was back in England two years later publishing a German paper for the Hanoverian and Hessian troops during the Seven Years' War. By 1760 Miller was again in Philadelphia where his first job turned out to be that of translator for a book that addressed the difficulties German speakers encountered with English law.[9]

Shortly after Sauer's death, and just before Miller began publishing the *Philadelphische Staatsbote,* the elder Christopher Sauer's concerns about the German speakers' difficulty with English law were given new life by the decision of the Berks County attorney David Henderson to publish a handbook of English legal terms in German. Henderson himself was not adept enough to translate his efforts, and turned to Miller, who issued *Des Landsmanns Advocat* in 1761, the only German-language legal handbook printed in America before the Revolution. Henderson had consulted with Conrad Weiser before the latter's untimely death in the summer of 1759, and contacted the Lancaster justice

Emmanuel Zimmerman, to whom he dedicated the book, and pastor Heinrich Melchior Mühlenberg, and Weiser's sons, as well. All encouraged the project. Attempting to explain the book's purpose to prospective readers, Henderson wrote an introduction that demanded a rapid acquisition of English and excused the book only as a stop-gap measure. The real purpose of the book, however, lay in instructing German speakers in the proper understanding of English liberty.

The book did not aim to make a learned legal expert out of a farmer, but rather to bring the current generation of German speakers into full contact with English law; in a succeeding generation, Henderson concluded, his work would be superfluous since the Germans will know English. Henderson urged upon his readers and potential clients the growing sense that a public political arena not only existed, but that Germans were compelled, if only out of self-interest, to participate in it.[10]

Henry Miller, Henderson's translator, quickly established himself as an independent and politically oriented printer whose dedication to the construction of public opinion was clear from the beginning. He now ended his former flirtation with the Moravians, signaling his independence with the 1762 publication of the broadside *Geistlicher Irrgarten,* a complex maze of Biblical passages directing players from four different sides through a labyrinth, to which Miller added at the bottom "Philadelphia, printed by Henrich Miller, in the year after his release out of the garden of errors and the opening up of heaven's gate, 1762."[11] At no time during the next decade and beyond did Miller reestablish his formal connections with a Protestant religious body; and yet, even here, the Swiss identity was not far from his mind. In August of 1770 Miller enthusiastically published an essay by Christian Ziguerer, preacher at Grüsch in Graubünden. Comparing his reaction to this piece with his admiration for August Hermann Francke's *Heiliger und sicherer Glaubens-Weg,* Miller concluded that an American edition in English and German ought to be brought out. For those who had doubts about its theological soundness, Miller triumphantly declared that a synod of pastors and professors of the Swiss Reformed Church testified to its orthodoxy.[12] Even the very first advertisement Miller printed reflected his Swiss orientation: Johann Conrad Steiner's *Die herrliche Erscheinung des Herrn Jesu zum allgemeinen Weltgericht* reflected the Reformed pastor's efforts in sixteen sermons which Miller first brought to public attention in his first edition on 18 January 1762.

Miller's independent religious posture and many wanderings never undermined his identity which he chose to promote as a model for German speakers' understanding of their rights in America. Even when threatened by an outraged Roman Catholic whom he believed to be mentally ill, Miller upheld the advantages of toleration he had come to know in Switzerland; he even suggested that his short apprenticeship in Brussels and Paris among a Catholic population suggested a growing tolerance in Europe which Miller hailed as a genuinely cosmopolitan spirit.[13]

The identity of German speakers as Germans had been vague and ill

defined in Europe for centuries, largely because the territories within the *Reich* exercised local privileges vis-à-vis the theoretical supremacy of the emperor. Perhaps sensing this, Miller assumed that acculturated German speakers in the colonies could make easy analogies to other countries' experiences as he had done in his journeys. By the mid-1700s, the first German writers in Europe had begun openly to lament the lack of a "German" identity, and to cast about for appropriate models that might supply one. Most thought that, while some princes had regularly aped the French court at Versailles, the actual traditions of German local life suggested that the republics of the Netherlands or Switzerland provided the best examples of how life should be ordered. Certainly, similarities of local institutional life had long suggested that the small republics might have something to offer, especially to the German southwest which shared many affinities in population and religion with Switzerland.[14]

Miller, sensitive to the fact that he was a newcomer to the German reading public, declared in his first issue of his paper that his intention was merely to serve "the Germans in this part of the world, so far removed from their fatherland." His somewhat chauvinistic reporting of the bravery of Germans in their exploits overseas appears to have been intended to reassure both readers, and perhaps himself, that "the German people have never been inferior to any other in bravery, or any other virtues." Both Christian and civic *(bürgerliche)* virtues would be promoted in his paper, although the preference given to secular affairs was obvious to anyone looking closely at the title of his "Weekly Philadelphia State Messenger: With the Newest Foreign and Local Political News," adding almost as an afterthought, "including the Remarkable Events Occurring from Time to Time in the Church and the World of Learning."[15] But the lack of interest in the domestic, local sphere of life that was so central to Sauer's approach was striking not only in the pages of the newspaper, but in the complete absence of homely advice and essays in Miller's almanac, the *Neuest- Verbessert- und Zuverlässige Amerikanische Calendar,* whose title, while admitting it was "newest and improved" also claimed to be "reliable," but not necessarily "High German" as did Sauer's.[16]

For the first two years of the paper's existence, Miller faithfully reported both British and North American political developments. At first, he seemed to take for granted a shared cosmopolitan interest in the world on the part of his readers. By 1764, he had begun to use without comment the term "American" to describe the identity of his readers, and welded together English and North American political history in the German language. Yet Miller may have been disappointed early on in the low level of awareness he sensed among his readership for the importance of international political affairs. At least this would explain his policy of identifying in parentheses cities in the German *Reich* outside of the southwest, especially Württemberg and the Palatinate, from which so many emigrants came. While towns such as Speyer, Heilbronn, Stuttgart, or Landau were self-evidently clear, Miller felt compelled to explain where other cities lay. Thus Regensburg was

identifed to be in Bavaria on the Danube, the city in which the *Reichstag* met. A few weeks later Berlin was identified as "a large and well populated city in the Central Mark of Brandenburg on the River Spree, the residence of the King of Prussia and Elector of Brandenburg."[17] Curiously, Miller almost never again drew upon any historical images from the German past itself, allowing himself only the observation in 1765 upon a letter from "a *German North American*" that the "*German Tongue* is the *Mother* of the *English Language,* so that . . . the laying a *Double Burden* on a good ancient *Parent* . . . [breaks] that divine Commandment, *Thou shalt honour thy Father and thy Mother,*" an obvious reference to the double tax to be laid upon foreign-language newspapers by the hated Stamp Act which Miller vociferously opposed in his paper.[18]

Yet his own Swiss heritage was also relatively unimportant to Miller until the imperial crisis deepened with the passage of the Stamp Act and the campaign to royalize Pennsylvania. In the aftermath of these controversies, Miller's allegiances to the Swiss struggles for liberty emerged and deepened from 1768 to 1775.[19]

At first glance, Miller's unencumbered translations of British parliamentary debates, ministerial decisions, and provincial politics could be taken as evidence proving that his readership needed no help in penetrating the mysteries of British legal and political culture. Hence, they also encountered little difficulty in understanding the debates over liberty and property. Several circumstances suggest that Miller was in fact assuming a different readership, and hence, anticipating a different response, than did Sauer, whom Miller never ceased to delight in attacking or belittling.

Miller, after all, had lived in England, worked for Franklin, and was the translator of Henderson's essay on the law. He was deeply familiar with British political and legal terminology, and apparently assumed that his readers were as well. Miller made no comments on, and gave few explanations for the accounts of British politics. Second, although he aimed at a continental distribution and had agents located from Halifax to Ebenezer and in most of the large German settlement towns in between, his circulation by 1776 may not have exceeded one thousand; in other words, he probably reached only half as many people as did the Sauer press, and perhaps intentionally so. Miller, after all, was consistently and aggressively pro-royalization in Pennsylvania and closely allied himself to the imperial perspective of Benjamin Franklin whose politics he unswervingly supported. Judging from the content of his paper, he seems to have assumed that a smaller group of informed and acculturated readers constituted his audience—exactly, that is, the cultural brokers who ran taverns, owned bakeries and breweries, engaged in coastal and overseas shipping, and comprised the leadership in German North American settlements.

As Willi Paul Adams has pointed out, Miller shared in the general adulation of Frederick the Great of Prussia, apparently oblivious to the combination of taxation and military expenditures upon which the success of the Prussian state was grounded. The *Staatsbote,* like the

Sauer press, had promulgated support for Britain's continental ally, reflecting the enthusiasm for Frederick engendered during the Seven Years' War.[20] Yet Miller did not continue to appeal to images drawn from the German past to provide his readers with a sense of shared linguistic or cultural identity. Rather, he assumed their status as German speaking British subjects in North America as a given, and devoted none of his efforts toward their domestic concerns. Miller poked fun at the unease of the Quakers in confronting the Paxton Boys and the fears engendered by Pontiac's Rebellion, pointing out that as the elders of the colony had sown, so now the young would reap, not knowing how to defend province and city. To drive the point home, Miller printed one of the satires to the tune of "A Soldier indeed am I, and stand before my Foe."[21]

Although Miller seemed content in the first three years of his activities merely to report foreign and domestic politics with little attempt at clarifying terms and words, the struggle over royalization in Pennsylvania, followed swiftly by the passage of the Stamp Act in 1765, changed the tenor of his paper dramatically. In the midst of the Stamp Act crisis Miller overtly reached back to German history, reminding readers of the oppressive taxes on printed matter common in the *Reich*, pointedly noting that in Germany printers were strictly forbidden to meddle in political debates.[22] In the debates that ensued between Sauer and his supporters who opposed changing the charter, and Miller and his royalizing sympathizers, for the first time the notion of "blessedness" or a condition of inner peace and undisturbed success appeared. Miller published in July 1764 a translation of an English broadside asking whether the assembly had intended to send a petition to the crown without consulting fellow citizens *(lieben Mitbürger)*, since the assembly's task was to stand before the crown as representatives *(Vorsteher)*. No other people's "civic, inward blessedness" *(bürgerliche Glückseligkeit)* could compare with Pennsylvania's if the protection of the original charter were rigorously upheld. Since disturbances were common in other colonies, blame should not be attached to the frame of Pennsylvania's provincial government. One wonders why Miller published this piece, which seems to argue eloquently against his own position.[23] Christopher Sauer, Jr., in one of the rare instances of genuine political engagement, attacked Miller and his allies, the royalizing Germans centered around Market Street, in a particularly hard-hitting pamphlet that ably juxtaposed domestic images against the pretentions of innovators.[24]

Sauer's attack on Miller and Franklin pleaded for peace in the aftermath of the bloodshed on the frontiers and the exchanges in broadsides among the Germans. The "inestimable justice and liberty" of old could only be retained if peace were made. Yet Sauer contributed little to the restoration of peace by encouraging partisans of the proprietary party to vote "like men and not like frighted women" *(wie Männer, und nicht wie furchtsame Weiber)*. Even more strongly, he employed the most negative domestic images, suggesting that those who continued to fight for royalization were *Misgeburten* ("misfits") who

opposed the success of men of "their own German Nation" like Heinrich Keppele as opposed to *Mitbürger,* fellow citizens, who supported the proprietary ticket. Franklin, he went on, completing the imagery, has "eaten our bread" and rewarded scoundrels like Joseph Galloway with a "fat office" *(fettes Amt)* while others got lesser crumbs *(geringere Brocken),* leaving the province in debt, being willing to see the entire house of government burn down rather than quieting the fractious relationships between governor and assembly.

The appeal of this domestic imagery and the manner in which the Sauer press had exerted itself to link domestic language images to broader issues of the public weal may go some distance in explaining why the royalization scheme was resoundingly defeated among the Germans. Sauer in particular resorted to imagery that drew upon the consensual role of the local community *(Gemeinde)* in representing the connection between cherished liberties and public responsibility. Although he appealed to all regardless of linguistic or religious background, the German-language text was aimed especially at the Lutheran and Reformed parties whom Sauer feared would be swayed to vote for royalization. Instead, he argued, liberty was a gift from God which he expected people to exercise. The privileges of Pennsylvania had always kept ultimate control over property in the proprietor, of course, but in practice, the right to property "and your purse and all else you own" was vested in free subjects who made those rights known to the assemblymen. The mediation of the local group's rights in the face of a central authority was well known to inhabitants of the Palatinate or Württemberg whose *Landtage* could be presented with the *Gravamina* against the pretentions of ducal or electoral exercises of power. But in the New World, Sauer warned, everyone "by the law of the land" was free, and not a slave, all equally enjoying "all liberties of a native-born Englishman," and all having "a share in the fundamental laws of the land."[25]

To be sure, both Sauer and Miller indulged in chicanery when it came to explaining the appropriate German translation of Franklin's infamous remarks about the "palatine Boors." That sentiment, first appearing in Franklin's 1755 *Gentleman's Magazine* essay "Observations Concerning the Increase of Mankind," received wide redistribution in shortened form from Sauer's press in 1764. Miller and his supporters felt compelled to answer the incendiary paragraph in which Franklin dismissed the Germans as rude peasants, as well as the accusations that Franklin had been behind the hated double rate to be levied on foreign newspapers by the Stamp Act. Instead, Miller's broadside insisted, the broadcasters of this fairy tale, the Wisters and David Deschler, did not understand that Franklin had actually worked hard to prevent the proviso.[26]

A disingenuous attempt to explain Franklin's terms was made in English in the same year, unconvincingly suggesting that his referring to the Germans "herding together" merely meant that such groupings "had a Tendency to exclude the English Language in a County where men multiplied so fast." An equally dubious footnote suggested that

" 'Tis well known that *Boor* means no more than a *Country Farmer,* and that *herding* signifies flocking or gathering together, and is applied by the best English Writers to harmless Doves, or Ladies in Distress."[27] Franklin and others pretended to scoff at the notion that the Germans would have heard the word *Boor* and interpreted it as "boar," i.e., a pig being "herded" to the polls. In fact, it is quite probable that this is precisely what the Germans did hear, and correctly divined Franklin's true sentiments about them. On the other hand, the essay at least pointed to the truth that the Germans had to master political and legal language in order to obtain for themselves any "Office of Trust or Profit."

Despite the rejoicing over the repeal of the Stamp Act on the part of both Sauer and Miller, Miller's writings took a sharper turn by 1768 as he discerned that repeal had not changed the ministry's basic posture toward the colonies. Both Miller and Sauer had copied English-language propaganda in juxtaposing "freedom" and "slavery" during the Stamp Act crisis, and Miller shrewdly discerned the connection between rising taxation to support military occupation and the tendency to override provincial assemblies, precisely the innovation which Great Britain had imposed during the Seven Years' War in appointing a British commander in chief with viceregal powers. Yet Miller curiously described the overshadowing of the assemblies by the imposition of the Stamp Act not as "against the constitution" *(verfassungswidrig)* but by a peculiarly awkward and more cautious construction, *unlandesverfassungsmäßig,* i.e., not appropriate or not befitting the constitution of the province.[28]

The refinement of terms identifying forms of taxation had been largely worked out by the time of the Stamp Act crisis. Yet as late as 1773 Miller's publication of a broadside protesting the decision of the assembly refusing an imposition of an excise in Pennsylvania reviewed both terms and history of taxation.[29] Excises had existed since 1700, the broadside argued, and such impositions upon spirituous liquors had never been a problem for previous generations just as jealous of liberty and law as the present generation. While such excises could be used in England to oppress people, that would not happen in Pennsylvania where at the county level, servants of the government *(Beamte)* were controlled by the people *(Volksmacht).* Appraisals of property could traditionally be appealed from an assessor to the county commissioners. Against those who warned that an assessor could break down the doors of a house, cellar or storeroom with a warrant *(Berechtigungsschreiben),* the broadside scornfully asked: "Do they understand under the word Liberty to mean here the condition in which people have the right honorably or deceitfully to conduct themselves according to their own pleasure against their neighbors?" Rather, liberty was a condition in which behavior was judged against the standard of the well-being and surety of the common society *(nach der Wohlfahrt und Sicherheit der allgemeinen Gesellschaft).* Perhaps, the writer continued, they mean that it is a lesser crime to steal from the public than from a private person. In addition, it was an excise *(Akzise)* and not a tax on the necessities of life *(Steuer* or *Taxen)* which was under discussion and which people would

avoid paying if they could. An excise on liquors justly touched the wealthy who were the real reason the assembly lacked the courage to adopt the measure. Is this wise, the essay concluded, "to impose yet a new burden upon movable and immovable property of a people already suffering under the load of heavy taxes?" This seemed especially foolish when the bill promised to bring in as much as a new tax of one penny on the pound levied against all chattels and real estate.

Apparently not interested in commenting upon the Declaratory Act, as did almost no other North American printer, Miller in 1767 did note the passage of the Townshend Duties, and approved of the subsequent imposition of nonimportation in 1767. But in 1768 Miller for the first team directly invoked images from other European resistance efforts as models for his German-speaking readers. Citing the Dutch motto "eendracht maakt macht" ("Strength in Unity") he unwittingly copied Heinrich Melchior Mühlenberg's own Latin invocation of 1764 which the pastor privately entered into his records as the Lutherans had marched from their schoolhouse to the polls: *vis unita fortior.* More significantly, in that same year Miller published the pamphlet which contained the song glorifying the story of Wilhelm Tell and the Swiss resistance against Habsburg tyranny.[30]

The most fascinating aspect of Miller's decision to reach into Swiss history for a model or identity for his readers is why he did so in the late 1760s, and why no models of resistance from German southwest history suggested themselves. Miller nowhere reflected upon this aspect of his past in detail. Yet he did suggest in his essay on the utility of newspapers published in 1774 that the purpose of the press was to make known political developments and to reveal the secrets of the ministers of state. A people in danger of losing the "priceless jewel of their liberty" Miller wrote, would find that the incomparable worth of newspapers was to function "as in Switzerland as watchmen on the mountains." Just as was true among that people, the press brought "like a signal fire" the attention of a people to life and warned of danger, against which only "unity and steadfastness" were adequate defense.[31]

In fact, Miller's decision in 1768 to seize upon the Wilhelm Tell legend is less odd than it seems. To be sure, according to at least some scholars, a sufficient tradition of peasant revolts existed in the German southwest that might at least have suggested a closer set of examples that would have aroused the historical self-consciousness of German speakers in America, most of whom came from the southwest. But the actual history of the southwest since the Thirty Years' War suggested that most peasants were inclined to use cautious legal procedures to protest attacks on their rights. The use of law faculties, the bringing of suits, or the writing of the *Gravamina* was more typical than any kind of outright resistance and uprising. In fact, that tradition seems, on the whole, to have been the stronger.[32]

Miller's use of the Tell legend concentrated on the swearing of the oath of loyalty among the Swiss determined to overthrow the tyranny of the Habsburgs. The title of the legend identifies Tell as the "original son

of freedom'' and the founder of the ''praiseworthy'' *Eidgenossenschaft.* The story concludes with Tell warning his fellows that freedom once won (giving praise to God for it) had to be defended, for if the Swiss ruined it they would never recover it again. In the same vein Tell warns them to be free from economic enslavement as well, otherwise they will end up as servants of the enemy *(''die Gaben machen blind; daß ihr nicht müssen büssen, und dienen zletzt dem Feind'').*

But to this poem the pamphlet appended ''Another beautiful Song concerning the Origins and Background of the Ancient Swiss'' that repeated the same emphasis on a people bound by an oath to one another. Tracing the mythic history of the wandering folk from East Friesland and Sweden into Switzerland where they fought the heathen for the Holy Roman Emperor, the poem pays homage to the sufferings of long ago, reminding the reader that God helps those who willingly suffer as Christ did on the cross. The eventual coat of arms adopted included the eagle on a golden field with a crown topped with the cross. But obedience—even for this people ''inclined to every form of humble obedience''—was due only because God had given them a pious ruler. Finally, however, no man can say who might be fortunate to have such an authority, but ultimate authority lay only with God. The virtues of the homely Swiss were reviewed in their humble clothing of *grober Zwilch;* for sustenance *(Nahrung)* they were fed on *''Fleisch, Käß und Milch.''*

As the nonimportation movement grew in strength in 1768, Miller clearly was searching for images stronger than those suggested by a German local tradition used to moving through channels. By presenting Tell as the supposed founder of an association bound by an oath that protected liberties, Miller sidestepped any traditional scepticism German speakers might have about the possibilities of a *Bündniß* or political association that was not tied together by agreement in religious principles. The Tell broadside appeared, after all, only a few months before Miller offered a library for sale containing political lexicons in which just such scepticism, reflective of the *Reich's* bloody past, was clearly evident. Interestingly, neither Miller nor Sauer ever referred to the tradition of presenting ''grievances'' *(Gravamina)* but instead only used the milder and more English term ''petition'' *(Bittschrift)* in describing the rights of subjects to present grievances. After this initial use of the Swiss model for his reading public, Miller dropped it as tensions with Britain seemed to subside. Yet he increasingly saw himself as less ''impartial'' *(unpartheyisch)* than he had originally claimed, as did the language of a broadside he agreed to publish in 1772 to protest the slanders and accusations leveled against tradesmen and artisans suspected of still wanting to alter the provincial charter and the ''blessed condition of our present provincial constitution and liberities'' *(die Glückseligkeit unserer jetzigen Landesverfassung und Freyheiten).*

Openly partisan, the broadside identifed the society as a ''Party'' *(Parthey)* with rules that allowed for expulsion of anyone betraying debates, or not agreeing to work against bribery and ''other harmful practices'' *(Bestechungen oder andere schädliche Practiken).* No mere private

quarrel would be considered excuse for failing to act in a patriotic manner for the best interests of the entire people, to which interest private opinions had to be subordinate. Although not precisely a society bound by an oath *(Eidgenossenschaft)* like the Swiss Confederation, the "Patriotic Society of the City and County of Philadelphia" moved German speakers closer to a kind of political association they had previously not known.[33]

Not until 1775, however, did Miller openly invoke the Swiss model again as he decided to reprint the essay of the Savannah Swiss Reformed pastor Johann Joachim Zubly. Thereafter, in relatively quick succession, he not only printed Zubly's sermon *The Law of Liberty* with the English version of the Swiss fight for freedom, but by July of 1776 in the pages of the *Staatsbote* included Salomon Geßner's poem "Das hölzene Bein" recounting the 1388 battle of Näfels in Glarus where Albert III of Austria had been defeated.[34] In this tale, too, as the old man tells the young shepherd the story of how he got his wooden leg, Miller managed to convey both some of the homely virtues to which he devoted very little of his publishing, with the political lessons he was more interested in propagating. The young shepherd could enjoy his country where the call of "freedom, freedom" rings in happy songs "from one peak to another" and "where what we see belongs to us, mountain and valley," only because of the sufferings of his forefathers. Recounting the battle, the old man tells the story of how the plumed Austrian cavalry were bested by a handful of Swiss. As the battle reached its peak, an enemy's horse trampled the man's leg. Before he could be killed, an unknown and wounded comrade bore him out of the battle and returned to the fray. In vain the old man had searched for his rescuer for years. In tears, the shepherd informs the wounded veteran that his own father had been the very man, but had himself died two years before, wondering if the man had survived whom he had carried out of the battle. The tale ends with the shepherd marrying the only heiress of the wounded veteran, the faithfulness of the oath-bound comrade rewarded in the united property and blood of the survivor's daughter and adopted son.

Miller's decision to publish his countryman Johann Joachim Zubly's essay, on the other hand, seems at first quite paradoxical. Both men were Swiss; although baptized Lutheran and dying a Moravian, Miller spent his formative years in the same Reformed atmosphere of Switzerland that produced the formidable transplanted cleric in Georgia. Zubly's own handling of the terms and issues surrounding public, political engagement and confrontation with illicit actions by authority was pure Swiss Reformed doctrine. Zubly's Zwinglian view of the relationship between politics and faith must have summarized Miller's own, although in the end Miller would remain loyal to the Revolution, and Zubly was unable to make the final break with his oath of obedience to the King. Perhaps the explanation lies in the fact that for Zubly, as for any orthodox Swiss Reformed, the union between politics and religion was sacred; for Miller, the baptized Lutheran who had converted to the Moravians, who were inclined to separatism and pacifism, such a union

was of little significance. Though proud of his Swiss heritage, most of Miller's thinking was cosmopolitan and secular. He seems to have thought little about the implications for the relationship between politics and faith that Swiss history held; Zubly confronted the issue head-on, with painful results for himself.

Zubly's *The Law of Liberty,* actually a composite sketch of Swiss Reformed theology, contained political principles, theological orientation, and the mythic-historical allegory to the Swiss struggle for liberty. The inscription on his title page (Isaiah 11:13: "Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim") suggested both the unity of the colonies with the empire, and the impossibility of divorcing world politics from religious conviction. Like Zwingli before him, Zubly took for granted the essential unity of the political and the religious world, and was, oddly enough, more medieval in this respect than Luther, who finally concluded that although the church needed the protection of the princes, the latter were not to be trusted, and that the church was essentially invisible and its true members were known only to God.

Zubly's account of the struggle of the Swiss for liberty also assumed that while liberty had been banished from nearly all the world, including perhaps Great Britain, it had been preserved in Switzerland. Yet the active resistance of the peasants in the cantons of Uri, Schwyz, and Unterwalden that finally spread to "*thirteen* cantons, besides some confederates" clearly had ramifications beyond the borders of Switzerland. It had been, after all, Zwingli's purpose to include the German southwest in the confederation plans, and that relationship had never been forgotten totally in the *Reich.* More importantly, Zubly insisted that resistance to initial acts of tyranny such as the disruption of trade was a theological obligation, not a mere political option. Zubly like Zwingli before him interpreted Paul's statement, "Stand fast in that liberty wherewith the Son of God has made us free" (Galatians 5:1), to be a command for active resistance to tyranny in a world that refused to distinguish sacred from secular. This reading of the relationship between power and liberty did not completely abandon the doctrine of the two kingdoms common to Western theological thinking, but it gave a novel turn to that tradition by locating authority finally in the independent local congregation, rejection of a state-supported episcopate, and the use of dialectic argument as a form of Biblical exegesis in which one could see revelation related to contemporary political events. Zubly's analysis of the crisis facing the empire, however, forbade him to endorse a severing of the imperial bonds. For, just as he saw a unity between the sacred and secular aspects of liberty, so too he believed that the political bonds of empire had a divinely blessed component within which liberty had to be defended, just as Zwingli had insisted that liberty within the bounds of the Swiss Confederation had to influence the politics, ultimately, of all Europe.[35]

Here, Miller found the ethic of political resistance to which his first groping citations of the Wilhelm Tell legend in 1768 had pointed him. Why Miller himself remained a committed patriot, even as he re-joined the Moravians among whom he would die at Bethlehem, while Zubly

remained loyal after providing some of the most eloquent texts in favor of resistance, remains locked in the mystery of individual conscience and decision. Miller, by early 1775 alarmed about rumors of German indifference to the impending crisis in the colonies of New York and North Carolina, finally moved to address precisely those whose domestic culture and isolation from the readership he had so carefully cultivated and nurtured, threatened to destroy a German-speaking resistance movement. His pamphlet aimed at bringing these communities into line. The *Schreiben des evangelisch-lutherisch und reformierten Kirchenraths . . . in der Stadt Philadelphia* addressed directly the lack of information that hampered certain Germans from seeing how dire was their peril.[36] Especially for those who had not had the benefit of the networks of communication and exchange developed over the past generation, reliance on old-fashioned notions of obedience, personal vertical ties in wealthy patrons and families, or even religious doctrines that seemed to support such notions, needed to be exploded. The lack of access to the printed word explained for Miller that the Germans of North Carolina and New York lay outside the community of readers that had evolved since the 1750s in those areas of the colonies that were linked by networks created by religious association, the German printers, and the agents who facilitated property recoveries and business deals. Miller found it pathetic that New York Germans would still refer to Sir William Johnson as their "father-in-law," perhaps because of Johnson's first common-law wife, a former Palatine indentured servant. Rejecting such familial analogies, Miller also pointed out the extraordinary difference separating an American from an English farmer, the latter forbidden to carry a loaded musket over his own fields or garden, the former unable to imagine not hunting wild game for hundreds of miles and certain of his rights to do just that.[37]

The images conveyed in such pamphlets drew upon the transferred images of the forest that German speakers were familiar with, but in a dramatically changed context. Instead of the forest representing either the property of lords, or being a place of refuge, as German tales had often portrayed it, the American forest now also symbolized the theater within which the self-confident German-American land owner roamed at will. Arguably the most popular story that circulated among German speakers before the Revolution was that of St. Genovefa, the medieval lady wrongly accused of adultery who escaped into the forest. Her son, nourished on the milk of a doe who miraculously sustains him, grows to maturity and deep piety in isolation from the allures of human society, and when both are rescued and restored by the repentant nobleman, Genovefa dies soon after, tired of the toils of this world. Such a story, when seen in the context of the images of the forest that underlay much of the folklore imported with German-speaking immigrants, could hardly remain untouched in a North American context where the forest also harbored the dreaded French and their Native American allies. Miller himself employed such images freely, suggesting during the uproar over the Stamp Act in 1765 that the forest might have to serve as the last refuge of liberty. The captivity narratives that had enjoyed a long

history among English speakers also received German treatments in the 1760s, and Sauer, Miller, and other printers regaled their customers with such pamphlets, both translations of the sufferings of English women, and one piece that featured a German-American heroine.[38]

As the crisis with Britain deepened, Miller must have been particularly gratified in early 1776 to be able to inform his readers that they could obtain from his old nemesis Sauer, another offering reflecting the Swiss heritage of which Miller was so proud. Sauer, Jr., offered readers the essay by "Herr Getzner of Zürich" *Der Tod Abels in fünf Gesängen* which was so popular "among the Germans that it was republished three times in one year," in addition to enjoying an English translation dedicated to Queen Charlotte of England. Yet in the end, as Miller displayed a front-page ad for the German version of Paine's *Common Sense,* it was finally to "Ihr Deutschen in America, besonders in Pennsylvanien!" that Miller appealed in March 1776. Reminding his readers of the hated condition of *Leibeigenschaft* which he compared to black slavery, Miller pointed out how compulsory military service, destruction of crops by game and by hunts, and the quartering of soldiers upon the population were all in store for Germans in America, just as they had been in Europe.[39]

Unfortunately, one cannot gauge very accurately the force of Miller's appeals. It seems highly unlikely that Miller overtly drew upon the Swiss analogies and historical lessons with the notion in mind that he was appealing to Swiss-Americans. Not only were his father's countrymen small in numbers, but Miller demonstrated from the first that his was a cosmopolitan spirit that reached beyond the bounds of a particular political or religious configuration. His was the broadest German-speaking and reading audience of British North America, not the Swiss-Americans of South Carolina and Georgia, or the scattered congregations in the Middle Colonies. By 1765 Miller not only accepted advertisements from people such as Philip Benezet, but he passed over in remarkable silence the death of his fellow Swiss-American Henri Bouquet. In that same year Miller began inserting under his masthead the sentence, "All Advertisements of any Length to be inserted in this Paper, or printed single by Henry Miller, Publisher hereof, are by him translated gratis."

By the time the Declaration appeared in his paper in 1776, for Miller the mixed identity of German-speaking Americans was "self-evident." Drawn mostly from the German southwest, these people were ministered to by pastors from Switzerland, or from the upper Rhine or the Halle-educated from central Germany. Most had only a passing knowledge of the details of international geography or politics. But the heroic tales of popular resistance the Tell legend provided coupled with the religious inheritance of resistance Miller counted upon to be sufficient to transcend either local or inherited loyalties. Eschewing the domestic-religious concerns of the Sauers, Miller cast his lot with the political leadership of Pennsylvania. Cultivating his relationship with Franklin, Miller remained on good terms with Germans like Heinrich Keppele and pastor Heinrich Melchior Mühlenberg, who had opposed royalization of

the province in 1764; and, despite his open admiration for his countryman Zubly, Miller broke with Britain where Zubly found he could not. As in so many other aspects of transferred cultural traditions, the adaptive possibilities remained open-ended for German speakers as well. The Swiss identity proved no more uniform or predictive a model for appealing to German-speaking patriotism than did Whig ideology among the English speakers. For Miller, however, the secular Swiss apprenticeship of his youth remained decisive, if somewhat ambiguous in its meaning for his personal behavior. A peripatetic all his life, this product of Zurich and the world endorsed Revolution and the defense of liberty, then retreated to Moravian Bethlehem where he died. His embittered countryman Zubly must have found the paradox impenetrable. By 1780 Zubly had explicitly rejected the Swiss (and Dutch) paradigms as legitimate forerunners of the American Whig cause, for he could find no justification for rending the sacred fabric that bound throne and altar together, either in Great Britain's empire, or in his own Helvetic Confederation's cantons.[40] That most German speakers, however, disagreed with Zubly and followed Miller remains one of the decisive results of the many mythic readings of history engaged in by transplanted Europeans in North America during that altogether remarkable era.

University of Illinois at Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

Notes

[1] Karl J. R. Arndt, "The First Translation and Printing in German of the American Declaration of Independence," *Monatshefte* 77 (1985): 138–42; on Miller's background, born in Rhoden/Waldeck, but whose father Henrich was a journeyman mason from Altstätten, near Zurich, see Willi Paul Adams, "Colonial German-language Press and the American Revolution," in Bernard Bailyn and John B. Hench, eds., *The Press and the American Revolution* (Worcester, MA, 1980), 162–63.

[2] C. Edwin Baker, "Property and its Relation to Constitutionally Protected Liberty," *University of Pennsylvania Law Review* 134 (1986): 744.

[3] For a detailed comparison between the two printers' use of political imagery and self-concepts, see chap. 8 of my forthcoming study, "Palatines, Liberty, and Property: Cultural Transfer and the Creation of an American Republic among German Speakers, 1727–1776."

[4] Otto Brunner, "Das 'Ganze Haus' und die alteuropäische Ökonomik," in Otto Brunner, *Neue Wege der Verfassungs- und Sozialgeschichte*, 2d ed. (Göttingen, 1968), 103–27.

[5] Despite some earlier work on Weiser, he is badly in need of a reassessment in the light both of new work on Native American and European relations and the role German speakers played in shaping Pennsylvania's frontier concerns from the 1740s. For the older literature, see Arthur D. Graeff, *Conrad Weiser: Pennsylvania Peacemaker* (Allentown, PA, 1945); Joseph S. Walton, *Conrad Weiser and the Indian Policy of Colonial Pennsylvania* (New York, 1971; orig. pub. 1900).

[6] Weiser Correspondence, Box 1, Historical Society of Pennsylvania, 20 September 1741. The only other hint of early political activity came in an unusual battle between seamen and a small group of Germans in Philadelphia during the election of 1742; see Alan W. Tully, "Ethnicity, Religion, and Politics in Early America," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography (PMHB)* 107 (1983): 491–536; Sauer's address to his readers has been published in *PMHB* 23 (1899): 516–21. See also Sally Schwartz, *"A Mixed Multitude":*

The Struggle for Toleration in Colonial Pennsylvania (New York, 1987), 159–204, who agrees that the brief upsurge in German interest in politics between 1740 and 1742 largely lay in the expiring law that dictated how inspectors were to be chosen to determine property qualifications of voters (174–75).

[7] The acts of 10 Anne c. 19 (1711) and the renewal 16 Geo II. c. 2 did not affect devotional sermons published singly, or pamphlets, but did control political pamphlets and in the expanded form of the law were assessed on the numbers of columns laid out in newspapers. Thus, a paper able to sustain such a tax was not only likely to be owned by wealthier printers, but those politically careful not to risk censorship, who hence could present an "official face" of truth. For details, see the exhaustive, and exemplary study by Karl Tilman Winkler, "Tagesschrifttum und Politik in der Ära Walpole" (Habilitationsschrift, Universität Göttingen, 1990), 46–65.

[8] *Pennsylvanische Berichte . . .* 1 April 1753; Keppele continued running the ad into early 1754; Historical Society of Pennsylvania bound volume, 1754 [sic]-1761. On circulation and prices, see Adams, "Colonial German-language Press," 166–72; also Alexander Waldenrath, "The Pennsylvania-Germans: Development of Their Printing and Their Newspress in the War for American Independence," in Gerhard K. Friesen and Walter Schatzberg, eds., *The German Contribution to the Building of the Americas: Studies in Honor of Karl J. R. Arndt* (Hanover, NH, 1977), 53–55.

[9] Adams, "Colonial German-language Press" 162–64.

[10] *Des Landsmanns Advocat . . .*, ii, iii–iv, viii.

[11] Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Broadsides. Apparently Miller attached himself to no religious group until the Moravians persuaded him to re-join them in 1773; see Adams, "Colonial German-language Press," 164.

[12] *Der Wöchentliche Philadelphische Staatsbote,* 14 August 1770.

[13] *Staatsbote,* 10 January and 31 January, 1775.

[14] Harold James, *A German Identity 1770–1790* (London, 1989), 11–33; on the relevance of the Swiss model, see Thomas A. Brady, Jr., *Turning Swiss: Cities and Empire, 1450–1550* (New York, 1985), chap. 1; on the eventual use of the United States as a model for German identity, Horst Dippel, *Germany and the American Revolution, 1770–1800: A Sociohistorical Investigation of Late Eighteenth-Century Political Thinking,* trans. Bernard A. Uhlendorf (Chapel Hill, 1977).

[15] Translation by the author. *Staatsbote,* 18 Jan. 1762; 22 March 1762.

[16] There exist only two incomplete copies of the almanac for 1763, and through 1774 Miller showed no interest in devoting himself to the explanatory essays which the elder Sauer had used in his almanac.

[17] *Staatsbote,* 22 March 1762; 19 April 1762. Miller identifies other cities such as Dresden, or Hamburg in the same manner, but not Swiss cities nor German southwest towns.

[18] Ibid., 16 Sept. 1765.

[19] Adams, "Colonial German-language Press," 183.

[20] Ibid., 176. Miller finally printed Franklin's satire in which Prussian policy was identifed as ruinous in 1773, "How a Great Empire may be Reduced to a Small One," *Staatsbote,* 21 Dec. 1773, three months after its appearance in *The Gentleman's Magazine.*

[21] Miller, *"Ein schön weltlich Lied"* (Melody: *"Ein Soldat bin ich eben, und steh vor meinem Feind"*); *Eine lustige Aria über die letztgeschehene Unruhen in Philadelphia* (Both probably Miller, Philadelphia, 1764?), Historical Society of Pennsylvania, German Broadsides.

[22] For general background and details in Pennsylvania politics, see variously James H. Hutson, *Pennsylvania Politics, 1746–1770: The Movement for Royal Government and Its Consequences* (Princeton, 1972), 162–74; Schwartz, *"A Mixed Multitude,"* 229–36. As Adams correctly points out, Miller disingenuously blamed Christopher Sauer, Jr., for meddling in politics by publishing a roll call of the Pennsylvania assembly showing who had voted to send a delegation to New York to the Stamp Act Congress, and who had not. Adams, "Colonial German-language Press," 187–88.

[23] Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, 24 July 1764 (possibly not Miller's press, but attributed to him).

[24] Ibid., "Höret ihr deutsche Bürger in Philadelphia, daß euch Gott auch höre!"; original in the Royal Swedish Academy of Science.

[25] *Eine zu dieser Zeit höchstnöthige Warnung . . . ;* see Adams's very different reading of this text; "Colonial German-language Press," 180.

[26] *An die Freyhalter und Einwohner der Stadt und County Philadelphia, deutscher Nation* (Philadelphia, 1764); see also the undated and unsigned broadside *Eine zu dieser Zeit höchstnöthige Warnung und Erinnerung an die freye Einwohner der Provintz Pennsylvanien* [Germantown?, 1764?]; Miller, *An die Deutschen, vornehmlich die zum Wählen berechtigten in Philadelphia-Bucks-und Berks Caunty* (Philadelphia, 1765).

[27] *To the Freeholders and Other Electors . . . of Pennsylvania* (Philadelphia, 1765).

[28] *Staatsbote,* 7 Oct. 1765. For a different reading of Miller's development which emphasizes the relative ease of German speakers' understanding of political and legal terms, see Adams, "Colonial German-language Press."

[29] *An die guten Einwohner in Pennsylvanien . . .* (Philadelphia, 1773).

[30] Miller published the essay and song on Wilhelm Tell at the same time that he also reprinted the Massachusetts Circular Letter in April, reported on the nonimportation movement and the decision by students at Harvard to wear homespun as a form of nonviolent protest; see Adams, "Colonial German-language Press, 194–95. Although some scholars suggest that the Wilhelm Tell legend may have parallels in the story of Henning Wulff or a Norwegian "Ur-story," Miller clearly was thinking of his own Swiss background and experiences in deciding to use the story. On the legend see, for example, H. G. Wirz, ed., *Das Weisse Buch von Sarnen* and M. Wehrli, ed., *Das Lied von der Entstehung der Eidgenossenschaft;* "Das Urner Tellenspiel," in *Quellenwerk zur Entstehung der schweizerischen Eidgenossenschaft,* part 3, vols. 1 and 2 (Zurich, 1947–52); Bernard Meyer, "Weisses Buch und Wilhelm Tell," *Der Geschichtsfreund* 112 (1959).

[31] *Staatsbote,* 31 May 1774.

[32] For a summary of the approach emphasizing peasant resistance, see Winfried Schultze, ed., *Aufstände, Revolten, Prozesse: Beiträge zu bäuerlichen Widerstandsbewegungen im frühneuzeitlichen Europa* (Stuttgart, 1983). The best argument against this perspective, especially Peter Blickle's work on the southwest, is Dietmar Willoweit, "Genossenschaftsprinzip und altständische Entscheidungsstrukturen in der frühneuzeitlichen Staatsentwicklung: Ein Diskussionsbeitrag," in Gerhard Dilcher und Bernhard Diestelkamp, eds., *Recht, Gericht, Genossenschaft und Policey: Studien zu Grundbegriffen der germanistischen Rechtshistorie: Symposion für Adalbert Erler* (Frankfurt, 1987), 126–38. Miller, *Ein schön Lied von dem Schweizerischen Erz-Freyheitssohn Wilhelm Thellen, dem Urheber der Löbl. Eydgenossenschaft . . .* (Philadelphia, 1768).

[33] *Die Artikel der Patriotischen Gesellschaft der Stady und Caunty Philadelphia* (Philadelphia, 1772), Library Company of Philadelphia Broadsides.

[34] John J. Zubly, *Eine Kurzgefaßte Historische Nachricht von den Kämpfen der Schweitzer für die Freyheit* (Philadelphia, 1775); Zubly, *The Law of Liberty* (Philadelphia, 1775); *Staatsbote,* 26 July 1776.

[35] I rely in my reading of Zwingli, Zubly, and Zubly's writings on many conversations with my colleague Leo Schelbert and his important unpublished essay, "The Contest between Power and Liberty: John J. Zubly's Swiss Perspective of America's Revolutionary Struggle," paper given at the German-American Symposium, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 14 October 1983. A more standard approach is offered by Randall M. Miller, ed., *"A Warm & Zealous Spirit": John J. Zubly and the American Revolution, a Selection of His Writings* (Macon, GA, 1982). Miller advertises the "Law of Liberty" as well as the account by a Swiss (Zubly) of "Great Britain's Right to Tax her Colonies" on 10 October 1775.

[36] (Philadelphia, 1775); the account begins by reminding German readers that the ministries have been against America since 1763 and vindicates the North American position by pointing to the repeal of the Stamp Act (3).

[37] On Johnson, see Bernard Bailyn, *Voyagers to the West: A Passage in the Peopling of America on the Eve of the Revolution* (New York, 1986), 576–82. The readership of these offerings cannot be precisely reconstructed, but a literacy rate of 80 percent among German speakers in North America by 1770 seems reasonable. See Farley Grub, "German Immigration to Pennsylvania, 1709 to 1820," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 20 (1990): 417–36.

[38] *Eine Schöne Anmutige und Lesens Würdige History von der unschuldig-Bedrängten heiligen Pfaltz Gräfin Genovefa . . .* (Philadelphia, 1762); two more editions were published, one at Lancaster in 1772, and a third in 1790. See Ronald Lieberman, *Keystone No. 10: "Die Alte*

Zeit'': German Americana and Classics of the Reformation (Glen Rock, PA, 1989), entries 400–2; also Karl J. R. Arndt and Reimer C. Eck, eds., and Gerd-J. Bötte, Annelies Müller and Werner Tannhof, comps., *The First Century of German Language Printing in the U.S.A.* (Göttingen, 1989), no. 438; the heroine is Genovefa of Brabant, married to Count Palatine Siegfried of Hohensimmern (8th cent.); not to be confused with St. Genovefa (Geneviève), patron saint of Paris (c. 422–502). On the imagery of the forest in German folklore, and its function as a sheltering haven where miraculous events occur, see Peter Taylor and Hermann Rebel, ''Hessian Peasant Women, Their Families and the Draft: A Social-Historical Interpretation of Four Tales from the Grimm Collection,'' *Journal of Family History* 6 (1981): 347–78. For the captivity narratives, see William Fleming, *Eine Erzehlung von den Trübsalen und der Wunderbaren Befreyung . . .* (Germantown, 1756), and Peter Miller and Ludwig Weiss, *Die Erzehlungen von Maria le Roy und Barbara Leininger, Welche vierhalb Jahr unter den Indianern gefangen gewesen . . .* (Philadelphia, 1759).

[39] *Staatsbote*, 19 March 1776. The advertisement for Paine's essay appears first on 23 January, the translation done by Steiner and Cist. Gessner's essay received English printings already in the colonies by 1770; see Evans No. 11667 and the New York Public Library holding No. 433a.

[40] Zubly, ''Helvetius No. 2,'' in *Royal Georgia Gazette*, 3 August 1780; see Randall M. Miller, ed., *A Warm & Zealous Spirit*, 179–80.