YEARBOOK OF GERMAN-AMERICAN STUDIES

Supplemental Issue

Volume 5

2019

Published at the University of Kansas by
The Society for German-American Studies

with the support of
The Max Kade Center for German-American Studies
and The College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

YEARBOOK OF GERMAN-AMERICAN STUDIES

Supplemental Issues

William D. Keel, Editor

Editorial Board
Hans C. Boas, University of Texas at Austin
Randall Donaldson, Loyola University Maryland
Hartmut Froeschle, University of Toronto
Claudia Grossman, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis
Timothy J. Holian, Wisconsin-Whitewater at Rock County
Antonius Holtmann, Universität Oldenburg
Giles R. Hoyt, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis
Walter D. Kamphoefner, Texas A&M University
Cora Lee Kluge, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Achim Kopp, Mercer University
Mark L. Louden, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Marc Pierce, University of Texas at Austin
Michael T. Putnam, Pennsylvania State University
J. Gregory Redding, Wabash College
Michael Rice, Middle Tennessee State University
La Vern J. Rippley, Saint Olaf College
Alexander Ritter, Universität Hamburg
William Roba, Scott Community College
Karen Rösch, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis
Steven Rowan, University of Missouri-St. Louis
Joseph C. Salmons, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Leo Schelbert, University of Illinois at Chicago
Bärbel Such, Ohio University
Don Heinrich Tolzmann, University of Cincinnati
Gerhard Weiss, University of Minnesota Twin Cities
Marianne S. Wokeck, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis

Fleeing Europe, Finding Philadelphia: Integration, Crisis, and the Migration of 1816–17

James D. Boyd, Editor

Published with the generous support of the
Fritz Thyssen Stiftung für Wissenschaftsförderung
Cologne, Germany

THE SOCIETY FOR GERMAN-AMERICAN STUDIES
Executive Committee 2019–2020

President
Cora Lee Kluge, University of Wisconsin-Madison

Vice President
Mark L. Louden, University of Wisconsin-Madison

Secretary
Karen Rösch, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis

Treasurer
Achim Kopp, Mercer Univeristy

Membership Co-Chairs
Karyl Rommelfanger, Manitowoc, Wisconsin
Katja Hartmann, Friedrich-Naumann-Stiftung

Website Manager
Michael Rice, Middle Tennessee State University

Newsletter Editor
Joshua Brown
University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire

Yearbook Editor
William D. Keel, University of Kansas

The Society for German-American Studies was founded for the purpose of encouraging and advancing the scholarly study of the history, language, literature, and culture of the German element in the Americas. This includes coverage of the immigrants and their descendants from Germany, Austria, Switzerland, and other German-speaking areas of Europe. Members of the Society include representatives from various academic disciplines and others who share a common interest in German-American studies.

The *Yearbook* is published annually. The editor welcomes contributions in English, preferably, or German on all aspects of German-Americana from members of the Society. The manuscript should be prepared following the University of Chicago Press *Manual of Style* and be submitted electronically, without the author's name in the document so that it can be reviewed anonymously by members of the Editorial Board. All correspondence regarding the *Yearbook* should be addressed to William D. Keel (wkeel@ku.edu). Inquiries regarding book reviews for the *Yearbook* should be addressed to Marc Pierce (mpierc@austin.utexas.edu). The *Newsletter* appears three times a year. Items for the *Newsletter* should be submitted to the editor Joshua Brown (brownjo@uwec.edu). Inquiries regarding the SGAS website should be addressed to Michael Rice (michael.rice@mtsu.edu).

The Society for German-American Studies is open to membership from individuals, societies, and libraries. Annual membership dues for individuals include subscriptions to both the *Yearbook* and all issues of the *Newsletter* published during the calendar year. Libraries, societies, and other organizations interested in obtaining the publications of the Society may subscribe to publications only. Membership and subscription applications are available online at *sgas.org.*

© 2019 by The Society for German-American Studies, ISSN 0741-2827
Printed at Jostens, Clarksville, TN 37040

TABLE OF CONTENTS

James D. Boyd
Introduction: Philadelphia, 2017 1

Marianne S. Wokeck
Weighing the Risks of Relocation in the Face of Crises: How German-Speaking Migrants Forged Transatlantic Pathways in the 18th Century 5

Andrew Zonderman
Sailing Souls: Colonial Philadelphia's German Merchants and the Development of the Transatlantic Passenger Trade 19

David Barnes
Soul-Sellers, Herring Boxes, and Desperate Emigrants: A Recipe for Ship Fever in the Early Nineteenth Century 39

James D. Boyd
The Crisis of 1816/17: Replacing Redemptioners with Passengers on the Atlantic 53

Konstantin Huber
Serial Sources in Excess: Inventuren und Teilungen *and* Pflegrechungen *in the Württemberg Communal Archives and their Significnce for Emigration Research* 67

An Act,

REGULATING PASSENGER SHIPS AND VESSELS.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That if the master or other person on board of any ship or vessel, owned in the whole or in part by a citizen or citizens of the United States or the Territories thereof, or by a subject or subjects, citizen or citizens, of any foreign country, shall, after the first of January next, take on board of such ship or vessel, at any foreign port or place, or shall bring or convey into the United States, or the Territories thereof from any foreign port or place; or shall carry, convey, or transport from the United States, or the Territories thereof, to any foreign port or place, a greater number of passengers than two for every five tons of such ship or vessel, according to the custom-house measurement, every such master, or other person so offending, and the owner or owners of such ship or vessel, shall severally forfeit and pay to the United States, the sum of one hundred and fifty dollars for each and every passenger so taken on board of such ship or vessel, over and above the aforesaid number of two to every five tons of such ship or vessel, to be recovered by suit, in any circuit or district court of the United States, where the said vessel may arrive, or where the owner or owners aforesaid may reside: *Provided, nevertheless,* That nothing in this act shall be taken to apply to the complement of men usually and ordinarily employed in navigating such ship or vessel.

SECT. 2. *And be it further enacted,* That if the number of passengers so taken on board of any ship or vessel as aforesaid, or conveyed or brought into the United States, or transported therefrom as aforesaid, shall exceed the said proportion of two to every five tons of such ship or vessel by the number of twenty passengers, in the whole, every such ship or vessel shall be deemed and taken to be forfeited to the United States, and shall be prosecuted and distributed in the same manner in which the forfeitures and penalties are recovered and distributed under the provisions of the act, entitled "An Act to regulate the collection of duties on imports and tonnage."

SECT. 3. *And be it further enacted,* That every ship or vessel bound on a voyage from the United States to any port on the continent of Europe, at the time of leaving the last port whence such ship or vessel shall sail, shall have on board, well secured under deck, at least sixty gallons of water, one hundred pounds of salted provisions, one gallon of vinegar, and one hundred pounds of wholesome ship bread for each and every passenger on board such ship or vessel, over and above such other provisions, stores, and live stock, as may be put on board by such master or passenger for their use, or that of the crew of such ship or vessel; and in like proportion for a shorter or longer voyage: and if the passengers on board of such ship or vessel in which the proportion of provisions herein directed shall not have been provided, shall at any time be put on short allowance, in water, flesh, vinegar, or bread, during any voyage aforesaid, the master and owner of such ship or vessel shall severally pay to each and every passenger who shall have been put on short allowance, as aforesaid, the sum of three dollars for each and every day they have been on such short allowance, to be recovered in the same manner as seamen's wages are or may be recovered.

SECT. 4. *And be it further enacted,* That the captain or master of any ship or vessel arriving in the United States, or any of the Territories thereof, from any foreign place whatever, at the same time that he delivers a manifest of the cargo, and, if there be no cargo, then at the time of making report or entry of the ship or vessel, pursuant to the existing laws of the United States, shall also deliver and report to the collector of the district in which such ship or vessel shall arrive, a list or manifest of all the passengers taken on board of the said ship or vessel at any foreign port or place; in which list or manifest it shall be the duty of the said master to designate, particularly, the age, sex, and occupation of the said passengers, respectively; the country to which they severally belong, and that of which it is their intention to become inhabitants; and shall further set forth whether any, and what number, have died on the voyage; which report and manifest shall be sworn to by the said master, in the same manner as is directed by the existing laws of the United States in relation to the manifest of the cargo; and that the refusal or neglect of the master aforesaid to comply with the provisions of this section, shall incur the same penalties, disabilities, and forfeitures, as are at present provided for a refusal or neglect to report and deliver a manifest of the cargo aforesaid.

SECT. 5. *And be it further enacted,* That each and every collector of the customs, to whom such manifest or list of passengers as aforesaid shall be delivered, shall, quarter yearly, return copies thereof to the Secretary of State of the United States, by whom statements of the same shall be laid before Congress at each and every session.

H. CLAY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
JAMES BARBOUR,
President of the Senate pro tempore.

March 2, 1819. APPROVED.

JAMES MONROE.

The U.S. Passenger Act of 1819, stipulating tonnage and provisions per passenger, and fines for violation to ship's captains, passed in reaction to the destitute condition of many arriving passengers in 1817, and part of a critical series of legislation, on both sides of the Atlantic, that would transform the passage of German migrants. This copy Staatsarchiv Bremen, 2-P.8.B.8.a/Bd.1 Teil 2.

James D. Boyd

Introduction: Philadelphia, 2017

Between 1815 and 1820, almost 15,000 German immigrants entered the United States, with arrivals peaking in 1816/17.[1] They were leaving a European continent that, with Napoleon's final defeat at Waterloo in 1815, had finally found peace after more than two decades of war. However, much of that continent, as well as it people, were exhausted. In the south western states of the newly recognised German Confederation, village harvests had continually supplemented Napoleon's armies, and community reserves had been emptied. A series of extreme geological and meteorological events in other parts of the globe compounded these problems. Volcanic eruptions, culminating in the Tambora event of April, 1815, had significantly adverse affects on weather in the northern hemisphere during the Napoleonic Wars, and in their immediate aftermath.[2] In 1816, the year that exhausted south west German communities had finally hoped for their first reprieve from war and weather in a generation, they were presented with biblically described weather conditions, widespread crop failure and the early onset of a hard winter. When combined with increased taxation, pressed from every community to pay off royal war debts and expand government offices, it looked, for many, as if reprieve at home might never come. Tens of thousands headed east and west, with only a small fraction reaching the goals they set out for, in a movement that became a transformative crisis.[3]

The migration movement that occurred from the German south west across the Atlantic, predominantly to Philadelphia and Pennsylvania, is well documented. Each aspect of this moment has been given close attention, be it the broader meteorological context, the testimony of the migrants themselves, the structure, course and logistics of the movement, or its wider context in German-American history.[4] The event was transformative not only in changing patterns of transportation in the Atlantic for future German migrants, but in seeding many of the migration networks that operated between old and new world for the rest of the 19th century. On the American side, it lead to the first attempts to legally manage and co-ordinate European immi-

gration. This attempt was enshrined in the first U.S. passenger laws, created in 1819—a direct result of the 1816/17 crisis. In 2016 and 2017, a number of events took place in both Europe and the United States to commemorate the event. The collected essays here were initially presented in Philadelphia in the summer of 2017, at a conference that was generously sponsored by the Fritz Thyssen Stiftung.[5] They offer new perspective, insight and findings about this transformative moment, and helped form a broad discussion about the context of the 1816/17 migration, its connectivity to the 18th century German-American movement that preceded it, the 19th century era of mass migration that followed it, and how modern scholars approach the issue of historical migration.

The papers collected in this volume shed new light on a number of aspects of the post-Napoleonic event, often named the 'Tambora crisis' in climate research, and are contextualised within the broader frame of German Atlantic movement. Pointing out that climate and weather crisis had a formative influence on the history of German engagement with the New World, Marianne S. Wokeck's essay explores migration as an adaptive strategy, framing the '18th century' of German-Atlantic migration between the extreme weather events of 1709 and 1816/17. In doing so the essay questions how migration as personal and community strategy was shaped by these events, encouraging scholars to use such instances as focal points for understanding migration systems. Andrew Zonderman then goes on to explore the peak age of the 18th century German-Atlantic 'redemptioner' system through the prism of German merchants and agents who, upon arrival in Philadelphia, pursued commercial enterprises through wider engagement—including passenger shipping—with the British Empire.

The story of the ship *Hope* demonstrates, in distressing detail, what happened in 1817 when the redemptioner system which brought Germans to Philadelphia on credit, collapsed into speculative trading, rather than organised transport. Until now, the standard story of passenger abuse during the 1817 crossing has remained that of the ship *April*, infamous for the mortality it caused.[6] In bringing forward the story of the *Hope*, David Barnes not only provides the historiography with a new case study, but brings to light the role of the Philadelphia Lazaretto in alleviating the suffering of many migrants during the 1817 movement—a crisis on American shores as well as those of Europe.

That crisis created the decisive legal changes that would signal the end of the redemptioner trade. In Europe, crisis in the Netherlands and transit territories of Prussia led to state-led impositions on migrants that effectively stopped the flow of speculative migration attempts. James Boyd explores these changes alongside the concomitant legal measures of the US navigation

law, in 1819, and changing American economic context after 1818, which made a return to any form of redemptioner system unprofitable and unpractical. In light of these changes, further changes to passenger law in European ports—haunted by the experience of 1816/17—ensured that when German emigration began to re-emerge around 1828, it did so under the fee-paying, competitive passenger system recognisable as the 19th century immigration model.

The volume closes with the paper 'Serial Sources in Excess', a contribution from Konstantin Huber that will be invaluable to historians and scholars investigating German-American history. From the district archive in Baden-Württemberg's Enzkreis, Huber has given tireless support to historical research into the German-American emigration question, as well as German social history. His contribution here, a revelation for many attendees in Philadelphia in 2017, explains and unlocks the value of huge volumes of material available to researchers in the German south west. The sources in discussion will support untold future research into German-Atlantic migration, and clearly harbour enormous potential for future historical discovery.

This volume now appears at the bi-centenary of the first U.S. Passenger Laws, passed in 1819, which were one of many critical social and political responses to the crisis of 1816/17. It is hoped that these essays will provide scholars of German-American history with fresh material insight into the events of 1816/17 (and beyond), and will introduce to the field manifold nuances that both contributed to the 18th century German-Atlantic system, and contributed to its displacement as a result of the Tambora crisis.

Brunel Institute
Bristol, United Kingdom

Notes

[1] Hans Jürgen Grabbe, *Vor der Großen Flut: Die europäische Migration in die Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika, 1783–1820* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2001), 60.

[2] Although by far the largest, Tambora was not the only major volcanic event of the Napoleonic era—there were at least 8 others, including an event of unknown origin in 1808/9, which began to effect weather patterns in Europe during 1812. This may have been the cause of failed vintages in 1812/13/14. See ibid., 32-34; also Jihong Cole-Dai, David Ferris, Alysson Lanciki, Jöel Savarino, Mélanie Baronie, 'Cold Decade (1810–19) caused by Tambora and another (1809) Eruption, *Geophysical Research Letters* 36.22 (2009).

[3] At least 33,525 departures were recorded in Baden and Württemberg from January 2017 until July 2017. 11,205 from Württemberg headed to Russia, the Habsburg Empire and Prussia, leaving slightly over 22,000 America-bound migrants from the two states—sig-

nificantly more than reached the USA across the 1815–20 period, let alone the single year of 1817. Baden numbers were 16,321 Jan–May 1817, Württemberg 17,205 (6,000 to the U.S.) from Jan–July. Hauptstaatsarchiv Stuttgart (HSAS) E146 Bu1783; Generallandesarchiv Karlsruhe (GLK) E236 2871.

[4] On the ecological context, see recently Rüdiger Glaser, Iso Himmelsbach and Annette Bösmeier, 'Climate of migration? How climate triggered migration from southwest Germany to North America during the 19th century, century,' *Climate of the Past* 13 (2017): 1573-92 and on effects within Germany generally Wolfgang Behringer, *Tambora und das Jahr ohne Sommer: Wie ein Vulkan die Welt in die Krise stürtzte* (München: C. H. Beck, 2017); on migrant testimony, and as an overview of the movement from individual and official perspective, the defining work remains Günther Moltmann *Aufbruch nach Amerika: Friedrich List und die Auswanderung aus Baden und Württemberg 1816/17, Dokumentation einer sozialen Bewegung* (Tübingen: Wunderlich, 1979); on the structure of shipping and trade that carried the migration, see Grabbe, *Flut*.

[5] 'Fleeing Europe, Finding Philadelphia: German Atlantic Migrants and the Crisis of 1816-17' was held at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania and German Society of Pennsylvania, July 17–18, 2017, with the support of Fritz Thyssen Stiftung, grant no 30.17.0.063GE, this publication is supported by the subsequent grant from the Fritz Thyssen Stiftung no. 60.19.0.038GE.

[6] Robert P. Swierenga, Henry Lammers, 'Odyssey of Woe: The Journey of the Immigrant Ship *April* From Amsterdam to New Castle, 1817–1818,' *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 118.4 (1984): 303-23.

Marianne S. Wokeck

Weighing the Risks of Relocation in the Face of Crises: How German-speaking Migrants Forged Transatlantic Pathways in the 18th Century

The crisis of 1816–17 occurred near the end of the long 18th century—a label that marks significant change close to but not at the turn of the century. As Hans-Jürgen Grabbe recently summarized: with the beginning of the 1820s, the patterns of travel, finance, and trade established in the 1700s for migrants from German-speaking areas of Central Europe to reach first British North America and then the United States shifted significantly and paved the way for different kinds of networks across the Atlantic and into the interior of the expanding United States. This brought with it different forms of communication, transportation, and banking that affected the characteristics and flow of subsequent mass migrations in the 19th century.[1] If the flight from German-speaking lands during the 1816–17 crisis marks the end point of earlier patterns, the question addressed here is "how did those patterns get started?", "how did they develop throughout the 18th century?", more fundamentally, "why did people relocate?" and then more specifically "why did German-speakers relocate across the Atlantic?"

The answers to those questions are interdependent, and highlight various parts of a complex whole. The broad outlines of the migration of German-speakers across the Atlantic are well known.[2] From the many, disparate records that survived scattered and unevenly we know that it was common, if not accepted for people in Europe to move: short-term as well as long-term; short distances and also far away; temporarily, often at a certain age, and permanently; alone and in groups; boys and men as well as girls and women; in reaction to adversity and in hopes of improved circumstances; responding to recruitment and making migration decisions individually and independently;

with capital and dependent on help along the way; often on foot and also by boat and carriage.[3] The directional flows of population movements in central Europe were sometimes north but predominantly east. In the 18th century, heading first north and then facing west was the exception, about ten percent of all long-distances moves, and those moves depended always on third-party transportation in order to cross the Atlantic, a feature that contributed not only significantly to the cost but also to the largely permanent nature of such relocation in the age of sail.

Historians have had a lively debate about the size of the migration of German speakers to the British North American colonies and the young United States—important in a culture that takes pride in Americans' ethnic background and in superlatives. More important, however, is to remember that the number of sojourners to the New World was large in absolute terms, more than 100,000 over the course of the 18th century, as well as in proportion to North America's population of European descent, the first sizeable influx of foreigners from outside Great Britain—readily identified as outsiders by their language and culture. There is little debate about the shape of the migration wave. Its beginnings in the decades around the turn to the 18th century—initially small but quickly increasing—reached an impressive peak in the middle of the century, and decreased somewhat thereafter with fluctuations around a lower trend, determined in part by the availability of shipping across the Atlantic. (More migration in peace times than during European conflicts and the war of the American Revolution). As to the character of the flow of German-speaking migrants across the Atlantic the substantial proportion of families in addition to the more typical young, single men among people on the move was of far-reaching significance because of the demographic and cultural impact on American society and those who followed later in their footsteps.

Research about the communication and transportations networks that enabled German speaking migrants to relocate has contributed significantly to our understanding about how the passenger trade developed and became routinized and specialized. What had started out as occasional connections along transportation routes mainly between Rotterdam and Philadelphia grew into an increasingly diversified set of networks that reflected developments in transatlantic transportation, communication, trade, and credit, firmly embedded in the context within which England expanded its role and ambition as an imperial power based on naval might.[4]

With the fairly recent shift from largely nationally-focused historical narratives to intensive engagement with Atlantic history the perspectives from which historians approach migration have also changed. The German perspective has traditionally emphasized emigration (*Auswanderung*), implying

release, sometimes flight, and thereby loss, when compared with those who stayed; the American perspective typically has paid attention to immigration (Einwanderung), with interest on the newcomers and their integration into those communities already in place. A more holistic focus on the effects of migration on localities from which people leave as well as on those to which they move promises better understanding of the reasons for relocating, the success or failure of such decision and the impact on the communities that lose or gain population.[5] Focus on the migrants in their roles as emigrants and also immigrants, provides dynamic links between the places and people they left and those to which they moved and with whom they connected.

The more we can learn how emigration (and outmigration) affected the local labor and marriage markets, for example, and also resulted in a redistribution of capital and movable assets among those who remained in place, the better we can understand the impact of emigration on economic and cultural developments more generally. Similarly, the influx of newcomers into a community or region offers insight into ways in which human capital and other assets affected the use of land, property holdings and the labour market thereby shaping socio-economic developments. The interplay of personal stories that can be traced in the records and patterns of the networks that link them allows for (re)constructing the complex web of relationships and circumstances that figured into the decision-making processes of moving across the Atlantic and the consequences that resulted from such relocation.

Any delineation of the arc that spanned the transatlantic migration of German speakers over the course of the long 18th century has to make a case for its beginning. Just as the end point was clearly indicated during the flight that accompanied the Tambora climate crisis, so it began under similar climatic triggers more than 100 years before. The mass migration of 1709 marks the point at which German-Atlantic migration was redefined from the pattern of the previous generation, and allowed for sustaining as well as scaling the westward migration flow. The shift from promising refuge for religious minorities to also offering a potential strategy for pursuing opportunity when faced with adversity was critical.[6] Addressing the pivot point of 1709 first provides an initial example of how climate adversity can illuminate the argument that migration can be viewed as an adaptation to vulnerability more generally—a strategy adopted again in 1816/17.

Early Climatic Responses

Information about America was readily available to the reading public as well as illiterate audiences in German-speaking lands for more than a generation before 1709. Many of the descriptions of far-away colonies such as Wil-

liam Penn's advertisement for Pennsylvania and the published or otherwise circulated accounts of immigrants settled in those places were associated with behaviour suitable for outsiders, namely people who did not fit into the established order at home, which included most prominently religious dissenters.[7] Emigration offered those sectarian seekers a viable option, sometimes the only possible reaction to adversity, and it was in that context that they cast their need or desire to leave oppressive circumstances in biblical language.

Emigration thus became exodus as well as a justification to escape decadent and doomed Germany and, on the positive side, to pursue the promise of Canaan. Francis Daniel Pastorius and Daniel Falckner in their writings from and about Pennsylvania are outspoken on that last point, setting up an interpretative framework for their respective decisions to remove to Penn's colony that allowed others to adopt similar reasoning, too. Ministers, teachers, and other local leaders were complicit in this framing of motives in terms of biblical metaphors because there is evidence that they re-told the printed migration accounts to those who could not read and that they used their sermons to comment publically on the applicability and timeliness of those biblical stories, thereby not only lending credence and legitimacy to the widely circulating testimonies from emigrants but also providing members of their parishes and communities with a language describing their plight that was more likely to elicit compassion and charity from authorities and people along the way. Put differently, the emigrants from territories in south-western Germany had learned how to describe their own reasons for leaving in empathetic ways well before Daniel Defoe, motivated by political considerations, characterized the 1709 migrants as "poor Palatine Protestants."

If emigrants from the Rhine lands and beyond in 1709 articulated their motives for leaving in biblical terms, the climate, in particular consequences of destructive climate events after the turn to the 18th century, played a significant, if not publicly articulated role in their decision to pursue perceived opportunities for a better life across the Atlantic. The harsh winter of 1708 affected harvests negatively and thereby threatened crises in terms of hunger, high prices, and indebtedness—climate events thus marking the mass emigration in 1709 and also the flight in 1816–17.[8] Re-consideration of migration from a climatically more astute perspective focuses on two areas. The first one is conceptual, adapting ideas from modern policy makers charged with planning to avoid disaster because of violent climate events. The second one pays different attention to the decision to migrate and the structures in place to channel migration.

Incidences of social unrest, reactions to crises, and interest in forms and effectiveness of government draw attention to measuring living standards and economic growth and development.. The variability of prices of food staples,

like grain, bread, and wine, allowed not only the plotting of movements locally, regionally, and nationally but serve also to explore further the complex relationships among many factors that affected the production, availability, and distribution of foodstuffs. In the past, harvest failures and credit shortages, in combination or out of sync, were common, often systemic, and caused hardships that rendered a large proportion of the population vulnerable to deprivation, curtailed expectations and hope for making a decent living, and left parents with few prospects of providing for their children.

The vagaries of weather and devastation by nature were blamed for and identified as reasons for failing crops and low returns, which have led historians to explore the ways and degrees to which climate and agricultural output were aligned—often in comparison with wages—for meaningful indications of the ability with which families could endure hard times. As a result, there is a wealth of information based on contemporary observations about the weather and from records of the market place and government with respect to prices, especially those sensitive to changes in temperature and precipitation. For the 18th century, the fluctuations in climate in German-speaking territories are well established, albeit with local or regional variations that may well differ from the aggregated information about countries and Europe as a whole.[9]

Geographers and other climate scientists as well as economists and governments have framed their attention to climate differently. Detailing the climate record and studying how climate systems work has yielded much fascinating data and intriguing interpretations of the interdependencies of oceans, wind, atmosphere, solar cycles, and other structures and processes. They introduced in their discussions of weather variability the concept of vulnerability as an analytical tool for describing states of "susceptibility to harm, powerlessness, and marginality of both physical and social systems." In this view vulnerability of social groups as well as individuals is not a negative indicator of poverty but exposure to sudden or slow-onset hazards in the face of which reaction or action draws on local customs, knowledge and, and belief systems.

One recent effort to construct a vulnerability index has raised questions and offered ideas suitable for revisiting the manner in which historians have viewed and explained emigration from German-speaking territories in the 18th century.[10] The approach of mapping vulnerability to climate change, and the regional variability of this, links sensitivity to hazards to the capacity to adapt.[11] This approach can help to assess how climate and weather affected migration in the Rhine lands. Starting from the premise that the effectiveness of society's adaptive capacity is paramount for how climate events translate into human and economic consequences, migration is specifically included in

the broad category of adaption planning.[12] The concept of adaptive capacity as component of a local or regional map of climate vulnerability raises the question of whether emigration from particular places can serve as a proxy for the sensitivity with which communities, households, and individuals react to weather-related hazards or anticipate hardships as consequences of harvest failures and subsequent economic crises. Inversely, it can also show the extent to which migration is diffused within a community/region as an adaptive strategy. Assessing vulnerability as a function of exposure to climate variability, sensitivity to the impacts of that exposure, and ability to apply methods of adaptation permits comparison across space and time.[13] With this approach "exposure" is understood as the chance that assets and livelihood will be affected by weather variability risk and "sensitivity" as the susceptibility of assets and livelihoods exposed to risk.[14] Consequently, "adaptive actions" are adjustments in assets, livelihood, behaviours, technologies, or policies that address risks from on-going or future hazards in that they confer private benefits by safeguarding lives and livelihoods. "Adaptive capacity" indicates the ability to reduce vulnerability associated with variable weather.[15]

With a focus on migration as adaptive action in response to climate it is critical to underscore the variability of hazards according to local and regional geography compared with large-scale or global climate events.[16] Before the Tambora crisis in the early 19th century, longitudinal climatic evidence for 18th-century Europe shows considerable but not extreme fluctuations around a fairly narrowly trending band of average temperatures and rainfall. In the contemporary literature and borne out by measurements of the extreme cold in the first decade of the century and the early 1740s and also the Laki volcanic eruption in 1783 stand out as notable, disruptive climate events, yet they are very differently aligned with migration to North America.[17] The mass exodus of 1709 was not matched a generation later, when emigration to the British colonies reached a significant high in 1738, nor almost 80 years later, when knowledge about the New World and opportunities for relocating westward across the Atlantic to North America abounded, but a generation later still another very significant spike in migration to the United States occurred in 1816–17. Critically, both 1709 and 1816/17 coincided with unofficial recruiting efforts for transport to North America, which in both instances ostensibly offered transportation 'for free'.[18]

The difference between those varying kinds of reaction calls for further exploration to better determine the threshold of hardship and risk to people's livelihoods from exposure to devastating weather that is associated with emigration as an identifiable coping strategy, and what factors—such as promoted access to migration—allow such customary strategies to manifest. Other modes of adapting to damaging weather and a more discriminating

examination of emigration from a particular place seems warranted in order to determine the nature of the emigration as well as the specific direction, or directions, of such movement. Put differently, if the level of migration from traditional areas of outmigration did not change substantially, was the lack of transatlantic relocation a sign that emigrants chose to turn elsewhere, or not to turn away at all—changes quite possible when issues such as the American War for Independence brought accompanying difficulties for securing transportation across the ocean?

In the age of big data and GIS, historians may be able to determine whether and, if so, to what degree areas with high numbers of emigrants at certain times show alignment with measured impact of extreme weather events or consequences. It may be possible to identify and examine localities with regard to comparable agricultural and economic characteristics but different migration behavior, especially in terms of the direction toward which emigrants moved—east or west. Similarly, historians may learn more about the reasons for a particular directional pull when examining localities from which emigrants moved in comparable numbers at the same time but that were part of very different regions agriculturally and economically. Comparison of places that is sensitive to geographical and climatic variability as well as the ebb and flow of emigration to destinations in Europe and across the Atlantic is likely to suggest not only the relative impact of weather hazards and their various consequences but also point to those factors in the emigration decision that are not weather related. Moreover, such a comparative approach may provide better insight into the range of adaptive strategies—among them relocation—in response to temporary or long-term difficulties in "making a decent living" or "being able to provide for one's family and children's future." Such potential fine-tuning of reasons for and circumstances under which emigration is considered or becomes an action is by no means a call to return to a more detailed cataloguing of the "push" factors in a dichotomous approach to understanding emigration. On the contrary, the greater awareness of the effects weather had under certain circumstances encourages further exploration of how acceptance of relocation as a coping strategy is linked to factors on which next steps depend after the decision was made.

The weather, price, wage, and population information available for 18th-century German territories may not yield enough data points to construct regionally differentiated maps of long-distance emigration in different directions to answer some of the questions about migration as an adaptive strategy to weather. Yet careful selection of some localities in certain regions may go some way toward a better understanding of the complexity with which people whose wealth, income, and livelihoods depended to a large degree directly or indirectly on agriculture and who were therefore vulnerable to changes in

weather, devised strategies for dealing with weather-related or induced adversities that included long-distance migration. Moreover, careful attention to the impact of the variability of weather is also likely to offer further insight into those instances and circumstances in which other vulnerabilities affected migration decisions.

Determining when to relocate and in which direction to set out depended on other, contributing factors. Among them ranked variously and different for each emigrant personal networks that were built on trust and support, options for transport to distant places—east as well as west—, increasingly more and more reliable information about the countries and rulers that invited immigrants, and the perception of better opportunities than those anticipated at home. With that review and understanding of relocation to far-away places as an indicator for resilience in the face of vulnerability, the emigration from German territories in the 18th century turns into illuminating instances in the long history of delineating and detailing how people whose lives and livelihoods are exposed to risks that come with socio-economic insecurity and instability, find hope and ways to new beginnings far away from home.

Exploring migration more fully as a measure of adaptability to adversity, real or perceived, suggests a broader research strategy that builds on a better understanding of the demographic and socioeconomic circumstances in particular localities and, if possible, regions, based on "big data," in order to examine in greater detail the range of responses that translated not only in the decision to migrate but that also affected the timing of the move and its direction. In an age in which community, especially a person's place in it, played a critical role in shaping outlook and behaviour and in which transactional relationships were personal and depended on trust the influence of networks—kin, neighbours, co-religionists—cannot be overemphasized. Accepting the enormous risk of emigration as a strategy for some people in certain situations as "private truths" is a basic prerequisite for emigration to play a significant role at all.[19] And yet without ways for financing the relocation, transportation, and knowledge of and connection to the new place, in this case the New World, potential decisions about emigration could not become real actions. The promise of a more holistic approach lies in the further inquiry into the dynamic interplay between the more general framework within which people made their living and evaluated their current lives and future prospects and the factors that shaped the personal decision-making.

Mindful of this approach, the significance of the 1709 mass migration lies primarily in the broad acknowledgement by ordinary people for the first time that seeking relief in America from hard times at home presented an acceptable option or, put differently in the terms of social scientists and economists, an adaptation to vulnerability, especially since migrants perceived the

financing of this move as free. Moreover, mass migration—signalling not only a new phase in the perception of migration but also in the organization of the migration process—served as stimulus for the entrepreneurial dynamic that created networks of people with various interests in promoting settlements in the American colonies and that made the trade in migrants profitable for small as well as large-scale operators over the course of the 18th century.[20]

As a result, emigrants learned to become immigrants and to redefine who they were as they crossed boundaries and manoeuvred among strangers in foreign lands. And those whom they encountered along the way developed roles and practices aligned with the support and services for those migrants, ranging in intent or outcome from charity to exploitation. Evidence of scheming of various sorts and to different ends can be found in advertisements and advice literature by speculators of all sorts and their agents; in the letters from immigrants and the stories told by newlanders; and in the many encounters with unfamiliar persons en route, ranging from boatmen on the Rhine to innkeepers upon debarkation in the American port of arrival. Rather than weighing the relative good or bad of newlanders and speculators and con men more generally recognizing and exploring the adaptive duality of the migration agents' role in manoeuvring between different cultures—that of the migrants and that of lands through which they had to travel—enriches our understanding how people could be made to believe the promise of a better new life faraway. (As well as remaining captivated by that promise after they left the familiarity of their homelands.)

There is a growing and increasingly sophisticated literature about the networks of agents, boatmen, captains, and shippers who played important roles in channelling the migration from the German-speaking lands along the Rhine and beyond.[21] Similarly, our knowledge has improved about the links forged by communication and credit on which transportation to ports in Europe, across the Atlantic, and to a broadening and deepening web of destinations in North America depended, thereby providing better insight into the interactions among personal business, private enterprises, and governments' plans and projects on both sides of the ocean. The specialization of the German migrant trade that developed over the course of the 18th century was a small but fully integrated part of the political and commercial linkages in the growing British Empire and the increasingly international interactions among Europeans.[22] Within that much larger imperial and globalized context, the trade in people on the move first offered a model for comparable migration networks originating in Ireland and Scotland, and then provided important information and experience to those who adapted—disrupted in current entrepreneurial terms—the fundamentals of organizing and profiting from the system of transatlantic relocation to the vastly and rapidly expand-

ing United States under the dramatically changed circumstances of the mid-19th century.

As important as it is to understand the structural elements of the trade with German-speaking migrants in the 18th century and their interdependence in the context of imperialism and globalization, the character of personal relationships across the Atlantic constitutes a requisite component without which the migration could not have been sustained or scaled over more than three generations. In this respect the pioneering generation, that is, those sectarians who left and settled mostly in the Delaware valley after the 1710s, established and maintained transatlantic networks among former neighbors that were critical in two important ways: the networks were personal and largely built on trust derived from shared values, and they had a strong commitment to and practice of philanthropy. As a result, early immigrants to Pennsylvania not only fared well after relocation but also shared their experience and positive assessment of their new circumstances with kin and coreligionists—word that also reached neighbors and others. In some cases such word was meant, in others interpreted as an invitation to follow in the footsteps of those pioneers. In effect early, successful immigrants took on the role of sponsors to those who came later and whose travel debts they were willing to assume in return for labor in households, farms, and shops.

Building on this personal practice of informal investment in emigrants, who undertook the transatlantic move with the promise to pay the transportation costs they owed upon arrival in the colonies, and also on the long-standing custom of transporting indentured servants and convicts from Great Britain to the Caribbean islands and North America, enterprising merchants, captains, and agents variously transformed what had largely been private transactions into business deals for profit. In many instances the developing trade with passengers and redemptioners was small but at times and in the hands of some large and well-connected merchants the scale of operations increased significantly.[23] In both cases success depended on the willingness and ability of already established former immigrants to invest in newcomers, most commonly matching masters and servants along lines of shared or familiar background, as evident in religion, language, and culture. The interdependence of continued, personal connections across the Atlantic, albeit increasingly mediated over the generations, and the business model that made overseas relocation affordable for emigrants of limited means created self-generating dynamics by which German-speaking emigrants could consider turning west in hopes of improving their lives even as circumstances in their home lands and in the New World changed.

Once the decision to relocate across the Atlantic was made, all such German-speaking migrants shared the fate common to those who leave home,

namely in search of defining an identity that is no longer referenced and rooted in the familiar past and traditions of one's place of origin but that is calculated by strangers along the journey and typecast by earlier arrivals, foreigners, at the immigrant's new destination. In the negotiations along the road and upon arrival a "cross-roads" occurs where strangers meet, strange goods are sold, and linguistic invention takes place.[24] The importance of language (bilingualism and multilingualism) is paramount in finding voice and identity, acceptance first and integration later—critical elements of the American experience, if not dream, described by Maxine Hong Kingston in the following way: "The immigrant project is not merely to learn English but to infuse the local tongue with one's own inflection" (to take the immigrant accent and making it part of America . . . the experience of unmaking an old world and re-describing its parts for his or her own purposes, the [immigrant] must suspect that the creole creation is an artifice and subject to the same re-imagining that allowed it in the first place.[25]

The impact of the large-scale emigration of 1709 was far-reaching. The sudden and broad population movement demonstrated that relocation in reaction to adversity, typically combined with certain opportunities and incentives, was a choice not only for dissenters but also for ordinary people—occurring sporadically in various territories throughout the 18th century and giving particular shape to the flow and composition of the migration of German speakers to the American colonies. It also forced territorial lords in the greater Rhine lands to reevaluate their population policies—efforts that met with varying success of restricting or easing the emigration of particularly defined groups of subjects and that are well documented in the official records of the various principalities but not systematically examined. It also gave rise to small and large-scale entrepreneurial opportunities in providing services for German-speaking migrants on their journey from the Rhine lands to North America and, possibly most importantly, it created transatlantic networks of kin, fellow countrymen, and coreligionists that provided both framework and dynamic for the self-generating forces that fuelled the German migration for the long 18th century.

Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis
Indianapolis, Indiana

Notes

[1] Hans Jürgen Grabbe 'The Phasing out of 18th-Centruy Patterns of German Migration to the United States after 1817,' *American Studies Journal* [online], 62 (2017): 1.

[2] The following summary is based on Marianne S. Wokeck, *Trade in Strangers: The Beginnings of Mass Migration to North America* (University Park, PA, The Pennsylvania State Univer-

sity Press, 1999), the findings of which have been added to and refined in the past two decades by several scholars, including significantly contributors to this volume: James Boyd; Andrew Zonderman.

[3] See in this volume the details that arise in many contemporary documents discussed by Konstantin Huber 'Serial sources in excess'.

[4] See Wokeck, *Trade*, 63-72 on the original incidences and maturation of the trade.

[5] See Tara Zahra, *The Great Departure: Mass Migration from Eastern Europe and the Making of the Free World* (New York, W. W. Norton, 2016), for an exploration of these questions in central-east European migration.

[6] See Marianne S. Wokeck, 'Rethinking the significance of the 1709 mass migration', in Jan Stievermann and Oliver Scheiding, eds., *A peculiar mixture: German language cultures and identities in eighteenth-century North America* (University Park, PA, 2013), 24, 36. On 1709 generally, Phillip Otterness, *Becoming German: The 1709 Palatine Migration to New York (*Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 2004).

[7] See Rosalind Beiler, 'Dissenting religious communication networks and European migration, 1660–1710', in Bernard Bailyn and Patricia L. Denault, eds., *Soundings in Atlantic History: latent structures and intellectual currents, 1500–1830* (Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press, 2009), 220-36.

[8] Wilhelm Abel, *Massenarrmut und Hungerkrisen im vorindustriellen Europa* (Hamburg, Paul Parey, 1974); also Wilhelm Abel, *Agricultural Fluctuations in Europe* (transl. of 3rd ed.) (London, Methuen, 1980), are two of the classics that have described and analyzed weather and climate affect socioeconomic circumstances. A recent study also reflects that theme: Daniel Kraemer, "*Menschen grasten nun mit dem Vieh" Die letzte grosse Hungerkrise der Schweiz 1816/17*, Wirtschafts-, Sozial- und Umweltgeschichte (WSU) 4 (Basel: Schwabe Verlag, 2015), ISBN e-book 978-3-7965-3447-8. The literature is large with many examples from across Europe. Carlo Casty, 'Temperatures and Precipitation Variability in the European Alps since 1500', *International Journal of Climatology* 25.14 (2005): 1855-80, is just one recent example.

[9] For a global perspective, see David D. Zhang, et al., "Global Climate Change, War, Population Decline in Recent Human History," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 104.49 (2007): 19214-19, Figure 1, <http://www.pnas.org/content/104/49/19214.full> (accessed 6 December 2016); also The Discovery of Global Warming, "The Modern Temperature Trend," graphs, <http://history.aip.org/climate/index.htm - contents> (accessed 6 December 2016); for air temperature in central England since 1659 <http://www.climate4you.com/CentralEnglandTemperatureSince1659.htm> (accessed 6 December 2016). See also Wolfgang Behringer, *A Cultural History of Climate* (Cambridge, Polity Press, 2010), 110, and also with a cultural dimension Hans von Storch and Nico Stehr, 'Anthropogenic Climate Change: A Reason for Concern Since the 18th Century and Earlier', Georg. Ann. Swedish Society for Anthropology and Geography, 88 A:2, 2006, 107-13. For Swiss data see C. Pfister, 'Monthly Temperature and Precipitation in Central Europe 1525–1979: Quantifying Documentary Evidence on Weather and Its Effects', in Raymond. S. Bradley and Philip D. Jones, eds., *Climate since A.D. 1500* (London, Routledge, 1995), 118-42, Figure 6.4 and especially the reference to CLIMHIST-CH, a weather chronology based on the CLIMHIST databank, p.131.

[10] Rasmus Heltberg and Misha Bonch-Osmolovskij, 'Mapping Vulnerability to Climate Change', Policy Research Working Paper 5554, The World Bank, Sustainable Development Network, Social Development Unit, January 2011.

[11] In the more recent literature about climate the distinction is made between "hazards" as natural and "disasters" primarily as the result of human actions. See, for example, Dorothea Hilhorst and Greg Bankoff, 'Introduction: Mapping Vulnerability', in Greg Bankoff, Georg Frerks, and Dorothea Hilhorst, eds., *Mapping Vulnerability: Disasters, Development & People*

(London, Earthscan, 2004), 2.

[12] Heltberg and Bonch-Osmolovskij, 'Mapping Vulnerability', 2.

[13] Heltberg and Bonch-Osmolovskij, 'Mapping Vulnerability,' 3.

[14] Ibid., 4.

[15] Ibid., 4-5.

[16] For indicators other than temperatures and rainfall, namely dendroclimatic evidence and dust veil data, see, K. R. Briffa and F. H. Schweingruber, 'Recent Dendroclimatic Evidence of northern and central European Summer Temperatures'; and R. S. Bradley and P. D. Jones, 'Records of Explosive Volcanic Eruptions over the Last 500 Years,' both in Bradley and Jones, eds., *Climate*, 366-92; 606-79.

[17] About the Laki eruption, see <http://www.climate4you.com/ClimateAndHistory 1700-1799.htm>

[18] On 1709 pamphleteering, see William O'Reilly, 'Working for the Crown: German Migrants and Britain's Commercial Success in the Early Eighteenth-Century American Colonies,' *Journal of Modern European History* 15.1 (2017): 130-52; on 1816–17 recruitment, James Boyd, 'The Rhine Exodus of 1816/17 in the Developing German Atlantic World' *The Historical Journal* 59.1 (2016): 99-123.

[19] Timur Kuran, Public Lies, *Private Truths* (Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press, 1997).

[20] See O'Reilly, 'Working for the Crown', also William O'Reilly, 'Strangers Come to Devour the Land: Changing Views of Foreign Migrants in Early Eighteenth- Century England', *Journal of Early Modern History* 21.3 (2016): 153-87.

[21] For the 1816–17 period, Boyd, 'Exodus'.

[22] See Zonderman, this volume.

[23] See Wokeck, *Trade*.

[24] Lewis Hyde, *Trickster Makes This World: Mischief, Myth, and Art* (New York, Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2010), 299.

[25] Quoted in ibid., 310.

Andrew Zonderman

Sailing Souls: Colonial Philadelphia's German Merchants and the Development of the Transatlantic Passenger Trade

Hundreds of thousands of Central Europeans in the early modern period traveled the globe as missionaries, soldiers, settlers, and merchants. Among them were the German merchant community of colonial Philadelphia, who played key role in the transatlantic passenger trade connecting Central European migrants with British North America. These men were customers, business partners, regulators, and disruptors of that industry. Those merchants engaged in multiple ventures of intra-colonial and international trade either directly or as brokers. German colonists were those who identified as German, either through self-description, using the German language in their homes or businesses, and/or participating in German-language religious or civic institutions.[1] Through this merchant community's activities in the transatlantic passenger trade, we can see how German-speaking peoples were active participants in shaping colonial commerce and legislation as well as the fracturing of the British Empire in North America.

Customers

The first step for the Germans who eventually became part of colonial Philadelphia's merchant class was to make their way across the Atlantic. These men, like other German migrants traveling to British North America in the middle quarters of the eighteenth century, became customers of a maturing transatlantic transportation industry. Prior to the 1720s, German migration to British North America was largely organized by religious networks and agents of the British government. William Penn and other British Quakers

established connections with German-speaking Labadists, Mennonites, and Quakers in the 1670s and encouraged them to move to Penn's new proprietary colony in North America after its 1681 chartering.[2] The Dutch Committee on Foreign Needs, organized in the mid-seventeenth century to aid persecuted Mennonites and other Anabaptists throughout Europe, arranged for the transatlantic passage of hundreds of Mennonites from the upper Rhineland and Swiss cantons until discontinuing this form of relief in 1732.[3]

Besides William Penn's recruitment of continental European migrants to his proprietary colony, other British metropolitan and colonial officials oversaw the migration of Germans to North America in the early eighteenth century. Governor John Archdale of Carolina Colony attempted to lure German migrants to the proprietary colony through a promotional literature campaign similar to Penn's, as well as by contracting with the High German Company of Thuringia. When thousands of German-speaking migrants made their way across the English Channel to Britain in 1709, several colonial governors lobbied for the migrants to be sent across the Atlantic. Several hundred went to New Bern in Carolina and about three thousand went to New York to settle in the Hudson River Valley and to produce naval stores.[4] Lieutenant Governor Alexander Spotswood of Virginia recruited several scores of families in the 1710s from the Siegerland and southwestern portion of the Holy Roman Empire to settle on what was the western fringe of Virginia, operate an ironworks, and establish mines where possible.[5]

Beyond colonial governors, British merchant firms in London and Rotterdam began to independently organize voyages for would-be Central European immigrants starting in the 1720s.[6] Rotterdam emerged as the primary port of embarkation for this trade thanks to its location at the mouth of the Rhine River. Taking the Rhine River downstream provided migrants a comparatively quick and cost-effective route to reach a port of embarkation for North America. The city also had an established history of sending out North America-bound passenger ships as Benjamin Furley, an English Quaker based in Rotterdam and William Penn's agent on the continent, helped organize many of the first voyages of Germans to Pennsylvania.[7] Rotterdam merchants organized the recruiting of passengers, their entry into Dutch territory, and their embarkation. They also provisioned and outfitted the vessel for the first transatlantic leg. Those in London helped secure capital, insurance, and a ship to legally transport the migrants to British North America. Philadelphia merchants oversaw the debarkation, the collection of passengers' outstanding debts, and the preparation of the vessel for its next destination.[8]

The industry grew quickly in the 1730s when more and more would-be emigrants began to take the opportunity of passage on credit. In this system, the migrant became indebted to the merchant to a sum equal to the travel

cost, plus 20 percent, and had the debt 'redeemed' by friends, family. If the passenger's debt was not redeemed within an agreed period of time, then the merchant or their agent could contract the passenger and/or family members into indentured servitude to pay off the debt. This "redemptioner system" helped fill the Mid-Atlantic colonies' ever-growing demands for labor.[9] The growing business facilitated a sizable migration of German-speaking peoples through Philadelphia, including approximately 55,000 between 1737 and 1754 with over 25,000 arriving between just 1749 and 1752.[10]

Prior to the 1720s, almost all Central Europeans going to British North America were sectarians fleeing religious persecution, who overwhelmingly travelled as families. Regular transatlantic shipping and the redemptioner system encouraged a new type of migrant: younger, single, poorer, disproportionately male, and motivated to travel primarily for better economic opportunities. As the century progressed, more and more of the migrants came over the Atlantic through the redemption system rather than paying their fares upfront, with up to half of passengers using credit to cover their voyage in the third quarter of the eighteenth century.[11]

The future German merchants' personal stories as passengers reflect these demographic shifts in German migration to British North America sparked by this maturing transatlantic passenger trade. They tended to be young and unmarried.[12] Caspar Wistar, born Caspar Wüstar in Waldhilsbach in the Electoral Palatinate, was twenty-one years old when he arrived in Philadelphia in 1717. His younger brother Johannes, who would become John Wister in Pennsylvania, was nineteen when he arrived in 1727. Heinrich, or Henry, Keppele was twenty-two and Georg Michael Hillegas was twenty-seven or twenty-eight when they made their transatlantic voyages to Philadelphia.[13]

They were men driven to move for economic advantage rather than to flee religious persecution.[14] Most of these young men came from middling socioeconomic backgrounds in their German homelands. Caspar Wistar and John Wister were sons of a *Jäger* [huntsman] in the service of Johann Wilhelm, Elector Palatine. Henry Keppele descended from local office holders on both sides of his family, and his father served as one in Treschklingen in the Duchy of Württemberg.[15] They paid for their travel in full, albeit often by the slimmest of margins, as Caspar Wistar claimed to have just nine pence when he landed in Philadelphia. These men avoided becoming redemptioners, which gave them great flexibility in their early employment in the labor-hungry city. They could immediately accrue capital to finance their future intra-colonial and transatlantic trade.[16]

Most of the initial members of Philadelphia's German merchant community started off as artisans, publicans, or retailers before starting ventures in transatlantic shipping and commerce. Caspar Wistar initially worked for

a soap-maker before securing an apprenticeship with a button-maker. He then founded his own button-making business before launching a successful career as a merchant, real estate investor, and glass manufacturer.[17] Keppele first worked as a butcher before purchasing a property on Market Street where he operated an inn and tavern that by 1747 became his primary business. In 1748, Keppele started selling linseed oil wholesale. In the following years, Keppele established himself in Philadelphia-area real estate as well as in trade with the West Indies, Great Britain, and continental Europe.[18] Adam Clampffer and his son William operated a tavern on Elfreth's Alley and a retail shop. By the mid-1750s, William had opened a store on Second Street selling imported British manufactured goods and East Indian products routed through Britain.[19] Daniel Steinmetz, who arrived in 1732, and Georg Michael Hillegas both became retailers and investors in real estate. Their sons, John Steinmetz and Michael Hillegas Jr. succeeded them and expanded their families' commercial operations around the Atlantic.[20]

Two key factors enabled these young men and their progeny to become merchants: Philadelphia's rapid growth, and the creation of a path to naturalization as British subjects. Philadelphia, established in 1682, had over 2,000 residents within a decade of its founding, approximately 13,000 by 1742, and almost 25,000 by the start of the War of American Independence.[21] The city's riverfront expanded as well with dozens of private and public wharfs, warehouses, piers, and harborages for vessels of various sizes. Tobacco, animal skins, and furs were the most lucrative early trade goods sailing out of Philadelphia, but over time wheat, flour, bread, lumber products, salted meat, and iron became the major exports. By the last years of the colonial period the city was British North America's busiest port. The German immigrants who would become merchants prospered in their initial ventures along with the city. Their early prosperity enabled them to place orders for imported goods and to invest in ships.[22]

Whilst German migrants made their way to British North America's fastest growing port city they needed legal rights to become merchants that they did not possess upon debarkation. As aliens arriving in Pennsylvania, the Navigation Acts barred them from trading with British colonies or from owning a British ship or shares in such a ship.[23] While William Penn, as proprietor of Pennsylvania, had helped guide legislation through the colonial Assembly in 1709 to create a naturalization process, it received royal assent because it applied only within the colony's bounds.[24] This new law helped ensure continental European migrants to Pennsylvania could pass on real property to their heirs, but they remained barred from engaging in international and intra-colonial trade. Caspar Wistar sought a way around this restriction when he petitioned for naturalization in 1723. Wistar ensured that the subsequent

bill included a clause specifying to his ability to trade and transport all kinds of goods not barred by law, as if he were a natural-born subject of the King of Great Britain who had been born in Pennsylvania. Notwithstanding Wistar's diligence in seeing through his personal naturalization bill, his status remained tenuous. The bill had to receive royal assent, which often took years; and there was still the matter of the bill's applicability to Pennsylvania only. Hence it was unclear if Wistar, for example, could trade with metropolitan firms. Wistar realized the tenuousness of his legal status and when he went on to establish a glassworks in New Jersey in 1739, he secured his naturalization with that colony's legislature.[25]

The would-be German merchants who followed Wistar could be more assured of their naturalized status and its application throughout the empire, thanks to the 1740 "Act for Naturalizing Foreign Protestants, and others therein mentioned, as are settlers or shall settle, in any of his Majesty's colonies in *America*." The act recognized that an "Increase of People is a Means of advancing the Wealth and Strength of any Nation or Country," and that migrants might be attracted to settle in the colonies if allowed to enjoy the privileges of being a subject. Starting June 1, 1740, aliens who provided proof of seven years of residency from a colonial government, as well as the witnessed taking of the sacrament within the past three months, were eligible to become naturalized British subjects.[26] The 1740 act paved the way for the emergence of an expanding German merchant community within the city.

The developing business of transporting continental European migrants across the Atlantic, Philadelphia's rapid economic growth, and the establishment of a legal path to naturalization for foreign colonists made the emergence of a German merchant community in Philadelphia possible. A few members, like Henry Keppele and Jacob Winey, would then become part of the very industry that brought them to their new homeland.

Business Partners

Philadelphia's small German merchant community emerged around midcentury as legal and financial barriers fell away. Men like Henry Keppele and William Clampffer started to invest their profits from their public houses and other businesses into shares of ships, and large wholesale purchases. Clampffer purchased a third of the newly built fifty-ton brigantine *Addison* in 1751, and less than two years later owned it outright with his father, Adam. Michael Hillegas Jr. by 1755 owned quarter-shares in a 120-ton ship and a twenty-four-ton sloop as well as a private wharf.[27] Keppele moved on from brokering linseed in the late 1740s to importing sugar and rum from Barbados and Jamaica starting in the early 1760s.[28]

German merchants' trade patterns were almost indistinguishable from their Anglo competitors. The German merchant community in Philadelphia focused its transatlantic trade on the British Isles, the Caribbean, and the Iberian Peninsula. The bulk of the trade was with Britain importing textiles, hardware, and East India products. David Deschler, cousin of Caspar Wistar and John Wister, concentrated on selling imported hardware and domestic goods, like paints, pigments, kitchen pans, and chisels.[29] In one 1765 advertisement in *Der Wöchentliche Philadelphische Staatsbote*, John Steinmetz, son of retailer Daniel Steinmetz, listed over twenty types of textiles he had recently secured from London, Liverpool, and Bristol.[30] Caribbean ports were markets hungry for the Mid-Atlantic's surplus foodstuffs and timber, and German merchants helped meet the demand. In exchange, they brought back sugar, rum, ginger, and leather as well as bills of exchange and specie to pay off their debts to British merchant firms.[31]

Many of the leading German merchants also sent ships to Iberia and the Wine Islands of the Central Atlantic. Jacob Winey, independently, and with his partner, Andreas Bunner, son of German immigrant and Philadelphia innkeeper Rudolph Bunner, forged a relationship with the Lisbon-based British firm Parr and Bulkeley in the 1760s to import a variety of wines.[32] Henry Keppele along with his son, Henry Keppele Junior, and son-in-law, John Steinmetz, regularly sent out their ship, *Charming Peggy* in the early 1770s to Lisbon and Tenerife to sell flour, grain, barrel staves, and North Atlantic fish. The *Charming Peggy* sailed back with tens of thousands of gallons of local wines as well as shipments of citrus, corks, oils, and silk.[33]

Engaging in the transatlantic passenger trade represented a rare business opportunity to connect back to Central Europe. Five of the approximately fifty-five Philadelphia-based merchants and firms involved in the business during the 18th century were German: both Henry Keppeles, John Steinmetz, Michael Hillegas Jr., and Jacob Winey. Only the Keppeles and Steinmetz invested in multiple voyages. These five German merchants all entered the business at its peak in the early 1750s or afterwards.[34]

The elder Henry Keppele was the most invested in the passenger trade and his path followed the larger pattern of Philadelphia merchants within the business. Initially Philadelphia merchants worked as agents for Rotterdam or London-based firms or took consignments of migrants. Over time, they started to finance these voyages independently, and to send out their own ships.[35] Keppele started out by securing a consignment of 386 German immigrants in 1752 from Captain George Parish of the ship *Queen of Denmark*. Over the next three years, he took six more consignments of German immigrants totaling almost 2,000 people, including almost nine percent of all adult male immigrants who arrived during the surge in German migration between 1751

and 1756.[36] Keppele sought to get around the Dutch government's strict regulations on the trade as well as the ensconced position of the well-established firms in Rotterdam, by having his migrants shipped from Hamburg. Five of his seven consignments in the 1750s came from there. Keppele's use of Hamburg was unique in the larger industry as only nine of the 255 redemptioner transport voyages between 1727 and 1775 began there.[37]

Keppele hoped Hamburg would be a place where he would have the advantage as a native German-speaker and with his connections in the city. Hamburg also offered a proximate point for attracting immigrants from the large Protestant populations of north German states. The Seven Years' War ended Keppele's hope of opening Hamburg, but by the 1770s Keppele reentered the passenger trade with his son and son-in-law. No longer relying on consignments from Hamburg and Rotterdam, Keppele and his partners took aboard German immigrants and other passengers in London where they regularly sent their ship, *Catharine*. London was a growing point of embarkation for transatlantic German migrants thanks to its greater shipping traffic with Philadelphia. Yet, the parties of immigrants the three merchants loaded onto their ship were much smaller than Keppele's consignments from the 1750s. These smaller shipments of immigrants were due both to the relative decline in the trade in the 1770s as well as the fact that the Keppeles and Steinmetz were taking on passengers to supplement imported goods, rather than filling up a ship predominantly with people.[38]

While Keppele was the largest Philadelphia German player in the eighteenth-century Central European transatlantic transportation business, several others also sought to profit in the trade. Michael Hillegas Jr., using his co-owned ship, *Henrietta* carried at least 239 German immigrants from Rotterdam in 1754 in coordination with the Dunlop Company. Jacob Winey's 150-ton *King of Prussia* sailed 143 immigrants to Philadelphia from Rotterdam in the fall of 1775, one of the last passages of the trade prior to the Revolution.[39]

Thus, starting in the 1750s several former customers of the transatlantic German migrant transporting business and their sons began to participate in the industry. Investing their money, time, and vessels, these merchants hoped to diversify their business ventures and turn a profit by bringing their colinguists to British North America. The elder Keppele's profits from consignments of migrants from Rotterdam and Hamburg in the 1750s may have helped finance his later trade in the Caribbean, Britain, and Iberia. Yet, overall, the Philadelphia German merchant community's involvement in the trade was very limited, both in the number of men participating and the duration of their involvement in the trade. Perhaps this was because the market was primarily in the hands of large British firms on both sides of the Atlantic. Instead, the German merchants largely focused on commerce with the city's

most popular foreign markets: Great Britain, the Caribbean, and the Iberian Peninsula. These merchants had a much larger influence on the transatlantic passenger trade with Central Europe as activists pressing for greater regulation of the industry.

Regulators

Philadelphians were shocked in November 1764 following the arrival of a ship crowded with terribly sick and hungry passengers. A letter to *Der Wöchentliche Philadelphische Staatsbote* described the clinic where many of the sickest migrants wound up as "*ein rechtes Tophet, ein Land lebendiger Todten, ein Gewölbe voll lebender Leichen, von welchen nicht als ihr Gewinsel und die thränende Augen zu erkennen gaben, daß die Seelen noch in ihren verwesenden Leibern seyn.*" [a real hell, a land of living dead, a vault full of living corpses, from which nothing but their whimpering and their watery eyes signified that the souls were still in the rotting bodies.][40] This shocking incident motivated leading members of the city's German community, including its merchants, to organize a society devoted to the care and protection of their newly arrived colinguists. Sixty-five men gathered together at the Lutheran schoolhouse on Cherry Street on December 26, 1764 to form the German Society of Pennsylvania (GSP).

Many of Philadelphia's German merchants played leading roles within the organization's founding and operation during the colonial and revolutionary eras. Henry Keppele helped organize the initial meeting and was elected president. He served as president until 1781 when he refused reelection, citing his declining health. Jacob Winey served as the organization's first treasurer and following his withdrawing from the post in the middle of 1766, Henry Keppele Jr. was elected in his stead. Keppele Jr. held the post of treasurer until 1779. Philadelphia merchants held the position of treasurer for so long probably because they had the accounting skills as well as the necessary property to bond as security for holding the GSP's treasury.[41]

While the GSP devoted many of its resources to providing material and legal aid to recently arrived Germans, one of its first actions was to lobby the colonial Assembly to pass stronger regulations on the transportation and treatment of immigrants on ships and on arrival at Philadelphia. At the body's first meeting in December 1764, the members voted to present the Assembly as well as Lieutenant Governor John Penn, the highest executive in the colony at the time, with English translations of their founding articles as well as a petition calling for new regulations on the shipping of immigrants.[42] While the colony had previously passed legislation to establish health inspections for incoming ships, a pest house on Providence Island for sick arrivals, a mini-

mum width and length for berths, and a minimum standard for necessary provisions, the petitioners found these earlier regulations to be wanting.[43] The GSP's petition contained nine points that they wanted a new law to address in order to better protect migrants' lives and property during and immediately after their voyages. These points included safeguarding passengers' goods from seizure to pay off debts to preventing spouses from being separated in their indentures.[44]

Less than two weeks after several GSP officers presented their founding articles and petitions, the Assembly began debating a bill that addressed their concerns about the transatlantic passenger trade. While the bill passed the Assembly, Lieutenant Governor Penn declined to sign it and asked that the bill be reviewed again at the next Assembly session later in the year. Penn's hesitancy to sign the bill at first may have been because of a counter-petition by some Philadelphia merchants objecting to the legislation and arguing that the immigrants coming over as redemptioners were free people making contracts in German, so no abuse or exploitation was taking place. When the bill passed again in the May session, Lieutenant Governor Penn approved it.[45]

The law placed a range of new responsibilities on ships' masters during voyages. They had to have a well-regarded surgeon and a fully stocked chest of medicines onboard whenever they carried fifty or more freights. There were also now required cleaning procedures, like fumigating between decks by burning tar and twice weekly cleanings of all decks with vinegar. Ships' masters also had to provide bills of lading for passengers' luggage that they would not have access to during the voyage to prevent the theft of goods. They also had to declare all goods for customs on behalf of their passengers. If any of a passenger's goods were seized for failing to pay customs, the ship's master was liable and had to make good on the passenger's lost property.[46]

The law also provided new protections for passengers upon their arrival in Pennsylvania. When unredeemed passengers went ashore to look for opportunities to pay their debts and their luggage remained onboard as security, the ship's master had to provide the passenger with a certificate detailing the goods and their value. There were also bans on ships' masters charging passengers to unload their luggage at their port of destination as well as keeping all non-sick passengers and non-heavily pregnant women onboard for more than thirty days after arrival, even those still indebted. Only immediate family members, excluding wives and mothers of children, could be made responsible for a dead spouse or child's freight costs, and any contract made between passengers and the ship's owner or master violating this principle was immediately void.[47]

The law improved the enforcement mechanism for both the old and new regulations by having officers inspecting vessels with passengers bring with

them "a reputable German inhabitant of the city of Philadelphia well versed in the English and German languages to be . . . interpreter." The paid interpreter was to go onboard and loudly introduce themselves and the officer in German, help the officer read aloud the regulations, and then begin an inquiry among the passengers about the conditions during the voyage. If there were passengers remaining on the ship thereafter, the inspecting officer and translator were to make weekly visits to the ship to examine conditions onboard.[48]

The GSP's merchant leaders and members played central roles in this passage of the strictest regulations of the transatlantic passenger trade during the colonial era. They were men of moderate to sizable wealth and growing political connections and clout. Several of the merchants were already active in some of Philadelphia's civic institutions. Caspar Wistar, John Wister, and David Deschler were three of the earliest members of the Fellowship Fire Company, the city's second oldest fire company. Many of the German merchants were regular donors to Pennsylvania Hospital.[49] As prominent figures within the colony's German-speaking communities, the petitioning German merchants carried the political clout of the growing numbers of German colonists who naturalized and were eligible to vote by the early 1760s.[50]

No German merchant did more to pass the reform legislation than GSP president Henry Keppele. He shepherded the bill through the Assembly, where he was serving his single term after the October1764 election. Keppele was well-suited to the task. He was intimately familiar with both sides of the trade. His transatlantic passage on the ship *Charming Nancy* in 1738 took almost six months and a contagious fever broke out on board killing scores of passengers. By the time the ship reached Philadelphia only about sixty of the 312 passengers survived. By 1765, twenty-seven years later, he had overseen the 'redemption' process for seven shiploads of German migrants.[51]

The efforts of Philadelphia's German merchant community and other German leaders in the colony led to a more stringent regulatory regime for the transatlantic passenger trade. The new requirements on passenger voyages and redeeming passengers' freight costs may have contributed to the declining volume of German migrants to British North America after the Seven Years' War. Other actions of the city's German merchants in the 1760s and 1770s certainly did.

Disruptors

While the Seven Years' War interrupted the transatlantic passenger trade between Central Europe and British North America for its duration, the War of American Independence started a nearly complete cessation in the business with German-speaking Europe for a generation. The British Navy controlled

the transatlantic shipping routes during the war. Thereafter the French Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars disrupted nascent connections between German ports and the United States.[52] Philadelphia' German merchants helped spark the initial conflict that disrupted the trade as some of the city's strongest critics of British imperial policy after 1763 and loudest voices for independence in the run-up to 1776. Through their actions, they disrupted the industry as well as reshaped the British Empire.

Philadelphia and its citizens were comparatively quiet in the years leading up to the break with Great Britain. The city had almost no crowd actions or formal protests before the late 1760s. In fact, Philadelphia was the lone port where the local stamp agent's home and property were protected by a crowd, rather than ransacked by one.[53] The city's elites sent a petition against the 1767 Townshend Acts, but only nine months after Boston and New York sent theirs and without the threat of a boycott. The city finally organized a boycott of British goods in response to the Townshend Acts in 1769 after the city's increasingly patriot artisans and laborers pressured local leaders. Even then many of the city's merchants within months began agitating for a revision or rescinding of the non-importation agreement.[54]

The German merchants, however, represented a reliable and active corps in favor of protesting and resisting the new revenue legislation from Parliament. John Wister, his son Daniel, David Deschler, Jacob Winey, William Clampffer, Adam Hubley, John Steinmetz, and both Henry Keppeles signed a non-importation agreement for British goods on November 7, 1765 in protest of the Stamp Act's passage.[55] After the port of Boston was closed in response to the 1773 Boston Tea Party, Adam Hubley, Michael Hillegas Jr., Henry Kepple Jr., and Jacob Winey served on the city's corresponding committee; and Francis Hasenclever, Keppele Jr., and Winey served on the Committee of Inspection and Observation to enforce the city's new non-importation agreement.[56]

The German merchants were more willing to resist for several reasons. As merchants, the changes in imperial policies, from new charges on imported goods and documents vital to transatlantic trade to increased enforcement of previous regulations threatened their businesses' profits.[57] The Stamp Act levied a double duty on all the items produced in the colonies and taxed under the act, if they were written in any language other than English.[58] The Stamp Act thus placed an extra financial burden on the German merchants and their less well-to-do colinguists. The double duty in the Stamp Act may have also served to remind the merchants of their days before naturalization when they had more limited rights. The German merchants or their fathers had gone through the laborious process of naturalization to pursue their livelihood, and they knew intimately the disadvantages of being a non-subject residing in the

British Empire. The wave of post-1763 revenue legislation and the growing military presence in the colonies seemed to be chipping away at the foundation that girded their social status and economic opportunities.

Following the violence at Lexington and Concord, many German merchants took up arms and helped create Pennsylvania's new constitution and government. Henry Keppele Jr. served with the third battalion of Pennsylvania state troops from July 1776 until his death in 1782.[59] Jacob Winey partnered with fellow Philadelphians Robert Morris and Thomas Mason in August 1775 to send a ship to continental Europe to secure war materiel for the Continental Army, as well as pick up cargos previously ordered by the Continental Congress.[60] Frederick Kuhl served as an elected delegate for the city of Philadelphia at Pennsylvania's constitutional convention in July 1776, having established himself as a leading radical and pro-independence voice. Kuhl and Keppele Jr. became members of the newly formed Council of Safety that was to serve as the state's executive organ, and Hillegas Jr. served as its treasurer.[61]

During the war, many of the merchants worked to keep their nascent state and country afloat financially. In March 1776, the Continental Congress appointed and authorized Frederick Kuhl, Adam Hubley, and Samuel Hillegas, son of Michael Hillegas Jr., along with several dozen others, to sign and number four million dollars in bills of credit.[62] In 1780, John Steinmetz, along with Henry Keppele and Michael Hillegas Jr. pledged subscriptions backed by their credit and property to the newly established Bank of Pennsylvania. The Bank of Pennsylvania's creators planned to raise 300,000 pounds in Pennsylvania currency to guarantee the loans the institution made to provision the Continental Army. The elder Keppele and Steinmetz pledged 2,000 pounds each and Hillegas Jr. pledged 4,000 pounds. The Bank of Pennsylvania influenced the formation of an institution that came to supersede it in financing the war effort the following year: the Bank of North America.[63] Hillegas Jr. rose to the highest rank within the revolutionary government among the German Philadelphia merchants. He became the first Treasurer of the United States, first jointly in May 1776 and then individually in August 1776.[64]

Merchants like the Henry Keppeles, Fredrick Kuhl, and John Steinmetz likely thought very little about how their refusal to import British goods, their participation in patriot organizations and nascent independent government bodies, and their military service impacted the transatlantic passenger trade to Central Europe. German merchants in Philadelphia focused their actions in the 1770s and 1780s on moving much of British North America towards independence. The War of American Independence, and its globalization by the entry of Great Britain's European rivals, effectively shut down shipping between Central Europe and British North America. In the first years of the newly formed republic, the focus of the transatlantic passenger trade shifted

more towards Ireland. It would be only after the end of the Napoleonic Wars that the passenger trade for Germans to America would re-emerge in fits and starts, and under a largely altered framework.[65]

Conclusion

The transatlantic passenger trade between British North America and Central Europe was critical to the migration of tens of thousands of German immigrants over the first three quarters of the eighteenth century. From this larger migration, a small number of men established themselves in Philadelphia midcentury as merchants trading around the Atlantic Basin. Their rise from being artisans and small retailers was due in part to their earlier socio-economic standing in their homelands, the city's rapid economic growth, and the formation of a naturalization process by British colonial governments and Parliament. Despite their personal connections with Central Europe and knowledge of German, few of these newly established merchants entered the transatlantic passenger trade. Instead their oceanic trade focused around ports where other British colonial merchants also commonly ventured: London, Bristol, Liverpool, Lisbon, Tenerife, and Bridgetown.

Yet, Philadelphia's German merchant community did shape the transatlantic passenger trade in critical ways both directly and indirectly. German merchants were founders and early leaders of the German Society of Pennsylvania, and they spearheaded the campaign to introduce further reforms to the trade to protect passengers' lives and property. Their efforts led to the passage of an act in 1765 that placed new responsibilities on merchants and ship captains to provide adequate provisions, sanitation, and medical care aboard their passenger vessels as well as protect passengers' luggage and their rights in making contracts for their indenture. German merchants' growing resistance to new British imperial policies and legislation after 1763 and subsequent support for the colonies' independence, helped trigger a war that began a series of major disruptions in the transatlantic passenger trade with Central Europe that lasted almost thirty years. Through these merchants' actions we can see the impact Germans had on the British Empire's development as well as the eighteenth-century world. Eighteenth-century Germans were neither isolated from, nor passive in contemporary global political and economic transformations. They were active participants in the thickening web of global trade, the expansion of European empires, and the sparking of political revolutions.[66]

Emory University
Atlanta, Georgia

Notes

[1] Thus, the German merchant community I define includes only a few Quaker merchants and no Jewish merchants, even when the merchants themselves or their ancestors came from German states.

[2] Dieter Pesch, ed., *Brave New World Rhinelanders Conquer America: The Journal of Johannes Herbergs* (Nümbrecht: Martina Galunder-Verlag, 2001), 12-13; Ingrid Schöberl, 'Daniel Pastorius and the Foundation of Germantown,' trans. Robert W. Culverhouse, in Frank Trommler and Joseph McVeigh, eds., *American and the Germans: An Assessment of a Three-Hundred-Year History* (Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985), 17; Marianne Wokeck, "German Immigration to Colonial America: Prototype of a Transatlantic Mass Migration," in ibid., 3-4.

[3] Lucy Forney Bittinger, *The Germans in Colonial Times* (New York, Russell & Russell, 1968), 96-97; Richard K. MacMaster with Samuel L. Horst and Robert F. Ulle, *Conscience in Crisis: Mennonites and Other Peace Churches in America, 1739–1789 Interpretation and Documents* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2001), 36.

[4] Walter Allen Knittle, *Early Eighteenth Century Palatine Emigration: A British Government Redemptioner Project to Manufacture Naval Stores* (Philadelphia, Dorrance & Company, 1937); William O'Reilly, 'Working for the Crown: German Migrants and Britain's Commercial Success in the Early Eighteenth-Century American Colonies,' *Journal of Modern European History* 15.1 (2017): 136-38, 141, 144; Philip Otterness, *Becoming German: The 1709 Palatine Migration to New York* (Ithaca, NY, Cornell University Press, 2004).

[5] Georg Fertig, 'Transatlantic Migration from the German-Speaking Parts of Central Europe, 1600-1800: Proportions, Structures, and Explanations' in *Europeans on the Move: Studies on European Migration, 1500–1800* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1994), 211; Klaus Wust, *The Virginia Germans* (Charlottesville, The University of Virginia Press, 1969), 20-25.

[6] Marianne S. Wokeck, *Trade in Strangers: The Beginnings of Mass Migration to North America* (University Park, PA, The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1999): xxi, 69, 75.

[7] Farley Grubb, *German Immigration and Servitude in America, 1709–1920* (New York, Routledge, 2011), 23; Wokeck, 'German Immigration to Colonial America,' 4.

[8] Wokeck, *Trade*, 59-60, 63-65, 93, 109.

[9] Fertig, 'Transatlantic Migration from the German-Speaking Parts of Central Europe,' 216; Aaron S. Fogleman 'From Slaves, Convicts, and Servants to Free Passengers: The Transformation of Immigration in the Era of the American Revolution,' *The Journal of American History* 85.1 (1998): 46, 51-52; Grubb, *German Immigration and Servitude in America*, 7; Günter Moltmann, "German Migration to America in the Colonial Period and the Redemptioner System," trans. Robert W. Culverhouse, in Trommler, McVeigh *Three-Hundred-Year History*, 32; Wokeck, *Trade,* 84.

[10] Fogleman, 'From Slaves, Convicts, and Servants to Free Passengers,' 51-52; Fogleman, *Hopeful Journeys*, 6; Moltmann, "German Migration to America in the Colonial Period and the Redemptioner System," 30; Birte Pfleger, 'Between Subject and Citizen: German-speakers in Eighteenth-Century Pennsylvania,' (Ph.D. diss., University of California-Irvine, 2003), 7; Wokeck, *Trade* 84.

[11] James Boyd, 'Merchants of Migration: Keeping the German Atlantic Connected in America's Early National Period,' in *Immigrant Entrepreneurship: German-American Business Biographies, 1720 to the Present*, vol. 1, edited by Marianne S. Wokeck (Washington, DC: German Historical Institute). Last modified February 12, 2015. <http://www. immigrantentrepreneurship.org/entry. php?rec=229>; Fertig, "Transatlantic Migration from the German-Speaking Parts of Central Europe," 232; Grubb, *German Immigration and Servitude in America*, 90-91; Wokeck, "German Immigration to Colonial America: Prototype of a Transatlantic Mass Migration," 7-8; Wokeck, *Trade in Strangers*, xxviii, 44, 51.

[12] Grubb, *German Immigration and Servitude in America*, 90-91; Wokeck, 'German Immigration to Colonial America,' 7-8; Wokeck, *Trade,* 48.

[13] Henry Keppele, Henry Keppele Family Record Book, German American Collection Ms. Coll. AM 625.2, Joseph P. Horner Library of the German Society of Pennsylvania (Horner Library), Philadelphia, 1-2; Rosalind J. Beiler, I*mmigrant and Entrepreneur: The Atlantic World of Caspar Wistar, 1650–1750* (University Park, PA, The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2008), 5-6; Insa Kummer, 'Caspar Wistar' In *Immigrant Entrepreneurship: German-American Business Biographies, 1720 to the Present*, vol. 1, edited by Marianne S. Wokeck. German Historical Institute. Last modified September 25, 2014. <http://www.immigrantentrepreneur- ship.org/entry.php?rec=1>; Michael Reed Mennich, *A Memoir of the First Treasurer of the United States with Chronological Data* (Philadelphia: Michael Reed Mennich, 1905), 12-13; Birte Pfleger, *Ethnicity Matters: A History of the German Society of Pennsylvania* (Washington, DC: German Historical Institute, 2006), 9; *Publications of The Genealogical Society of Pennsylvania* 9.1 (1924): 51-52.

[14] Fogleman, *Hopeful Journeys*, 35.

[15] Henry Keppele, Henry Keppele Family Record Book, German American Collection Ms. Coll. AM 625.2, Horner Library, 1-2; Beiler, *Immigrant and Entrepreneur*, 1, 12; Insa Kummer, 'Caspar Wistar.'

[16] Beiler, *Immigrant and Entrepreneur*, 2, 6.

[17] Rosalind J. Beiler, 'From the Rhine to the Delaware Valley: The Eighteenth-Century Transatlantic Trading Channels of Caspar Wistar', in Hartmut Lehmann, Hermann Wellen- reuther, and Renate Wilson eds., *In Search of Peace and Prosperity: New German Settlements in Eighteenth-Century Europe and America* (University Park, PA, The Pennsylvania State Univer- sity Press, 2000); Beiler, *Immigrant and Entrepreneur*, 1, 5l; Milton Rubincam, 'The Wistar-Wister Family: A Pennsylvania Family's Contributions Toward American Cultural Development,' *Pennsylvania History* 20.2 (1953): 143, n. 1.

[18] *The Pennsylvania Gazette,* October 26, 1749; Pfleger, *Ethnicity Matters*, 9; Birte Pfleger, 'John Henry Keppele,' in *Immigrant Entrepreneurship: German-American Business Biographies, 1720 to the Present*, vol. 1, ed. Marianne S. Wokeck, German Historical Institute, last modified July 13, 2015, <http://immigrantentrepreneurship.org/entry. php?rec =7>; A. G. Roeber, *Palatines, Liberty, and Property: German Lutherans in Colonial British America* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998), 124.

[19] Pensylvanische Berichte August 1, 1754; *The Pennsylvania Gazette* May 27, 1756; United States Department of the Interior, National Parks Service, National Register of Historical Places Inventory—Nomination Form (Form 10-300) for Elfreth's Alley (Historic District), <https://npgallery.nps.gov/GetAsset?assetID=1eb13716-03fd-4855-a49a-7b8bafbd6866>

[20] *PPennsylvanische Fama*, March 17, 1750; *Der Wöchentliche Philadelphische Staatsbote*, February 16, 1767; *Der Wöchentliche Philadelphische Staatsbote*, June 8, 1767; *Publications of The Genealogical Society of Pennsylvania* 9:1, 1924, 51-52; Michael Reed Mennich, *A Memoir of the First Treasurer of the United States*, 12-13; Roeber, *Palatines, Liberty, and Property*, 124.

[21] J. H. Elliott, *Empires of the Atlantic World: Britain and Spain in America 1492–1830* (New Haven, CT, Yale University Press, 2006), 181, 262; Charles H. Glatfelter, *Pastors and People: German Lutheran and Reformed Churches in the Pennsylvania Field, 1717–1793* (Breinigsville, PA, The Pennsylvania German Society, 1981), 411; Roger D. Simon, *Philadelphia: A Brief History* (University Park PA: The Pennsylvania Historical Association), 2003, 6; Sam Bass Warner Jr., *The Private City: Philadelphia in Three Periods in Its Growth* (Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania, 1968), 11. In 1749 Benjamin Franklin and several other Pennsylvania colonists made a count of the houses of Philadelphia and estimated the city's population to be 12,000 people. Wilbur C. Plummer, 'Consumer Credit in Colonial Philadelphia', *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 66.4 (1942), 385.

[22] Thomas M. Doerflinger, *A Vigorous Spirit of Enterprise: Merchants and Economic De- velopment in Revolutionary Philadelphia* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press,

published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1986), 15; Arthur L. Jensen, *The Maritime Commerce of Colonial Philadelphia* (Madison, WI, State Historical Society of Wisconsin for the Department of History, University of Wisconsin, 1963), 2, 5, 7-9; Joseph J. Kelley, *Life and Times in Colonial Philadelphia* (Harrisburg, PA: Stackpole Book, 1973), 46.

[23] Margrit Schulte Beerbühl, 'Naturalization and Economic Integration: The German Merchant Community in Eighteenth-century London', in Randolph Vigne, Charles Littleton, eds., *From Strangers to Citizens: The Integration of Immigrant Communities in Britain, Ireland and Colonial America, 1550-1750* (Brighton: Sussex Academic Press, 2001), 512; Margrit Schulte Beerbühl, *The Forgotten Majority: German Merchants in London, Naturalization, and Global Trade 1660–1815* (New York: Berghahn, 2015), 6, 248.

[24] Beiler, *Immigrant and Entrepreneur*, 104-5; Rosalind J. Beiler, 'Smuggling Goods or Moving Households? The Legal Status of German-speaking Immigrants in the First British Empire', in Walter G. Rödel and Helmut Schmahl, eds., *Menschen zwischen zwei Welten: Auswanderung, Ansiedlung, Akkulturation* (Trier: Wissenschaftler Verlag, 2002), 12-13.

[25] Penn Archives Pennsylvania Marriages, Wister and Butler Families Papers, Collection 1962 Series 10 Box 33 Folder 2, Historical Society of Pennsylvania (HSP), Philadelphia; Beiler, 'From the Rhine to the Delaware Valley' 175-176; Beiler, *Immigrant and Entrepreneur*, 105-107, 137-138; Beiler, 'Smuggling Goods or Moving Households?', 15, 18.

[26] *A Collection of Statutes Connected with the Administration of the Law; Arranged According to Order of Subjects, with Notes, By William David Evans, Esq., Vice-Chancellor of the County Palatine of Lancaster* (London: J. Butterworth and Son, 1817), 14-16.

[27] *Pensylvanische Berichte*, August 1, 1754; *The Pennsylvania Gazette*, May 27, 1756; John

J. McCusker, Ships Registered at the Port of Philadelphia Before 1776: A Computerized List- ing, Collection 3235, HSP.

[28] Roeber, *Palatines, Liberty, and Property*, 124.

[29] *Der Wöchentliche Philadelphische Staatsbote*, March 28, 1763; *Der Wöchentliche Philadelphische Staatsbote*, May 28, 1764.

[30] *Der Wöchentliche Philadelphische Staatsbote*, October 7, 1765.

[31] Christopher Pechin to John Steinmetz, October 26, 1762, Jasper Yeates Brinton Col- lection, Collection 1619, Series 1 Box 1 Folder 2, HSP; Christopher Pechin to John Steinmetz, October 30, 1762, Jasper Yeates Brinton Collection, Collection 1619, Series 1 Box 1 Folder 2, HSP; Christopher Pechin to John Steinmetz, April 19, 1763, Jasper Yeates Brinton Collec- tion, Collection 1619, Series 1 Box 1 Folder 2, HSP; John Fell to John Steinmetz, October 6? 1763, Jasper Yeates Brinton Collection, Collection 1619, Series 1 Box 1 Folder 2, HSP; "Freights from Jamaica to Europe," August 25, 1773, Jasper Yeates Brinton Collection, Collec- tion 1619, Series 1 Box 5 Folder 15, HSP; "Sundry goods on board the Catharine for Jamaica on Freight Shipped by the following persons," November 10, 1773, Jasper Yeates Brinton Collection, Collection 1619, Series 1 Box 13 Folder 4, HSP; Bill of Lading of James Sutton of Catherine, November 24, 1773, Jasper Yeates Brinton Collection, Collection 1619, Series 1 Box 13 Folder 3, HSP; Pigou & Booth to John Steinmetz, September 22, 1774, Jasper Yeates Brinton Collection, Collection 1619, Series 1 Box 13 Folder 4, HSP; Thomas M. Doerflinger, 'Commercial Specialization in Philadelphia's Merchant Community, 1750–1791' in *The Busi- ness History Review* 57.1 (1983): 24, 36; Plummer, 'Consumer Credit in Colonial Philadelphia', 387-88, 396.

[32] "Form of a Bond give in the Plantations to load Iron and Lumber, agreeable to the Acts of the 4th of Geo. III Cap. 15. And 5th of Geo. III. Cap. 45," May 16, 1768, Port of Philadelphia Customs House Records, Collection 157, vol. 8, leaf 981, HSP; *Der Wöchentliche Philadelphische Staatsbote*, July 19, 1768; Parr and Bulkeley to Henry Keppele and Son, May 14, 1771, Jasper Yeates Brinton Collection, Collection 1619, Series 1 Box 5 Folder 12, HSP; Bennet J. Hill and Margaret Howe Hill, "William Fisher, Early Philadelphia Quaker, and his Eighteenth Century Descendants Surnamed Bradford, Brown, Browne, Bunner, Cavender, Cooper, Corker,

Fisher, Hartley, Leaming, Lloyd, Lyon, Trotter, and Wilson," *The Pennsylvania Genealogical Magazine* 21.4 (1960): 290-91.

[33] Parr and Bulkeley to Henry Keppele & Son, May 14, 1771, Jasper Yeates Brinton Col- lection, Collection 1619, Series 1 Box 5 Folder 12, HSP; Parr and Bulkeley to Henry Keppele and Son, September 9, 1771, Jasper Yeates Brinton Collection, Collection 1619, Series 1 Box 5 Folder 12, HSP; Parr and Bulkeley to Henry Keppele and John Steinmetz, April 24, 1772, Jasper Yeates Brinton Collection, Collection 1619, Series 1 Box 5 Folder 13, HSP; Commyns Brothers & Power to Mr. Keppele and Mr. Steinmetz, May 18, 1772, Jasper Yeates Brinton Collection, Collection 1619, Series 1 Box 5 Folder 13, HSP; Parr, Berkeley, & Co. to Henry Keppele and John Steinmetz, June 19, 1772, Jasper Yeates Brinton Collection, Collection 1619, Series 1 Box 5 Folder 14, HSP; Parr, Bulkeley, & Co. to Messieurs Keppele and Stein- metz, November 27, 1772, Jasper Yeates Brinton Collection, Collection 1619, Series 1 Box 5 Folder 14, HSP; Commyns Brothers & Power to Henry Keppele and John Steinmetz, Febru- ary 11, 1773, Jasper Yeates Brinton Collection, Collection 1619, Series 1 Box 5 Folder 15, HSP; *The Pennsylvania Gazette*, June 16, 1773; Parr, Bulkeley, & Co. to Henry Keppele Sr. and John Steinmetz, August 12, 1773, Jasper Yeates Brinton Collection, Collection 1619, Se- ries 1 Box 5 Folder 15, HSP; "[Account] Sales of 1157 [Barrels] Flour, 35 [Barrels] Ship stuff, 2730 [Bushels] Indian Corn, [15,000] Pipe, 7,700 [Hogshead], & [1,900] [Barrel] Staves [per] the Charming Peggy, [Samuel] Davison [Master] [from] [Philadelphia] & Sold here on [Account] of Messrs. Henry Keppele & John Steinmetz of said place," August 12, 1773, Jasper Yeates Brinton Collection, Collection 1619, Series 1 Box 13 Folder 5; Invoice of merchandise shipped by Parr Bulkeley & Co on the Charming Peggy for Falmouth and Philadelphia on account and risk of Henry Keppele Senr. and John Steinmetz, September 1, 1773, Jasper Yeates Brinton Collection, Collection 1619, Series 1 Box 6 Folder 1, HSP; *Der Wöchentliche Pennsylvanische Staatsbote*, December 7, 1773; *The Pennsylvania Gazette*, December 8, 1773; *Der Wöchentliche Pennsylvanische Staatsbote*, January 3, 1775.

[34] Fogleman, *Hopeful Journeys*, 6; Moltmann, 'German Migration to America in the Colonial Period and the Redemptioner System', 30; Pfleger, 'Between Subject and Citizen', 7; Wokeck, *Trade* Appendix: German Immigrant Voyages, 1683–1775.

[35] Wokeck, *Trade,* 93, 107-8, 111.

[36] *Pensylvanische Berichte*, December 16, 1754; Grubb, *German Immigration and Servitude in America*, 62-63; Wokeck, *Trade,* Appendix: German Immigrant Voyages, 1683–1775, 245, 265.

[37] Grubb, *German Immigration and Servitude in America*, 23; Wokeck, *Trade in Strangers*, 66 n. 20.

[38] Passenger Articles with James Sutton of Catharine, March 15, 1773, Jasper Yeates Brinton Collection, Collection 1619, Series 1 Box 16 Folder 8, HSP; "Passengers from London [per] the Catharine arrived at Philadelphia April 28 1773," c. 1773, Jasper Yeates Brinton Collection, Collection 1619, Series 1 Box 8 Folder 4, HSP; Mark Häberlein, 'Migration and Business Ventures: German-Speaking Migrants and Commercial Networks in the Eighteenth- Century British Atlantic World', in John R. Davis, Margrit Schulte Beerbühl, and Stefan Manz eds., *Transnational Networks: German Migrants in the British Empire, 1670–1914* Leiden: Brill, 2012, 21; Wokeck, *Trade* 81, 112, Appendix: German Immigrant Voyages, 1683–1775.

[39] John J. McCusker, Ships Registered at the Port of Philadelphia Before 1776: A Com- puterized Listing, Collection 3235, HSP; Wokeck, *Trade* Appendix: German Immigrant Voy- ages, 1683–1775.

[40] *Der Wöchentliche Philadelphische Staatsbote*, November 19, 1764.

[41] 'In memory of the 210th anniversary of the landing of the first German settlers in America', Philadelphia, 1893, 44, German American Collection, Pamphlet AE 10.9, Horner Library; "Protocol des Secretarii Der Teutschen Gesellschafft in Philadelphia," German Ameri- can Collection, AE 1.1, 28, 43, 45, Horner Library; Birte Pfleger, 'John Henry Keppele'; Os- wald Seiden-

sticker, *Geschichte der Deutschen Gesellschaft von Pennsylvanien: Von der Grundung im Jahre 1764 bis zur Jubelfrier der Republik 1875* Philadelphia, Graf & Breuninger, 1917, 253.

[42] "Protocol des Secretarii," German American Collection, AE 1.1, 21, 23-24, 26, Horner Library..

[43] *TThe Statues at Large of Pennsylvania from 1682 to 1801*, William Stanley Ray, 1898, 94-97; Hartmut Bickelmann, [J.P.D. Toalster trans.,] 'The Venture of Travel," in Günter Moltmann, ed., *Germans to America: 300 Years of Immigration 1683 to 1983* Stuttgart, Eugen Heinz Druck- und Verlagsgesellschaft mbH, 1982, 48; Karl Frederick Geiser, *Redemptioners and Indentured Servants in the Colony and Commonwealth of Pennsylvania* New Haven, The Tuttle, Morehouse, & Taylor Co., 1901, 60-64; Grubb, *German Immigration*, 77-78; Pfleger, 'Between Subject and Citizen,' 39.

[44] Seidensticker, *Geschichte der Deutschen* 46-47.

[45] Geiser, *Redemptioners and Indentured Servants*, 65-66; Pfleger, "Between Subject and Citizen," 44-45.

[46] *The Statues at Large of Pennsylvania from 1682 to 1801*, 433, 435-36, 439-40.

[47] Ibid., 434, 436, 439-440.

[48] Ibid., 434-435, 438-440.

[49] *Pennsylvania Gazette*, May 29, 1755; *Votes and Proceedings of the House of Representa- tives of the Province of Pennsylvania Beginning the Fourteenth Day of October, 1758* Philadelphia, Henry Miller, 1775, 147; Thomas Scharf and Thompson Westcott, *History of Philadelphia, 1609–1884* Philadelphia, L.H. Everts & Co., 1884, 1884-1885.

[50] Philipp Münch, 'German Language Almanacs in Revolutionary Pennsylvania', in William A. Pencak,ed., *Pennsylvania's Revolution*, University Park PA, Pennsylvania State Univer- sity Press, 2010, 57.

[51] 'In memory of the 210th anniversary', 41, 43, German American Collection, Pamphlet AE 10.9, Horner Library; Pfleger, *Ethnicity Matters*, 9.

[52] James D. Boyd, 'An Investigation into the Structural Causes of German-American Mass Migration in the Nineteenth Century', Ph.D. diss., Cardiff University, 2013, 24, 114; Aaron S. Fogleman, 'From Slaves, Convicts, and Servants to Free Passengers: The Transformation of Immigration in the Era of the American Revolution', 51, 64-65.

[53] Jessica Choppin Roney, *Governed by a Spirit of Opposition: The Origins of American Political Practice in Colonial Philadelphia* Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 2014, 161-162..

[54] *Der Wöchentliche Pennsylvanische Staatsbote*, October 2, 1770; Thomas M. Doerflinger, 'Philadelphia Merchants and the Logic of Moderation, 1760–1775', in *The William and Mary Quarterly* 40:2, 1983, 218-219; Jane T. Merritt, 'Tea Trade, Consumption, and the Republican Paradox in pre-Revolutionary Philadelphia', *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 182:2, 2004, 134, 136; Simon, *Philadelphia: A Brief History*, 20.

[55] "Resolution of Non-Importation Made by the Citizens of Philadelphia," Treasures Collection (HSP.Treasures) Am.340, HSP; John Russel Young, ed., *Memorial History of the City of Philadelphia, From its First Settlement to the Year 1895* New York, New York History Company, 1895, 368-370.

[56] Pennsylvania Gazette, December 12 1774; Doerflinger, 'Philadelphia Merchants and the Logic of Moderation', 223; Hezekiah Niles, *Principles and Acts of the Revolution in America: or, An Attempt to Collect and Preserve Some of the Speeches, Orations, & Proceedings, with Sketches and Remarks on Men and Things, and Other Fugitive or Neglected Pieces, belonging to the men of the revolutionary period in the United States* Baltimore, W.O. Niles, 1822, 180; Richard Alan Ryerson, *The Revolution is Now Begun: The Radical Committee of Philadelphia, 1765–1776* Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1978, 73, appendix M; Simon, *Philadelphia: A Brief History*, 23; Wolfgang Splitter, 'The Germans in Pennsylvania Politics, 1758–1790: A Quantitative Analysis', *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 122:1&2, 1998, 56 n. 43-44.

[57] Sara Kinkel, 'Disciplining the Empire: Georgian Politics, Social Hierarchy, and the Rise of the British Navy, 1725-1775' Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 2012, chapter 5; Stephen Conway, "British Governments, Colonial Consumers, and Continental European Goods in the British Atlantic Empire, 1763-1775," *The Historical Journal* 58:3 (2015), 712, 720-21.

[58] A five-year exception was given to the recently conquered Francophone territories of Canada and Grenada. Danby Pickering, *The Statues at Large from Magna Charta to the End of the Eleventh Parliament of Great Britain, Anno 1761* (Cambridge: Joseph Bentham for Charles Bathurst, 1765), 188.

[59] *The Pennsylvania Packet or the General Advertiser*, November 4 1779; 'In memory of the 210th anniversary' 44, German American Collection, Pamphlet AE 10.9, Horner Library. 60 Thomas Mason, "Journal of my proceedings from the Commencement, until the Conclusion of my Voyage," Henry Pleasants Jr. Collection, Collection 1508. Folder 35, HSP

[60] Thomas Mason, "Journal of my proceedings from the Commencement, until the Conclusion of my Voyage," Henry Pleasants Jr. Collection, Collection 1508. Folder 35, HSP

[61] John W. Jordan, ed., *Colonial Families of Philadelphia* (New York: The Lewis Publishing Company, 1911), 1159; Ryerson, *The Revolution is Now Begun*, 173; Scharf and Westcott, *History of Philadelphia, 1609–1884*, 322-23; Warner, *The Private City*, 27, Table 5 part 1.

[62] Worthington C. Ford et al., eds., *Journals of the Continental Congress, 1774–1789* (Washington, DC, 1904–1937), 194.

[63] 'The Plan of the Bank of Pennsylvania, Established for Supplying the Army of the United States with Provisions for Two Months', *The New Jersey Gazette*, July 5, 1780.

[64] Jordan, *Colonial Families of Philadelphia*, 1159-60; William T. Parsons, *Another Rung Up the Ladder: German Reformed People in American Struggles 1754–1783* (Collegeville, PA: Chestnut Books, 1976), 13.

[65] Boyd, 'An Investigation', 2, 114; Wokeck, *Trade*, chapter. 5.

[66] David Blackbourn, 'Germany and the Birth of the Modern World, 1780-1820', *Bulletin of the German Historical Institute* 51 (2012): esp. 11-12.

David Barnes

Soul-Sellers, Herring-Boxes, and Desperate Emigrants: A Recipe for Ship Fever in the Early Nineteenth Century

In 1804, a riot by detained German immigrants caused hundreds of dollars of damage to Philadelphia's state-of-the-art new quarantine station, known as the Lazaretto. The Lazaretto opened in 1801 as a means of breaking the cycle of yellow fever epidemics that had devastated the city four times between 1793 and 1799. Overcrowded shipboard conditions and cruel deprivation during the long ocean journey pushed the passengers of the ship Rebecca to the limits of their patience. A flotilla of immigrant vessels, each loaded with exhausted and near-starving Germans, many suffering from "ship fever" (epidemic typhus), arrived at the Lazaretto within days of one another, and taxed the station's capacity and supplies beyond their limits.[1]

The *Rebecca* riot of 1804 reminds us that enslaved Africans were not the only victims of human trafficking in the United States. While African chattel slavery would tear the country apart within a few decades, a different kind of coerced servitude flourished in Philadelphia, the capital of the early abolition movement. Those aboard the Rebecca who did not have enough money to pay their passage were "redemptioners." Their unpaid fares were 'redeemed' through labor on the American side. The word even contains a hint of spiritual uplift. But the riot of the Rebecca's redemptioners at the Lazaretto in 1804 gives us a glimpse of the underbelly of America's immigration history. The patriotic mythology of the Statue of Liberty—"I lift my lamp beside the golden door"—has always been at best a very partial representation of that history. But seen from the Lazaretto, where those redemptioners lucky enough to have survived their journeys were disgorged half-dead while ship owners collected their handsome passage fees, the myth seems almost obscene.

The Soul-Selling Business

It was more than the call of freedom or the flight from want that brought these German immigrants to the Lazaretto.[2] Their journey was made possible by a sophisticated and profitable industry, designed to turn the hopes of the poor into cash. Like most redemptioners, the *Rebecca*'s passengers were recruited by "Newlanders" (*Neuländer*)—earlier German-speaking American immigrants who were paid by the ship owners and brokers for recruiting further migrants to follow in their footsteps. From Aarau to Tübingen to Bad Dürkheim to Darmstadt, the Newlanders criss-crossed the most promising regions, where poverty and dislocation had prepared the ground, and where emigration patterns had already been established. Dressed in their finest clothes, complete with ruffles, wigs, and jewelry, they touted America as a place of easy riches. They "conduct[ed] themselves as men of opulence," one victim complained, "in order to inspire the people with the desire to live in a country of such wealth and abundance."

> They would convince one that there are in America, none but Elysian fields abounding in products which require no labor; that the mountains are full of gold and silver, and the wells and springs gush forth milk and honey; that he who goes there as a servant, becomes a lord; as a maid, a gracious lady; as a peasant, a nobleman; as a commoner or craftsman, a baron.

"Now, as everyone by nature desires to better his condition," the rueful emigrant concluded, "who would not wish to go to such a country!".[3]

The emigrant paid more than the cost of the ocean passage. Newlanders might extort their own fee, or volunteer to take possession of the traveler's cash for "safekeeping." All worldly possessions were packed into trunks as the journey down the Rhine began. Each city or principality along the way charged its own customs duty—several dozen in all—as delays and expenses mounted. It could take weeks to reach Rotterdam or Amsterdam, where the waiting continued for the departure of an America-bound ship. Even those who had left home with money in hand were by then often broke or in debt. The ship's captain or his agents often paid off the emigrants' debts, adding the amount—plus interest—to the fare for the passage. When the time finally came to board the ship and set sail, both the trunks of belongings and the Newlander who had promised to be on the same ship and to safeguard money and valuables were often nowhere to be found. Little wonder that the Newlanders came to be known as *Seelenverkäufer*—"soul-sellers."[4]

Each individual or family agreed on a fare with the captain before departure. In this human cargo trade, bodies were money, and sea captains had every incentive to cram as many of them aboard as possible. Emigrants were "packed like herring in a box," it was said at the time—averaging 300 passengers in the smaller vessels (under 200 tons cargo capacity) and reaching up to 800 passengers in the larger ships (250–300 tons capacity) at the height of the trade. Some passengers were forced to sleep on deck, exposed to the elements. Belowdecks, even the cleanest vessel quickly turned foul when crowded with so many sweating, itching, eating, belching, flatulating, excreting, unwashed bodies. Even without any infectious disease, routine seasickness layered another sour stench over the acrid smell of crowded bodies. But these human herring-boxes were also hothouses for "ship fever" or typhus, the disease that killed thousands of immigrants to North America in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. ("The lice abound so frightfully," said one German passenger on a redemptioner's ship in 1750, "that they can be scraped off the body."[5] In 1909, the human body louse was identified as the vector that carries the germ of epidemic typhus from person to person.)

Wind and weather determined the length of the passage. In unfavorable conditions, cheek-by-jowl in the fetid cargo hold, the hours felt like days, the weeks like lifetimes, and the sickness and death were inescapable. "There is on board these ships," one passenger lamented, "terrible misery, stench, fumes, horror, vomiting, many kinds of sea-sickness, fever, dysentery, headache, heat, constipation, boils, scurvy, cancer, mouth-rot, and the like, all of which come from old and sharply salted food and meat, also from very bad and foul water, so that many die miserably." Quality and quantity of food and water were a constant source of complaint. A rock-hard biscuit or two and a few ladles of a brownish liquid that once resembled water was often a day's full diet. Captains rationed supplies strictly, and whipping or beating awaited anyone who demanded more. If the voyage was unexpectedly long, and the food and water ran out or spoiled, then the human cargo simply went hungry and thirsty. Experienced traders knew that delivering strong, healthy laborers upon arrival meant higher profits, so they had an incentive to safeguard the health of their cargo. But the many opportunistic merchants who quickly converted their cargo holds for emigrant passage in order to profit from surges of migration paid little attention to providing for their passengers. Illness and death were costs of doing business; besides, in many cases, if a passenger died past the halfway point of the journey, surviving relatives were required to pay the deceased's full passage.[6]

In 1750 and again in 1765, the Pennsylvania Assembly passed laws aimed at curbing the worst abuses of redemptioners and other immigrants, for example by limiting the number of passengers per ship and requiring a

minimum square footage per passenger. But the arm of Pennsylvania's law did not reach as far as the European ports of embarkation, and the new rules proved impossible to enforce. In response to the persistently dreadful plight of the redemptioners, a group of German immigrants joined in 1764 to form the German Society of Pennsylvania. The society fought to help new arrivals and (with only marginal success) to protect immigrants from the worst effects of the entrenched system of redemption and servitude.[7] The tide of emigrants from German lands ebbed and flowed in the subsequent decades, but in the early years of the Napoleonic Wars, Germans again flocked to Philadelphia in large numbers under the redemptioner system.[8] Jefferson's Embargo Act of 1807 then turned off the faucet, but pent-up demand for emigration and the agricultural catastrophe of "the year without a summer" flooded Philadelphia with well over four thousand Germans in 1817 alone. During the peak years, fully a third of the German migrants were redemptioners or other servants.[9]

The Long Journey of the ship *Hope*, 1817

During the 1817 wave of crisis migration, thirteen years after the Rebecca riot, conditions deteriorated in the carrying trade. Hundreds of Germans aboard another ship bound from Amsterdam to Philadelphia were "close to a revolution," in the words of one survivor of the ill-fated journey. This ship was called *Hope*, and hope was nearly lost—many times over. Much of the *Hope*'s misfortune can be traced to factors beyond human control, but the decisions made by the ship's owner, captain, and crew before and during the voyage show just how expendable they considered its cargo to be.

In the early spring of 1817,—twenty-six-year-old Rosina Gös left her home in the village of Sasbach on the edge of the Black Forest, just across the Rhine from the French city of Strasbourg. With were her husband Matthias, also twenty-six, and their four-year-old son George. It is possible that she did not know it yet, but as she undertook this long and perilous journey, Rosina was pregnant. Along with a group of emigrants from their region, the Gös family headed down the Rhine toward Amsterdam. At some point, the Black Forest group met another group of emigrants from the Aargau district in northern Switzerland, including thirty-four-year-old Jacob Hilfiker, his wife Maria, and their eighteen-month-old son Rudolph, and the lot of them—350 strong—set sail for Philadelphia from the island of Texel just north of Amsterdam.[10] It was the eighth of May, 1817, the wind was favorable, and Captain Geelt Klein of the Dutch ship *Hope* was looking forward to a smooth, quick, and profitable passage.

The good luck lasted just a few minutes. As soon as the *Hope* made it out into the North Sea, the wind disappeared, and for the next eight days the jam-

packed ship floated aimlessly, either absolutely still or fighting a headwind. When the wind finally picked up on May 16, the ship made quick progress into the English Channel. Noticing that the delay had made a severe dent in their food provisions, the passengers asked the captain to land somewhere in England to replenish the supplies. He refused, telling them they had plenty of food for the rest of the journey.

They soon found themselves in the open ocean in strong winds. On June 4, a ship from Morocco sailed near and greeted the *Hope* with a barrage of gunfire, setting out a boat for a boarding party. Captain Klein mustered the crew and as many passengers as possible on deck, arming them with the ship's entire supply of guns and swords. This show of strength deterred the pirates, who promptly made a half moon around the *Hope* and sailed away. Not long after, a violent storm appeared almost without warning, and for two full days and nights battered the ship mercilessly. The masts were nearly snapped off, and almost all of the sails and ropes were torn down. The costly damage and the delay for emergency repairs was bad enough; even worse was the effect on Captain Klein, who became so terrified of further damage—which would cost him money—that for the rest of the journey, as soon as the wind grew strong, he ordered the sails lowered. He gave up entirely on the topmost and side sails. The ship slowed to a plodding pace. After seven weeks at sea, the passengers expected to see the North American mainland any day. When they saw mountains, they were confused, until word spread that they were looking at the Azores, the Portuguese island chain barely a third of the way across the Atlantic. The immigrants' spirits were crushed. They looked at their meager food supplies in despair. Ever since the North Sea delay, Klein had reduced all food and water rations by a third. Realizing that they faced the real prospect of actual starvation, the passengers pulled together enough energy to turn hopelessness to anger. They demanded that the captain land in the Azores and buy food. "We were close to a revolution," survivor Adrian Märk remembered later. When a gang of passengers threatened him, Klein linked arms with all of his crew and faced down the mutineers. There would be no stopping for supplies.

As June turned to July and the *Hope* crept slowly westward, the immigrants' hunger grew worse. Illnesses of all kinds took hold, and the weakened bodies were powerless to fight them off. Ship fever spread throughout the cargo hold that served as the passenger cabin. The deaths began with a family from the Black Forest group; only the youngest son survived to watch his loved ones weighted down with shot, sewed into sailcloth shrouds, and dropped overboard to sink into eternity. A passenger from the Aargau group had been hired as the ship's doctor, but he had been given almost no medications and was all but powerless in those conditions. A few days after the first

deaths, a ship from Liverpool sailed near. Hearing of the widespread hunger and illness aboard the *Hope*, the English captain offered food and medicine. Klein refused the offer. The *Hope*'s passengers, so weak they couldn't stand upright, watched the other ship sail away, its passengers dancing gaily on deck.

It had been eight weeks since Amsterdam. There was no more meat, no more butter, no more cheese or even vinegar or liquor. Captain Klein was now allowing half a daily ration of water every three or four days. The bread was "moldy and inedible," Adrian Märk recalled. The captain had stopped distributing wood for cooking, so the remaining rations of peas, barley, and rice were useless. Adults received only a drinking glass of soup per day. Illness was everywhere, and the pace of death accelerated. Not a day went by without at least one sailcloth casket being dumped into the sea. To make matters worse, it was discovered that thirty of the thirty-two water barrels allocated to the passengers had sprung leaks. Those well enough to do so were reduced to collecting rainwater that had accumulated on deck; it smelled like asphalt and garbage, and no matter how thirsty they were, many could not keep it down. Märk recalled simply, "Our misery was great."

Progress continued to be slow. Four times in the last two weeks of July, the ship got tangled in huge patches of seagrass. Another storm tossed the *Hope* around for four days, forcing the starving Germans to stay belowdecks surrounded by ship fever, and pushing them back eastward as if taunting them. By now, all but three of the crew were also sick, and there were not enough able-bodied hands on deck to guide the ship safely through the storm. Finally—the weary passengers thanked God for at last hearing their desperate prayers—the weather calmed, and five days of favorable winds carried the *Hope* swiftly toward the American mainland. One night, there was a light in the distance. Captain Klein had a big lantern hung at the top of the storm mast, and an hour later, a boat arrived carrying the pilot who would guide the ship through Cape Henlopen and Cape May, and up the Delaware Bay and River toward Philadelphia.

When the pilot boarded the ship, he blanched with horror. The crew and passengers looked more dead than alive. Sensing the urgency of the situation, he overrode the Klein's timidity and ordered all sails hoisted. Only a few passengers were able to stand on deck and take in the scenery. Märk's heart surged with relief and awe at the sight of the New World, with the "dark green oak woods" and "beautiful meadows and plantations" on the banks of the Delaware. The *Hope* sped upriver, making up for lost time, and reached the Lazaretto on August 7. It had been ninety-two days since the departure from Texel. In Märk's words, "the healthiest of us looked like dead."[11]

Shock and Reckoning: The *Hope* at the Lazaretto

The flood of German immigrants to Philadelphia that year—more than forty percent of them redemptioners—was well underway at the time. The previous peak year was 1804, the year that culminated in the *Rebecca* passengers' riot. Even before that crisis, the Lazaretto officials had found themselves utterly unable to accommodate so many people in quarantine at one time. After an appeal to the state legislature for funds, in early 1805 the Board of Health erected a new building at the Lazaretto—informally called the "Dutch House," thanks to a common confusion between Dutch and *Deutsch*—for the accommodation of healthy passengers under quarantine. But nothing could have prepared the Lazaretto officials for the 1817 season, when Germans came to Philadelphia at more than double the rate of 1804.[12]

The first ship Lazaretto physician George Lehman and quarantine master Christopher O'Conner inspected on August 7 was the ship *Johanna & Elizabeth*, also from Amsterdam, carrying 421 redemptioners and other migrants. Because of the overcrowding he found aboard, Lehman detained the vessel, admitted the sick to the Lazaretto hospital, and sent the remaining passengers to the Dutch House. Then he saw the *Hope*.[13]

During the official questioning, Captain Klein reported just a few cases of illness aboard. Lehman had been on the job for only two months. Just twenty-four years old, he was barely four years out of the University of Pennsylvania medical school, but his political connections to Democratic Governor Simon Snyder got him appointed to the Board of Health the previous year, in 1816. He would go on to serve for nineteen years on Tinicum Island, more than three times longer than any other doctor in the Lazaretto's history. When he finally retired, he had seen it all. But on that August morning in 1817, he didn't need years of experience. He had only to open his eyes to dismiss Klein's protestations out of hand. He had never seen anything like the groaning mass of gaunt, pale creatures he found aboard the *Hope*. The ship had left Amsterdam with 346 passengers aboard. Forty-eight had been buried at sea. Ten or twelve more arrived showing just the faintest signs of life, and did not survive long enough to be admitted into the Lazaretto hospital, which immediately filled up with the most desperate cases. About 120 were so sick that they were unable to eat or drink. "Most of those remaining," Lehman reported, "were so feeble and exhausted that they could with difficulty walk to the house provided for their reception."[14]

Lehman had a job to do, and it was getting more overwhelming by the minute. He immediately sent word to turn the passengers from the *Johanna & Elizabeth* around, and send them back aboard their ship for the time being. It was crowded and dirty, but it was palatial compared to what Lehman saw

on the *Hope*. Those passengers from the *Hope* who were least acutely ill were sent to the Dutch House. Amid the confusion and sickness, stepping over corpses and soon-to-be-corpses, Lehman could barely stifle his anger. Reflecting on that moment a day or two later, he wrote:

> Justice and humanity demanded that the *Hope*, in her wretched situation . . . should be first attended. She is a living sepulcher. The slave trade has been abolished, as contrary to the laws of God; so should this inhuman traffic. Three, four, and five hundred poor and ignorant creatures, are stowed in one vessel, conveyed to a far distant country, living on provisions that we would sometimes hesitate to give our beasts.

The quality of the *Hope*'s bread became notorious. Coarse and sour even when not moldy, it was roughly ground from the chaff and the hard outer layers of whatever grain it came from, with little actual flour. Lehman said even hogs wouldn't eat it. A newspaper said a piece of it "would cause the blood of every human person to chill." Another observer called it "the worst I ever saw."[15] But what chilled Lehman's blood was more than the quality of the food. It was the entire system that generated profits from misery through what amounted to the purchase and sale of human beings. The ship owner or captain or consignee might be villainous, or perfectly virtuous. It wasn't the individual but the structure of human trafficking itself that caused such suffering, ship after ship, year after year.

Lehman, O'Conner, and Lazaretto steward James McGlathery had little time for philosophizing. A couple of days after the *Johanna & Elizabeth* and the *Hope*, the ship *Vrow Elizabeth* arrived from Amsterdam, also full of German redemptioners (477 total passengers). Then came the *Xenophon*, likewise jammed full of redemptioners: 484 passengers had left Amsterdam, and 49 (mostly children) had died en-route. With the approval of the Board of Health, Lehman ordered the *Johanna & Elizabeth* disinfected as quickly as possible and then sent up to the city with all of her healthy passengers. But that still left well over a thousand passengers at the Lazaretto. Most were destitute, and many were starving and sick. After an emergency meeting with Lehman, the quarantine master, and the Lazaretto steward, the Board of Health reported that "a more distressing scene has not been witnessed at the Lazaretto since its establishment."[16]

The next two weeks were a whirlwind of activity. Of course, the board immediately ordered the vessels under quarantine to be cleaned, whitewashed, and fumigated as extensively as possible, with special procedures prescribed for the *Hope*.[17] But what about all those people? Meeting their immediate

material needs was not only a humane imperative; it could also prevent discontent from boiling over into violence. The board and the quarantine officers were determined not to allow a recurrence of the redemptioners' riot this time. The steward McGlathery had been a member of the Board of Health in the early years of the Tinicum Lazaretto, and he remembered how much trouble provisioning could cause. So did George Budd, a current member of the board. He had been the Lazaretto steward in 1804, when the redemptioners rioted.

It was concerning but not altogether unusual when a passenger from the *Hope* named Swigelar escaped from the Lazaretto with his children during their quarantine. There were known to be occasional breaches in the high fences that surrounded the station. Whenever there was an "elopement," the board put out the word in the city either through informal channels or through newspaper notices. It occasionally offered a reward, and often the escapee was caught and returned to quarantine. What Swigelar did, however, was unheard of. After making his way to Philadelphia, he left his children there and went *back* to the Lazaretto (likely sneaking in through the same hole in the fence). There he was accused of "using such conversation as tended to excite mutiny and dissatisfaction among the passengers." After the harrowing journey of the *Hope*, it shouldn't have been hard to stir up discontent. As soon as McGlathery got wind of this agitation, he put Swigelar under detention at a nearby tavern where he could not be a disruptive influence on the quarantined masses. (The Board of Health sent out a messenger to find his children and place them under proper care.) The troublemaker was later moved to an isolated room in the Lazaretto itself that was used as a prison when needed. This confinement changed Swigelar's attitude; within two days he was released "after making proper concessions for his misconduct."[18]

Meanwhile, McGlathery and the Board of Health had their hands full housing, feeding, clothing, and caring for the arrivals. The Dutch House wasn't big enough to accommodate more than a fraction of them, and all the tents in Philadelphia might not have sufficed. A board delegation met with the U.S. customs collector for the Port of Philadelphia, who agreed to allow the board to temporarily house passengers in the huge customs warehouse next door to the Lazaretto, normally used for storing and ventilating potentially contaminated cargo. The Health Officer hired an emergency assistant physician and two nurses in the city and sent them down to the station right away. All tents in the City Hospital's possession were requisitioned and also sent down. A committee was appointed to make plans for setting aside a wing of the City Hospital for the Germans if necessary. A delegation from the board met with the German Society of Pennsylvania to solicit their help in providing relief for the miserable newcomers. After McGlathery reported that

he couldn't possibly feed so many starving mouths, the board hired a baker to help him. When he needed more food and supplies, the board told him to purchase them and keep a separate account, to be charged to the Philadelphia consignees of the *Hope*. Lehman reported an urgent shortage of medicine, and the board's secretary procured them and sent them down. More nurses were needed—German-speaking ones—and the board hired them. Extra nurses and provisions continued to be requested, and supplied, through the expiration of the quarantine season in October.[19]

Shortly after the *Hope*'s arrival, the board ordered "twenty rough coffins" to be "sent down forthwith." Five days later, they ordered twenty-five more. A month later, twenty-five more. Forty-eight of the *Hope*'s passengers who were alive (if only barely) upon arrival at the Lazaretto died there, bringing the ship's full death toll to ninety-four. Given the eyewitness descriptions, it is surprising not that so many died but that 252 passengers somehow *survived* the voyage and were restored to some semblance of health at the Lazaretto. Some were hospitalized for as long as two months.[20]

The Gös family from the Black Forest—pregnant Rosina, Matthias, and young George—survived. Baby Maria Anna, whose name would soon be Americanized to Mary Ann—was somehow born safely, either at the Lazaretto or not long after their quarantine ended. They became the Gase family of Pennsylvania; a second daughter, Elizabeth, followed four years later. Rosina lived to age 66, and Matthias and the children all survived into their late 70s. Sometime in the 1820s, they moved to Perry County in south central Ohio, then in the 1830s to Seneca County in northwestern Ohio, where many of their descendants still live today. The Hilfikers from Aargau—Jacob, Maria, and little Rudolph—also survived, and settled in Montgomery County north of Philadelphia, where four more children were born over the next ten years. That generation eventually scattered throughout Pennsylvania, Indiana, Illinois, and Nebraska. (Their descendants include the clothing designer Tommy Hilfiger.) Adrian Märk was detained for four weeks with his wife and three children. After recovering from her serious illness, his wife shared a room with a woman who was despondent after the grueling ordeal she had been through. Her threat to commit suicide so traumatized Märk's wife that she fell ill again, and their nursing baby subsequently died. Märk nevertheless credited the medical care and "very good food" they received at the Lazaretto for saving many lives. The family stayed in Philadelphia only three weeks, then bought a carriage and horses and headed west across the mountains, settling in Pittsburgh where Märk found work as a hatmaker.[21]

Meanwhile, the Board of Health set out to recover the extraordinary costs incurred at the Lazaretto because of the *Hope* disaster. The Philadelphia merchant firm of Glazier & Smith was registered as the consignee, and would

normally be responsible for costs associated with its passengers' board and medical care while in quarantine. After the firm did not respond to a request to send down clothing for the *Hope* survivors, the Board of Health sent a delegation to investigate. On August 20, two weeks after the ship's arrival, Glazier and Smith informed the board that after a "disagreement with the captain," the firm no longer considered itself the consignee of the *Hope*. This complicated matters considerably. Another delegation visited the Dutch consul, who insisted that because none of the passengers were Dutch citizens, he had no stake whatsoever in their welfare, but because the ship was Dutch owned, he would defend the owners' interests vigorously. A three-month legal wrangle ensued in which the board's solicitor reaffirmed the collective responsibility of the *Hope*'s owners, captain, and consignee for quarantine-related costs, and the board tried to apportion those costs to the appropriate parties. Two board members spoke with Captain Klein at the Lazaretto in early September, as the *Hope* was being prepared to come up to the city. They told him he would be billed not only for the supplies needed to outfit the ship, but also for all supplies furnished to all passengers and sailors while at the Lazaretto. Klein acknowledged the former, but pretended not to understand the latter. The board finally calculated the total amount due: $2,980.13. It billed Glazier & Smith $404.56 for the expenses incurred while that firm was the consignee of record, and the balance to the "captain or owner." Glazier & Smith paid their bill, and promptly began negotiating on behalf of the Dutch owner. A payment plan was eventually arranged whereby the board received full payment, plus interest.[22]

The German Society of Pennsylvania took little comfort in this financial resolution. As bad as the *Hope* disaster was, it was also a symptom of a larger problem that needed to be addressed. As part of their effort to "assist and relieve" the German immigrants, the society sent John Keemle to the wharves as an interpreter. He was able to get candid first-hand reports from the new arrivals, just out of quarantine, about how they had been treated, and he was angry enough to challenge the captains face to face. Keemle bemoaned the cruel treatment that had reduced his fellow Germans to "the lowest state of poverty and wretchedness," and that forced the society to come to their aid lest they "perish in our streets for want, which as a Christian and enlightened people we cannot tolerate."[23]

The passengers on the ship *Vrow Elizabeth* complained bitterly of harsh treatment at the hands of Captain Blackman. He withheld bread for days on end. He kept them on salt rations as if they were still at sea, and the salt-preserved meat was too salty and tough to chew or swallow. He regularly demanded more money from the passengers for nonexistent expenses or for services that were included in their fare, like medicine and cooking. When

Keemle confronted him, Blackman admitted matter-of-factly, "Yes sir, they are all against me," then waved him off, saying that as a foreign subject he was answerable only to his own country's laws. Keemle shot back that he was mistaken, and that he would abide by Pennsylvania's laws or be banned from the port of Philadelphia. Blackman's response was to complain to Keemle that he had been forced to refund $1,000 in unjustified fees. In their eyes, Keemle reported back to his colleagues at the German Society, the captains were the only law aboard their vessels.[24]

After visiting several other immigrant vessels and interviewing their passengers and captains, Keemle finally saw the *Hope* after it had come up from the Lazaretto, cleaned and disinfected. He asked Captain Geelt Klein about Dr. Lehman's report that hundreds of "famished and emaciated beings" had been taken from his ship. Klein "blustered out, 'Poh, poh, who cares for the doctor there? I am a subject of a foreign power." Keemle bristled. ("I grew warm," he confessed to his colleagues.) At last, his indignation boiled over. "You are mistaken," he spat out at Klein. "We will let you know that you shall conform to our laws and regulations, and if you do not like them, away with you from our shore! Who the devil sent for you?" Later, Klein demanded a $10 fee from each of his redemptioners who was bought, "for expenses incurred at the Lazaretto." The German Society promptly filed suit, and forced him to refund the money.[25]

Keemle's indictment of the captains and their employers was harsh. No doctor on board. Medicine chests barely stocked enough for 10 or 12 patients. (One captain told passengers who asked for medicine, "*Geht und kauftein schnaps!*"—"Go buy some liquor!"—which he then sold them.) "Lost to every sense of feeling for the sufferings of their fellow creatures." "If they can only get their money, enjoy themselves, and gratify their infernal passions, it is all they care and look for." As for the immigrants, many told Keemle they had lost everything during the Napoleonic Wars ("Bony's ambitious bloody war") and sought only to improve their lot in "a peaceable and happy country." Instead, they "fell into the hands of avaricious merchants and cruel-tempered captains, who treated them as bad as Bony's soldiers did." Keemle calculated that if they provided adequate food and supplies, and boarded fewer passengers per vessel, ship owners could still make a healthy profit from the immigrant trade. But he concluded that only a new law with tough penalties, strictly enforced, could remedy the evils that he had described.[26]

When the *Hope* finally left Philadelphia to return to Amsterdam in late December 1817, Geelt Klein was at the helm. However, when the ship next crossed the Atlantic in the spring of 1818 en route to Baltimore, it had a new captain named Hancock. Adrian Märk reported in his account that Klein was fired and fined $100 for his misconduct.[27]

By the first week of October 1817, the last of the Amsterdam ships had finished their quarantines, all but twelve of the patients in the Lazaretto hospital had either died or recovered, and operations were winding down for the year. Because of the unprecedented volume of patients and healthy passengers, the quarantine season had been extended to October 15. James McGlathery, the 44-year-old steward who had somehow managed to feed, clothe, and supply so many hundreds of sick and hungry Germans for week after week, and keep order at the overwhelmed station, could finally breathe a sigh of relief that the chaos was over. But his labors had taken their toll, and the exhausted steward was stricken with a sudden fever. On October 7, just over a week before the season was to end, James McGlathery died — the last casualty of the ill-fated journey of the ship *Hope*.[28]

University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Notes

[1] Philadelphia City Archives, Minutes of the Philadelphia Board of Health (MPBH), December 27, 1804 and January 10 and April 25, 1805; John Christian, *Autobiography of John Christian* Exeter Township, PA, 1865, 5-19.

[2] There is no direct evidence that either Jacob Schweitzer or Johan Christen was a redemptioner or indentured servant. At least 100 of the *Rebecca*'s passengers—mostly Swiss Germans like Schweitzer and Christen—were redemptioners, see *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser*, September 10, 1804. I focus on Schweitzer and Christen in this narrative because documen- tary evidence survives about their lives in the United States after arrival, and about their de- scendants to the present day.

[3] Cheesman A. Herrick, *White Servitude in Pennsylvania: Indentured and Redemption La- bor in Colony and Commonwealth* (New York: Negro Universities, Press, 1969 [1926]), 184- 5; August Ludwig Schlözer, Briefwechsel Göttingen, 1777, quoted in Karl Frederick Geiser, *Redemptioners and Indentured Servants in the Colony and Commonwealth of Pennsylvania* (New Haven, Tuttle, Morehouse & Taylor, 1901), 18-9.

[4] Ibid. Those who had experienced passage with redemptioners wrote pamphlets home warning against the abuses of the trade, famously *Gottlieb Mittelberger, Gottlieb Mittelberger's Journey to Pennsylvania in the Year 1750 and Return to Germany in the Year 1754*, trans. Carl S. Eben (Philadelphia: John J. McVey, 1898); see also Hannah Benner Roach, 'Advice to German Emigrants, 1749', in Marion F. Egge, ed., *Pennsylvania German Roots across the Ocean*, Genealogical Society of Pennsylvania, Special Publication No. 8 (Philadelphia: 2000), 41-53.

[5] Herrick, *Pennsylvania*, 188; Mittelberger, *Journey*, 20.

[6] Herrick, *Pennsylvania*, 188; Marianne Wokeck, *Trade in Strangers: The Beginnings of Mass Migration to North America* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1999), 77-80; Sharon V. Salinger, *"To Serve Well and Faithfully": Labor and Indentured Servants in Pennsylvania* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 93-6.

[7] See Zonderman, this volume.

[8] This movement was heavily tied to a rise in religious separatism in core regions of emi- gration; see Karl J. Arndt, *George Rapp's Harmony Society: 1787–1847* (Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1965), and more recently Eberhard Fritz, 'Religiöse Rebellen im grenznahen Dorf' in *Der Enzkreis: Historisches und Aktuelles* Bd.15 (Ostfildern: Thorbcke, 2016), 179-205. Movements occurred largely up to 1806, before the principal battles between Napoleonic and German forces. Departures peaked during 1802-3, coinciding with the peace of Amiens, with arrivals subsequently reaching the United States in 1804.

[9] Farley Grubb, *German Immigration and Servitude in America, 1709-1820* (London: Routledge, 2011), 343-5.

[10] The following narrative of the *Hope*'s ill-fated journey is based on "The Journey of the Ship Hope," a first-hand account written a year after the fact by Adrian Rudolf Märk in Pittsburgh, PA, and published in the *Swiss Messenger* newspaper in Aarau, Switzerland, number 50 (December 10, 1818), 393-4, and number 51, December 17, 1818, 401-5, translated by Alfred Hilfliker and reproduced at <http://www.gase.nl/InternettreeUSA/ship%20hope.htm>, consulted May 29, 2015.

[11] The foregoing narrative is drawn from Märk, "The Journey of the Ship Hope."

[12] Grubb, *German Immigration*, 344-45.

[13] *Grotjan's Philadelphia Public Sale Report*, August 18, 1817; "Extract of a letter from the Lazaretto," *National Advocate*, August 11, 1817.

[14] Märk, "The Journey of the Ship Hope"; MPBH, August 11, 1817; *Philadelphia True American*, quoted in *Ladies' Weekly Museum*, August 23, 1817.

[15] "Extract of a letter from the Lazaretto," *National Advocate*, August 11, 1817. The letter is unsigned, but passages such as "I immediately remanded the healthy passengers on board the *Johanna*" could only have been written by the Lazaretto physician. *Philadelphia True American*, quoted in *Ladies' Weekly Museum*, August 23, 1817; *New-York Evening Post*, December 11, 1817.

[16] *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser*, August 12, 1817; *Relf's Philadelphia Gazette*, Au- gust 12 and 15, 1817; MPBH, August 11 and 12, 1817.

[17] MPBH, August 8 and 13, 1817.

[18] MPBH, August 18, September 3 and 5, 1817.

[19] MPBH, August 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 16, and 18, 1817.

[20] MPBH, August 11 and 16, 1817.

[21] Ronald A. Gase, "American Gase Family Tree," <http://www.gase.nl/Internettree/f1923.htm#P2477>, consulted June 2, 2015; John E. Hilficker, "Brief Summary of the Family of Jacob Hilfiker/Hilficker/Hilfiger," <http://www.hilficker.addr.com/hilficker/hilficker_genealogy.htm>, consulted June 2, 2015; John Hilficker, personal communication, May 28, 2015; Märk, "The Journey of the Ship Hope."

[22] MPBH, August 14, 19, 20, 21, September 1, 5, 8, 11, 12, 17, 18, and November 21, 1817.

[23] *New-York Evening Post*, December 11, 1817..

[24] Ibid.

[25] Ibid.

[26] Ibid.

[27] *Relf's Philadelphia Gazette*, May 13, 1818; Märk, "The Journey of the Ship Hope."

[28] MPBH, October 4, 7, 11, and December 23, 1817.

James D. Boyd

The Crisis of 1816/17: Replacing Redemptioners with Passengers on the Atlantic

The aftermath of the 1816/17 migration of Germans to Philadelphia fundamentally re-shaped the future of migration between German Europe, indeed continental Europe, and the United States. It was this episode that brought an abrupt end to the redemptioner system of migration between the German states and North America, and which ultimately paved the way for competitive passenger systems of the 19th century. On the European side, the crisis produced legislation across the continent and its ports that excluded those unable to pay for their passage to America, effectively ending the supply of redemptioners themselves. On the American side, the crisis was followed by a number of contextual factors that damaged demand for redemptioner labour among any who still tried, within the confines of new legal structures, to reproduce the system. From 1818 onwards, the prospects of selling redemptioner labour in the United States were dubious. Economic conditions were deteriorating, and convoluted attempts at sale of redemptioner labour in territories where it was not a labour institution were problematic. The system that had been fundamental for German passage to America for three generations, was over. When German emigration began to re-emerge in the late 1820s, a succession of subsequent legal parameters were put in place in Atlantic ports that proved decisive in ensuring that paying passengers would be the only realistic option for ship owners from the 1820s onwards. This paper examines these factors, exploring for the first time the legislative endeavours across Europe in the dozen years after the crisis that transformed transit from its 18th century conventions to its 19th century model.

Legislation, 1817

The factors that caused the 1816–17 emigration crisis from German Europe are far better explored than the factors which ended that movement. Weather extremes, post-Napoleonic economic hardship, war-weariness, religious connections and recruiting activity have all been examined.[1] The reasons for the movement ending are sometimes less specific. The general lack of shipping in comparison to the volume of migrants, leading to failure and their destitute return home from around mid-1817, is sometimes cited.[2] The general expending of migratory energy by mid-1817 and improved harvests that year and the following are also mentioned. Some literature, however, mentions the enforcement of Dutch legislation in June 1817 as a significant factor. In fact, when examined in light of the migration flow, this legislation appears to be decisive. Faced with an escalating humanitarian crisis in Amsterdam, on 12 June 1817, Dutch authorities began to enforce legislation that required migrants to have a valid contract in hand, with a 'reputable Dutch shipper' if individuals were to gain entry at the border.[3] The strength of the Dutch legislation was reinforced by Prussian legislation—covering the tract of land between the Netherlands and the emigration states of Baden and Württemberg—which denied south Germans transit through Prussian territory unless they had sufficient cash and official passports.[4] Migrant testimony from mid-June attests to the enforcement of border rules, with 200 Gulden in cash required per adult creating a major blockage on the path to the Netherlands.[5] From February to May 1817 there had been 1,290 declared departures for the USA on average each month from Württemberg. In June, at the mid-point of which the Dutch border closed to unorganised emigration, that number almost precisely halved, to 640.[6] By July, departures had virtually ceased, numbering just 30.[7] After that, the authorities stopped recording the event.

Reserves of emigrants and their abuse in Amsterdam

The timing of border legislation in mid-June 1817 thus appears to be the most immediate cause for the cessation of departures out of Baden and Württemberg, the two states which had provided the bulk of emigrants during the crisis.[8] It was the beginning of the end of the crisis, and the system—redemptioner passage on credit—upon which the migration surge had been based.[9] This legislation did not, however, solve the immediate problem of those who were still stranded in Amsterdam, who had largely expended their credit, and were in dire conditions. The worst abuses of the crisis, in terms of vessel overcrowding and under-provisioning were reserved for mid 1817

onwards, in cases such as the ships *Hope* and *April*, and were testament to the desperation of those who had become stranded, and the unscrupulous practices of those exploiting that desperation.

There were also effects of the Dutch legislation further afield. Once Dutch ports became difficult to access without pre-arranged passage contracts or cash, migrants began to seek other alternatives. As Andrew Zonderman has pointed out, in the later 18th century, Hamburg had begun to engage in redemptioner trading and it was to this port that groups of Württembergers began to drift in order to seek available ships. On July 23, 1818, Hamburg authorities reacted by reiterating mandates first issued in 1792, and then 1795, that 'groups arriving here by land or water seeking emigration will not be admitted, but returned to the border'.[10] For urban authorities in north European ports, the crisis of 1816/17 was a crisis of unsupported foreign aliens, and that crisis had caused authorities in principal departure ports to seal off entry for speculative emigration.

Such legislation was by no means novel. When flows of redemptioner traffic had originally begun to increase in the late 1730s, Dutch authorities had implemented a series of measures to ensure that unsponsored aliens did not arrive en-masse in the Netherlands. By 1738, arriving migrants had to provide the name of a merchant who would stand as surety for their stay in the Netherlands. Organising brokers of the redemptioner trade arranged for passes to be given out by the thousand at the border in order to comply with this rule.[11] The critical difference between 1816/17 and the peak of the redemptioner trade between the 1730s and 1760s was that the final episode was entirely ad-hoc, and lacked the organisational oversight of large scale commercial brokers. The persistent traders of the mid 18th century were gone, and with them, so had the maintenance (and enforcement) of transit structures. In 1816 and 1817, whilst some merchants and boatmen offered to bring passengers directly to a waiting vessel, many recruiters and Rhine river shippers simply offered to take people into the Netherlands, where they might then try their luck in seeking passage with any captain who would take them.[12] Some recruiters offered tickets for vessels in Amsterdam that didn't even exist.[13] Because the border enforcement and legal framework of transit migration had atrophied in the intervening generations, this speculative approach 'worked' (at least for Rhine boatmen) until active measures were taken in June 1817. The precedent of renewed legislation and of the 1816/17 crisis experience then lead to short-lived attempts at rejuvenating organised redemptioner passages. These were critically undermined by developments across the Atlantic.

Last Attempts

In 1818, the American economy entered a period of recession, as the post-war boom in import-export exchange with Europe, particularly Britain, swung to bust as a result of financial speculation.[14] In well-developed regions such as Pennsylvania, which had absorbed the first waves of German emigrants in 1816 and 1817, and which were well-exposed to economic fluctuations, labour demand slowed. From 1818, whilst the sale of female house servants in Philadelphia persisted, the sale of redemptioners as rural labour in the back country had slowed.[15] The sale of redemptioners beyond Pennsylvania became more common, and more complicated. Sales of German redemptioner contracts spread into the surrounding states of New York, Ohio, New Jersey and Maryland, but also spread as far afield as Virginia, North Carolina and Alabama territory.[16] These sales were often the result of 'soul driving', wherein batches of labour contracts were bought at the harbourside and large groups driven into territories further afield to be sold at higher prices.[17] On occasion, as was the case in frontier Ohio, a well-organised system of redemptioner use, organised around German immigrant entrepreneurs, worked.[18] However, away from the well-developed customs of Pennsylvania, where redemptioner labour had long functioned as an informal economic institution, the selling of contracts often proved difficult. The German Society of Maryland was at pains to demonstrate that redemptioner labour had no formal legal basis, other than the financial debt owed by the passenger, which could be obviated through claims of insolvency at a debtors court.[19] Whilst many emigrants lacked the legal representation to pursue such a course, some simply refused to honour contracts, and found that courts ruled in their favour, as happened with a group of 22 redemptioners when attempts were made to sell their labour in Tennessee, a state with little precedent for the model.[20]

Within the context of changing European law, these conditions were important. Because the reinstatement of European port laws effectively closed speculative redemptioner debarkations from mid-1817 onwards, once the well of available passengers in port had finally dried up, attempts to get credit-based passengers on to vessels required significant sponsorship, in order to cover transit conditions. However, the changing market and legal contexts in the U.S. often rendered these more organised attempts ruinous. In 1819, 385 Württembergers travelled from Antwerp to Philadelphia under a credit arrangement with private investors. They refused to sign indentures, rendering their promissory notes worthless. The creditors lost 4,000 dollars and were ruined.[21] This was one case among many. Investors like Ludwig Gall from Trier on the Moselle, and Ferdinand Ernst, the former owner of a large estate near Hannover, had paid the passages of 15 and 94 people, respectively,

also in 1819. Upon arrival in Philadelphia, Gall's prospective servants found themselves surrounded by a group of German Americans who told them they were "free as the air," because their contracts possessed no validity under U.S. law.[22] Gall was forced to return to Germany.

Further disasters occurred during attempts to sell redemptioner labour in New Orleans in 1820 and 1821. Compounding these difficulties were expensive new legislative requirements created by the U.S. passenger Act of 1819. A direct reaction of the destitution and public burden that vessels such as the *Hope* had caused, the legislation was designed to improve sanitary conditions and limit abuses of arriving migrants. Passed on 2nd March, 1819, the Act stipulated that a ship must not carry more than 2 passengers per 5 tonnes burthen. The passenger laws also stipulated the level of provisions that a vessel had to carry, with captains fined the amount of $3 per passenger per day—payable to the passenger—for the duration of time that any passenger was placed on ration.[23] Whilst U.S. enforcement of the law was not necessarily stringent, its conditions would soon become an important element in European shipping strategies.

For European ship brokers, the incentive to carry redemptioner labour after 1817 had disappeared. Organised attempts to provision ships and pay captains to transport migrants became a high risk strategy, because the sale of redemptioner labour in the U.S. was a dubious prospect, and the moneys fronted per passenger to get them across borders and on to ships might not be recovered.

The New Legal Form of Migration

The next time European emigration began to surge, further tightening of laws ensured that there would be no opportunity to carry passengers on credit at all. The legal steps taken in 1817, 1818 and 1819 set a precedent for successive legislative measures across Europe over the next dozen years which further tightened access to major ports to those with the ability to pay for their emigration at the point of departure. One by one, all major border crossings and ports providing German migrants with access to the Atlantic erected significant monetary and ticketing stipulations regarding through-migration and port access. Once this became the case, for recruiters and shippers, there was no further incentive to construct credit-based contract systems for German emigrants. If legal parameters made sure that only paying customers could begin the migration process, the onus for business became the sale of valid tickets in the hinterland, at or near the point of departure - a critical model in 19th century emigrant shipping. Indentured labour did not, of course, disappear as a supply mechanism in some areas of the U.S. and

among other ethnic groups, particularly east Asian labour into California, but for German migrants and European shippers, a dozen years of legislation that followed the shock of 1816-17 would determine the shape and practice of new passenger transit for the coming century.

Once the post war economic and ecological shocks of the 1816/17 period had receded, the demand for emigration slowed for much of the next decade. However, in 1828, migration again suddenly arose from south west German states, notably Württemberg, where successive heavy harvests had initially allowed the peasant economy to recover, but subsequently created low price levels that led to high numbers of farm insolvencies.[24] The revolutionary foment of 1830 and further economic difficulty then accelerated emigration into a distinct movement, becoming a surge from multiple German regions in 1832. Authorities in states across Europe reacted immediately with a raft of measures that combined and tightened the key elements of exclusive legislation enacted in 1817 and 1818, creating highly stringent criteria for would-be migrants who intended to access the United States.

The Legal form of New Migration

In 1828, at the first sign of renewed movement, officials in the Netherlands instated a new, stringent law, requiring a fully paid ticket for the entire Atlantic passage, in hand, at the Dutch border, alongside a passport and a certificate from the Dutch consul within the migrants' home territory.[25] The requirement of a paid ticket was a significant moment in the history of the European migrant business. It became a standard stipulation in all major continental ports, and meant that brokers had to have agents and ticketing offices placed within migrant communities and regions in order to retail tickets and organise the attendant official paperwork. In future, the organisation and capture of emigrant business would require emigrant brokerages as formal businesses, stationed at nodal points in the migration route.

During the late 1820s, the French port of Le Havre also emerged as viable outlet for south west German migrants to the New World. The port was the major continental entrepôt for American cotton, and ran a regular trade between New Orleans, New York and France. As the French textile industry developed in Alsace, empty cotton wagons returning to port became a favourable trail for German emigrants in the neighbouring Palatinate, Baden and Württemberg. As emigration accelerated, the potential problem of destitute migrants becoming stranded in France began to worry the French Minister of the Interior. In 1830, he sent circulars to consuls in regions of out-migration stipulating that U.S.-bound migrants needed a visa from the

French consul, which could only be obtained if the applicant possessed 200 Florins (fl).[26] In 1836 this was amount was doubled to 400, and 200 for children, and, on top of cash, border entry also mandated possession of a ticket in-hand, as with Dutch legislation.[27]

In 1832 Bremen followed the same pattern. The 1832 'Conditions for Passengers to the United States of America' stipulated that 'only passengers who have their passage money in cash, and have paid ticket deposits . . . will be accepted,' whilst those not meeting these criteria would be 'immediately sent back to their homeland'.[28] The amount of cash was stated as 244 Florins per emigrating adult, and 100fl per child, meaning that a family of 4 would need 688fl in cash to enter the port, a sum of money that, left in reserve after all transit costs from home to harbour, excluded all but the most solvent potential migrants.[29] These sums were notably higher than actual ticket prices, typically 70–80fl, and would thus meet the post-1817 assurance that migrants would not become public charges in the port. In 1832, Hamburg once again re-iterated its legislation banning migrant from entering the city in groups, a strategy which was designed to reduce transiting individuals to a trickle.

Future Directions

The implementation of post-1817 laws served different strategic purposes for the ports in which they were enacted. For ports such as Hamburg, which had a flourishing trade with Britain, they were designed only as exclusive measures, with no great interest existing in emigration. Similarly in the Netherlands, where trade was concentrated on domestic connections with the East Indies, the laws were exclusive measures against a trade in which there was little local interest.[30] The French laws were a symbol of both restriction and indifference. However, whilst some maintained their policies as purely exclusive measures, others recognised what the new requirements represented. If migrants entering ports were solvent, with cash and tickets in hand, they represented a tremendous business opportunity. As Torsten Feys has demonstrated, it was in those port cities that combined efforts to exclude insolvent migrants, whilst cultivating the business of solvent, paying customers, that a new boom in migrant shipping arose, determining the routing and structure of the European passenger trade, and of the German American immigrant.[31] The exemplar of this tactic was the city of Bremen. It was followed by Antwerp, and, eventually, Hamburg.

The Bremen laws of 1832 were focused not only on vessel regulation, but famously provided regulation for the entire passenger trade.[32] Consciously modelled after the 1819 U.S. Passenger Act, the bremische laws held shippers

to the condition of 2 passengers per 5 tons, with sufficient, free provisions in food and water to last 90 days at sea.[33] This was comfortable redundancy on an average voyage time of 60 days. Recognising that emigration was a growing trade, and that the city's new deep water dock at Bremerhaven had proven immediately popular with migrants from 1830, the legislation was designed to give the port a competitive edge in the growing trade. Moreover, in order to organise the transit, paperwork and financial readiness of potential migrants, the city authorities were the first to comprehend the advantage and logic of placing emigration brokerages at significant points in the German interior. By 1832 brokerages for bremische shippers were already open in Frankfurt, Darmstadt, Gießen, Mosbach am Neckar, Karlsruhe and Stuttgart, with early advertising and co-ordination spearheaded by the broker Carl Traub and merchant shipper C.L. Wenk.[34] The subsequent success of Bremen in the German migrant trade need not be told here, but it is important to note that where Bremen's lead in passenger care was followed, most notably Antwerp in the later 1840s, and in Hamburg through the private endeavours of the Hamburg Amerika Line [HAPAG] from 1847, large flows of emigration were subsequently directed. The example of HAPAG was especially important. By-passing the city's still-out-dated laws which did not care for migrants, HAPAG's guaranteed superior treatment, whilst adopting the pre-paid ticketing model—organized through rural brokerages—marked the point at which state legislation emanating from 1817 had fully evolved into private market practice shaping emigration commerce.[35] Put another way, the market had adopted legal parameters as best practice, and used those parameters to pursue business.

Historiographically, the enforcement of post-1817 German migrant legislation is often questioned.[36] It is unclear how stringently borders were enforced, and there is evidence of clandestine smuggling which allowed individuals and families to circumvent rules and necessary paperwork, especially for Le Havre.[37] However, it was clearly in the interests of ship owners, and port cities themselves, that the rules were generally observed. In-land brokerages ensured guaranteed paying custom for shippers, and individuals reaching ports with cash reserves represented an excellent market for local services, a situation heavily capitalised upon in Bremen. In simple business terms, it made far greater sense for the industry to operate on the right side of the law rather than the wrong side of it. It is perhaps not at all coincidental that German immigration to America from around 1830 to 1845 is historically classed as the 'middle-class' generation of immigrants, constituted of small landowning classes of the South West, and the individual adult emigrant from the North West, who later remitted funds for his family.[38] In short, it was a generation that necessarily had the means to pay for

migration, a product of the changed environment produced by the aftermath of 1817. Empirical data in the case-study village of Ölbronn, discussed later in this volume by Konstantin Huber, shows how sharp the contrast became.[39] Beyond this generation, remittances and assisted emigration (especially in the crisis era of 1846–54) rapidly re-opened opportunities for emigration among poorer elements of society, which had otherwise closed with the redemptioner system.

One of the most critical legacies of the 1816–17 crisis was thus to fundamentally transform the way in which German immigrants reached America. The humanitarian crisis in the Netherlands in the middle of 1817 inspired a series of legislative measures over the next decade and half that not only ended the 18th century model of transportation, but determined the lines within which 19th century passage would operate. The problem of thousands of destitute migrants in Amsterdam in 1817 caused a re-iteration of old laws that were designed to prevent the ad-hoc arrangement of speculative passage on credit. Deteriorating relations between the Netherlands and Prussia, through which access to the Low Countries was gained, caused Prussia to instigate cash border stipulations that would become a fundamental element in European cross-border transit over the following years. The destitution with which the highly exploited migrants of late 1817 and 1818 reached the U.S. caused the American government to regulate the immigrant trade for the first time in 1819, drafting legislation that would soon provide a standard for competitive shipping. The economic fall-out of the post-war era then made convoluted attempts to continue redemptioner sales unprofitable. Even when conditions in the U.S. recovered, there was no incentive to re-create any complex, credit-based trade, because when migration re-emerged between 1828 and 1832, European ports quickly reacted by tightening laws that ensured migrants would be solvent, fare-paying customers. These laws were a boon to ports such as Bremen that grasped the commercial opportunities of the changed trade. Ironically, it was here, on the European side, in Bremen and Bremerhaven, that the U.S passenger Act of 1819 had its greatest impact, by setting the bar in a 'race to the top' in shipping standards.[40] The answer to why the German redemptioner trade ended, is that transit laws across Europe from 1817 onward made it very difficult for the insolvent to reach ports, and American conditions in 1818–19 made it a ruinous commercial risk to help them do so.

These legislative measures, between 1817 and 1832, not only prevented the re-occurrences of the redemptioner trade, but had far reaching consequences for the system of international migration from continental Europe. They determined the socio-economic makeup of the next generation of German immigrants into the United States. Those that followed predecessors from

1817 were far more likely to be farmers than disenfranchised tradesmen and labourers, who had typically made use of the credit-based redemptioner system.[41] As the networks of migration between the German states and U.S. bloomed, most migrants were those that had capital assets to sell. This was less the case for North West German migrants, departing from 1832 onwards, but even here, solvency was necessary. The consequences of this selectivity upon German settlement patterns in the United States remains an important and largely untested line of enquiry.[42]

Of critical significance to wider European emigration was the logistical arrangement of emigration that the new laws necessitated. Emigrant brokerages and agencies were required in hubs of outmigration to ensure that emigrants could make it to port and provide custom for those outfitting ships. This meant, typically, the pre-sale of tickets for the entirety of the ocean passage, which could be used to obviate border stipulations, as well as the arrangement of requisite passport and consular paperwork. A major commercial industry of migration management and advertising was thus inaugurated. Whilst individual agents operating on behalf of brokerages continued to proliferate, as they had in the redemptioner era, their activity was necessarily tied back to shipping industry via the co-ordinating brokerage, which acted as the intermediary between the two. This became the critical structural feature of the commerce of migration across the continent, spreading from the German lands to central and eastern Europe.[43]

The crisis of 1816–17 is an episode that has proved a fertile ground for the study of various factors in German-American migration—the organisation and civic management of contemporary German rulers, the role of adaptability to climate pressure, the role of recruiters in migration, the parallel conditions between European and American economies in the years beyond Napoleon, and the experience of ship owners during a boom period of crisis migration.[44] It also provides coherent explanations for the transformation of German and continental transit systems from the 18th century model to the 19th, and provides a historical reference point for how international management of migration systems has evolved and occurred in the past. As such, it continues to be a fascinating moment in German-American history from which we can continue to learn useful lessons, not only about historic system change, but for similarly crucial moments in the history of mobility, up to the present day.

Brunel Institute
Bristol, United Kingdom

Notes

[1] The most recent work on climatic conditions can be found in Stefan Brönniman, Daniel Krämer, *Tambora und das 'Jahr ohne Sommer' 1816: Klima, Mensch und Gesellschaft* (Bern: Geographica Bernensia, 2016) (published in English as *Tambora and 'the year without a summer' of 1816: a Perspective on Earth and Human Systems Science*); also Rüdiger Glaser, Iso Himmelsbach and Annette Bösmeier, 'Climate of migration? How climate triggered migration from southwest Germany to North America during the 19th century,' *Clim. Past* 13 (2017): 1573-92; on war-weariness and post war difficulty, Mack Walker, *Germany and the Emigration, 1816–1885* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1964), esp. 2-4; more recently Hans Jürgen Grabbe 'The Phasing out of 18th-Centruy Patterns of German Migration to the United States after 1817,' *American Studies Journal* [online] 62 (2017); on religious connections see multiple essays by Eberhard Fritz, including recently Eberhard Fritz 'Reiligiöse Rebellen im grenzhahen Dorf' in *Der Enzkreis, Historisches und Aktuelles* (Ostfildern: Thorbecke, 2016), 179-205; on recruiting activity, see the detailed investigation by Hans Jürgen Grabbe, *Vor der großen Flut: Die europäische Migration in die Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika, 1783–1820* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2001), 268-77, also James Boyd, 'The Rhine Exodus of 1816/17 within the Developing German Atlantic World,' *The Historical Journal* 59.1 (2016): 109-13.

[2] Walker, *Emigration* Chapter 1.

[3] SSee reproduction of Dutch legislation in Günter Moltmann, *Aufbruch nach Amerika : Friedrich List und die Auswanderung aus Baden und Württemberg 1816/17, Dokumentation einer sozialen Bewegung* (Tübingen: Wunderlich, 1979), 213-14.

[4] Walker, *Emigration* 36

[5] See Letter to Johann Georg Rapp from Leonhard Wörner, who had set out from Württemberg with a large party on June 12, 1817, only to be stopped in Oberwesel, Prussian territory near the Netherlands border, reproduced in Karl J. Arndt, *George Rapp's Harmony Society: 1787–1847* Philadelphia, PA, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1965, 190.

[6] Hauptstaatsarchiv Stuttgart [HSAS] E146 Bü 1783 num. 15-20.

[7] Ibid.

[8] Baden authorities recorded 16,321 America-bound emigrants Jan-May 1817, Würt- temberg 6,000 from Jan–July. HSAS E146 Bu1783; Generallandesarchiv Karlsruhe (GLK) E236 2871.

[9] t is estimated that 48 percent of passages in1816/17 were subject to redemptioner contracts (2,800 contracts in all), whilst the number who had travelled hoping to gain a re- demptioner contract was undoubtedly far higher. See Grabbe, *Flut* 335.

[10] Staatsarchiv Bremen [SB] 2-P.8.B.8.a/Bd.1 Teil 1, leaf 60.

[11] See Marianne Wokeck, *Trade in Strangers: The Beginnings of Mass-Migration to North America* (University Park ,PA: Penn State University Press, 1999), 63-4.

[12] Among the more reputable merchants were Antwerp Merchants Heinrich Dirks and

C.F. Loewers, see Boyd, '1816' 112, also Gerhard P. Bassler, 'Auswanderungsfreiheit und Aus- wandererfürsorge in Württemberg 1815–1855: Zur Geschichte der südwestdeutschen Mas- senwanderung nach Nordamerika,' *Zeitschrift für Württembergische Landesgeschichte* 33 (1974): 129-34.

[13] See the case of Richard Rodolphe and J.J. Hartsnick in *Pennsylvania Gazette* 26.01.1818.

[14] On massive post-war trade growth, see James Belich, *Replenishing the Earth: The Settler Revolution and the Rise of the Anglo-World, 1783–1939* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008); for a breakdown of trade patterns before and after the wars, Grabbe, *Flut* 106-16.

[15] Grabbe, 'Phasing'.

[16] Ibid.

[17] Grabbe, *Flut* 344-7.

[18] Martin Baum, a first-generation German from Alsace who settled in Cincinnati 'sometime around 1800', was among the most prominent merchant figures in the city from 1807 to 1831, and 'in his numerous undertakings he needed reliable labourers, and brought many German redemptioners to Cincinnati, whom he treated well'. Baum founded the first iron foundry in the region, and introduced sailboats to the Ohio and Mississippi in favour of flat and keel boats. Other German merchants were hugely successful in the region, including railroad entrepreneur Johann Jacob Weiler, who arrived in 1818 and died in 1881 as the 'rich- est man in central Ohio'. See *Der Deutsche Pionier* 10 (1878): 44; Albert Bernard Faust, *The German Element in the United States*, 2nd ed. (New York, NY: 1927), 422, 424-25.

[19] See efforts by Christian Mayer, of the German Society of Maryland, discussed in Klaus Wust, *Pioneers in service: the German Society of Maryland, 1783-1981* (Baltimore: The German Society of Maryland, 1981), 6-7. This precedent had already been established for Pennsylva- nia by its supreme court in 1797, Grabbe, *Flut,* 287, 337.

[20] Grabbe, 'Phasing' 12-13, also other similar examples in Grabbe, *Flut* 363-34.

[21] Grabbe, 'Phasing', 16.

[22] Ibid.

[23] SB 2-P.8.B.8.a/Bd.1 Teil 2.

[24] Farm insolvencies in Württemberg hit a decade peak of 2,660 in 1828; in the subse- quent 2 years, emigration grew by 167 percent, from 1.361 individuals to 3,642, thereafter exceeding 7,000 in 1832. On insolvency levels, see G. Seybold, *Württembergs Industrie und Außenhandel von Ende der napoleonischen Kriege bis zum Deutschen Zollverein* (Stuttgart: Kol- hammer, 1974), 35; on emigration volumes Wolfgang von Hippel, *Auswanderung aus Südwest- deutschland: Studien zur Württembergischen Auswanderung und Auswanderungspolitik im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 1984), 138.

[25] Torsten Feys, *The Battle for the Migrants: The Introduction of Steam Shipping on the North Atlantic and Its Impact on the European Exodus* (St. Johns, Newfoundland: International Maritime Economic History Association, 2013), 15.

[26] Ibid., p.17.

[27] Ibid., *Anziegeblatt Unterrheinkreis* 57, 1836, in Generallandesarchiv Karlsruhe, [GLK] Beständ 236, num. 8973, S.8.

[28] SB 2-P.8.B.8.a/Bd.1 Teil 2.

[29] Cash sums quoted in *Bremen Anziegeblatt* 54, 1832 see GLK Beständ 236, num. 8973, S.8.

[30] Feys, *Migrants* 16.

[31] Ibid., 14.

[32] Dirk Hoerder, 'The Traffic of Emigration via Bremen/Bremerhaven: Merchants' Interestes, Protective Legislation and Migrants' Experiences,' *The Journal of American Ethnic History* 13.1 (1993): 68-101.

[33] SB 2-P.8.B.8.a/Bd.1 Teil 2.

[34] Ibid.

[35] Agent activity of HAPAG brokers was well documented in Mecklenburg, a newly ascendant source of emigrants, from the early 1850s, helping to consolidate business for the new firm. Files of early agents and ticketing are included in Mecklenburg Landeshauptarchiv Schwerin (MLHAS) Domanialamt Boizenburg, 2.22-10.1, Nr 9d.

[36] Feys, *Migrants* 17, 38-9.

[37] Ibid., p.17.

[38] On the North West and the also the 'middle-class' character of migrants in this period, Walther Kamphoefner, *The Westfalians, From Germany to Missouri* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987).

[39] According to Württemberg state records, the average wealth of migrants during 1817 (which includes migrants to both America and the European East) was 65.5 Gulden per per-

son. The measure is imperfect as it includes children accompanying adults, and multiple des- tinations, but is the best indicative figure of the period. Existing probate records for a sample of 11 adult departures from Ölbronn for North America between 1829 and 1848 shows an average of 1,716 Gulden per person, with only 1 individual, a farm labourer worth 71 Gulden, falling into previously typical patterns. It is likely the emigration of this individual was paid for by his employer, who also emigrated the same year. A more complete sample could offer different data, however it is noteworthy that among this sample, the farm labourer was the out- lier. See HSAS E146 Bü1783 Gemeindarchiv Ölbronn (GA) 9133 Inventuren u. Theilungen (IT)1146-7; GO9133 IT/1151-4;GO9133 IT/1156-8.

[40] During the first half of the 19th century, this was in stark contrast to British passenger transit, the regulations for which were constantly tightened and loosened, and rarely heeded.

[41] In the 18th century, as well as in the emigration surge of 1816/17, typically 70-75 percent of migrants were of trades and labouring backgrounds. Meaning that peasant farmers (numerically the most significant of the population) were drastically under-represented. Data for Württemberg communities in the period 1828–45 show that peasant farmers were drawn in representative volumes for the first time, with tradesmen receding comparatively. On 18th century migration type, von Hippel, *Auswanderung* 52 and its mirror in 1816/17 Boyd, 'Exodus,' 114. See examples of communities for 1828-45 period in James Boyd, "The Role of Rural Textile Production in South-West German Emigration: Württemberg Communities in the Early Nineteenth Century," *Textile History* 46:1 (2015): 38.

[42] As it does for departed communities, as raised by Wokeck earlier in this volume.

[43] See generally Michael Just, *Ost- und südeuropäische Amerikawanderung 1881-1914. Transitprobleme in Deutschland und Aufnahme in den Vereinigten Staaten* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 1988); also Tara Zahra *The Great Departure: Mass Migration from Eastern Europe and the Making of the Free World* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2016), 23-65.

[44] See inter alia Brönniman and Krämer, *1816*; Grabbe, *Flut*; Moltmann, *Aufbruch*.

Konstantin Huber

Serial Sources in Excess: *Inventuren und Teilungen* and *Pflegrechnungen* in the Wüerttemberg Communal Archives and their Significance for Emigration Research[1]

Until now, the Württemberg *Inventuren und Teilungen* and *Pflegrechnungen* have been the subject of far too little attention in the subject of emigration research.[2] They are sources which are to be found in archives at the lowest administrative level, namely in city municipal and communal archives, and are of major significance to any historian who wishes to understand the social and economic context of southwest German emigration to North America.[3] For many communities, the records span the 17th to the 20th centuries, and as such were recorded during each critical episode in emigration to North America, including the events of 1709, 1816/17, and 1847/8, as well as the long durée of migration movements that occurred in between. It is hoped that this paper will reveal to researchers on both sides of the Atlantic the incredible value of these sources for migration research, not least the 1816/17 crisis.

In the Early Modern period Württemberg already possessed a comparatively modern administration for which it was much admired. One expression of such a modern administration is a high degree of textualization. That this was the case in Württemberg means that municipal and communal archives today contain an especially extensive wealth of written sources.[4] This is due above all to the considerable records originating in the legal sphere of voluntary jurisdiction and non-contentious proceedings, which in Baden and other German territories emerged to a much lesser extent.

Two main groups of serial sources from the field of voluntary jurisdiction are of particular significance to the history of emigration: first, the *Inventuren und Teilungen*—personal asset registers within the purview of inheritance

law—and secondly the *Pflegrechnungen,* related to guardianships of those assets.[5] The example of the village Ölbronn in the northwest of Württemberg, located roughly between Karlsruhe and Stuttgart, gives an example of the extent of these records. The communal archive contains in total 111 metres of shelving from the time 1569–1974. Of that, there are over 16 metres of *Inventuren* und *Teilungen* and nearly 10 metres of *Pflegrechnungen*, thus together roughly a quarter of the total archival holdings.

Proper administrative structures were a requirement for such an excess of records and sources. The inheritance laws of Württemberg were another underlying reason for such structures: a partible inheritance system meant that unlike in other territories where one son was named as the primary heir, property was equally divided amongst all surviving children. Because of the common practice of widows remarrying there were already families in the 18th and 19th centuries which could be called "patchwork". Due to the fact that children from different marriages had to be treated differently upon the division of an estate, a written accounting of the respective property rights was necessary. As is well known, this partible inheritance system led above all in the 19th century to the impoverishment of large segments of the population, and this in turn became the main cause of the emigration which characterized those regions.

Both the *Inventuren und Teilungen* and the *Pflegrechnungen* are invaluable for assessing just how household and individual wealth and prospects were managed and effected by partible inheritance. They give micro-economic detail to households affected—and unaffected—by emigration. Not only that, the records were frequently home to annexed narratives and references to family conditions, and conditions at the time of a migrants' departure. The origins of both groups of serial sources lay in the 16th century Württemberg *Landrecht*, an oft-praised legal codex which owes much to the exceptional Duke Christoph (1550–1568). Much of it was adopted more or less word-for-word by neighbouring territories such as Baden and the Electoral Palatinate. Both series of sources ended with the introduction of the *Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch* in 1900, and were thus succeeded by the state guardianship files and estate files.[6]

Inventuren and Teilungen

The *Inventuren und Teilunge*n are defined as "descriptions of property, which have been filed respectively upon the marriage [*Beibringens-Inventur*] or death of a resident [*Teilung*]. They contain material concerning everyday culture and the lives of the most varied population groups."[7] There were similar sources in other German territories, but not to the extent of Württemberg.

There were few groups whose property was exempt from being inventoried in this way: the ducal family, the court, and the nobility.[8] An *Inventur*, essentially the inventory of goods brought to a partnership, by both the male and female parties, consists in most cases of a relatively thin dossier. In exceptional cases, as with particularly wealthy persons, they may very well comprise thick volumes of over 100 pages. There are also very thick volumes in which many individual *Inventuren und Teilungen* have been collated—these are either copies of the originals or original records which were later bound.

The listing of assets in the *Inventuren und Teilungen* is not limited to valuable possessions such as real estate, vehicles, livestock, monetary assets and liabilities, or jewelry. Rather, it includes in rare precision the stuff of everyday life: furniture, clothing, linens, books, dishes and all else—from the available stores of grain and wine to the amount of onions in the kitchen. The *Inventuren und Teilungen* thus draw "an exact picture of the rich, poorer, and poorest classes."[9] Their systematic study, and the rich explanatory notes that often accompany their details mean that the sources can help to achieve a biography of domestic, village and family life, from the everyday to life-changing events. The following mundane material items are taken from the *Inventur* of Anna Margaretha and Jacque Berger, married in 1760 in Ölbronn. After the wooden and metal kitchen utensils, their furniture is listed under the rubric "Schreinwerck":

- *"1 gehimmelte Bettladen", that is, a bed with canopy—valued at one guilder*
- *1 bed without canopy—"ohngehimmelte"—value, 20 Kreuzer*
- *1 old chest—12 Kreuzer*
- *1 large chest (with pieces of metal outside)—40 Kreuzer*
- *1 cupboard—8 Kreuzer*
- *1 "thänninen Tisch", (= firwood table)—30 Kreuzer*
- *2 old chairs—10 Kreuzer (one for 4 and one for 6)*
- *1 "ohngeleinten dito", that is, another chair, but without armrests—2 Kreuzer*
- *1 "Bach-Molten" (= a large tub for dough processing)—16 Kreuzer*
- *1 cradle—16 Kreuzer*

These *Inventuren und Teilungen* are of real analytical value to any number of historical disciplines: social history, economic, mentality, educational, church, art, family and population history. For migration historians, for whom the records remain little used, they are an unmatched source for the socio-economic analysis of migrants, and their material circumstances. Their value as a source for the history of education was indeed recognized over 100 years ago

but only in the past 50 years have they appreciably begun to be taken into account by other researchers. This comes down to the simple fact that the sheer mass of material requires an enormous amount of work.[10] The *Inventuren und Teilungen* of the mid 18th and early 19th centuries are particularly exhaustive, whereas afterwards the recording of belongings became more summary.

The *Teilung* documents were made at the opposite end of the household lifecycle—with the death of the marriage partners, and divided up property for partition. There are—aside from some special forms—essentially two types of *Teilung*: the *Eventualteilungen*, compiled after the death of one of the spouses and listing the shared assets, and *Realteilungen*, after the death of the surviving spouse. In the first case, the respective inheritances were not in fact divided up and passed on to the heirs, rather the portions were merely calculated. Only with *Realteilungen* were the inheritances in fact apportioned out.[11]

Our interest here is on the *Teilungen*, as they contain details of the heirs of the deceased including whereabouts and residence. It is here that we also find references to heirs who have emigrated, otherwise information that is not easy to come across, as well as detailed information of their personal wealth. Even parish registers—the demographic history source *par excellence*—in most cases only name persons who were present for religious ceremonies which took place locally: baptisms, weddings, and funerals. If someone moved away, or even emigrated, then he would effectively disappear from the parish registers. For this very reason there are blank gaps in many family histories. By contrast, any individual entitled to an inheritance had to be included in the *Nachlassinventare*, and even those who had emigrated illegally and thus forfeited many of their legal protections were still legal heirs.[12]

Further complimenting the rich potential of *Teilungen* records are two special categories of these documents: the so-called *freiwilligen Vermögensübergaben* and the *Vermögensuntersuchungen mit Schuldenverweisung* (asset investigations with remission of debt). In these cases neither wedding nor funeral was the occasion of the goods register, but rather the handing over to heirs their inheritance for other reasons—such as the intent to emigrate. In a state so intimately occupied with the details of its citizens, it is of little surprise that emigration was a social and economic act of great interest to the Württemberg government.

The 1514 Treaty of Tübingen between the duke and the estates guaranteed the *Recht des freien Zugs* (right of free movement) in the duchy. That meant that, in theory, subjects were free to move wherever they pleased and, in contrast to other territories such as neighbouring Baden-Durlach, were not subject to a supplementary emigration tax (in German *Abzugsgeld* or *Nachsteuer* of 10 percent of total assets, for example, in Baden-Durlach). In prac-

tice, however, the dukes of Württemberg pursued in the 18th century a more uncompromising course, a "more or less covert policy of obstructing and preventing emigration" (in the words of Wolfgang von Hippel).[13] Officials exerted great moral pressure, amounting to an "indirect emigration ban".[14] This changed with the end of the *ancien regime*. In 1806 Duke Friedrich ascended to the kingship amidst the territorial restructuring of the Napoleonic mediatization. Rather than extending the old estate-based constitution to his new possessions, however, he did away with it entirely. The drastically enlarged kingdom was given a unitary organization and a strict, enlightened absolutist administration. Thus in 1807 king Friedrich abrogated the 1514 Treaty of Tübingen and with it the—theoretical—freedom of emigration. His son, king Wilhelm, who came to the throne in 1816, "the year without a summer", introduced a thorough policy change, resulting in a new and particularly liberal constitution. Under Wilhelm I, who reigned until 1864, freedom of movement, and thus emigration, existed not only in theory but in practice.

Subjects wishing to emigrate were required to report their intention to royal officials and, as may be the case, settle their outstanding debts. Furthermore they were required to give up their rights as subject and citizen and swear not to serve against Württemberg for one year, in support of which they also had to provide surety.[15] The *Vermögensuntersuchungen mit Schuldenverweisung* (asset investigations with remission of debt) were a part of this procedure. After the "year without a summer", no less than 16 such legal transactions took place in the Württemberg village of Ölbronn between February and June 1817. Inside of the Ölbronn archive is the example of the family of Johann Jakob Böhringer, born 178.[16] The children, who were also to emigrate, were:

a) Daniel, 7 Jahr alt,
b) Johann Engelhard, aet[atis] 5,
c) Friderika Carolina, aet[atis] 3,
d) Katrina, aet[atis] 1.

The couple wanted to emigrate to America—„Mit "allerhöchster" Erlaubnis" (= "with highest permission"). A local citizen, the farmer, Gottlieb Geigle, stood surety for them, and they sold all their properties on April 14th, 1817. In all probability, Johann Jakob and his family wanted to follow in the footsteps of his brother, Christian Ulrich Böhringer, who had already sold his properties in February 1817 in order to emigrate. Fate had other plans, however. A so-called "legend of Johann Jakob Böhringer's emigration" has been passed on from generation to generation, until a descendent, Terry Baringer, passed it on to the author of a 1982 local history of Ölbronn.[17] There it is writ-

ten that the family left their home on August 23rd, 1817, where "their path led them to Amsterdam, where—before they had gathered enough capital to pay their passage—baby Catharina died on December 17th, 1817 . . . Jacob was finally successful (after 4 months) in securing passage for himself and his family, and at last they embarked in Amsterdam on a sailing vessel bound for Philadelphia. They spent 91 days at sea. The crossing was calamitous: there were many storms, towering waves, the ship was blown off course and twice shipwrecked (from leaks). The passengers lost all of their belongings, some of them their lives—of the 444 persons who had boarded, only 200 (!) reached New Orleans, many miles from their actual destination, exhausted by their long and exhausting journey. They landed on March 4th, 1818. The Böhringers made their way up the Mississippi and Ohio rivers in a cumbersome old keel boat to Louisville, Kentucky—at that time a small but rising riverfront city. From there they continued on . . . to Fern-Creek, a small town near Buechel, Kentucky. For a time the family lived in a stable until Jacob found secure employment and was able to arrange proper housing for his family. In Jefferson county, their new home, three more children were born."

Johann Jakob's brother Christian Ulrich Böhringer, it seems, made it as planned to Philadelphia.[18] Or rather, this can be assumed from the *Nachlassinventur* of his brother Johann Matthäus, who had remained in their homeland and died in 1852. It contains a letter by Christian Ulrich, written in 1830—13 years after his departure from Ölbronn—in which he mentions living in "Bieber Thaunshib Collombiana Caunty", presumably meaning Beaver Township, Columbia County in Pennsylvania.[19] The three page letter addresses various questions of assets and property and in doing so mentions the other emigrant brother, Johann Jakob, with whom Christian Ulrich had written contact. Christian Ulrich, at that time 55 years old, then goes on to tell of himself and his family: he married a second time, with a Swiss woman, and had two more children with her; his oldest son lived in Philadelphia. On the final page Christian Ulrich summarizes his experience of having left his homeland: "Ich hatte deswegen wohl gethan, daß ich ausgewandert bin; dan ich hatte besser leben in diesem Land als in Deutschland".[20] He speaks proudly of his property and says contentedly: "Dan kan ich kaufen und verkaufen, wan ich kan u[nd] will, ich brauch sonst niemand nichts geben . . .".[21]

Included in the Realteilung of an Ölbronn *Schultheiß* (mayor) who also happened to be named Johann Jakob (or just Jakob) Böhringer (1779–1834, mayor 1813–1833) is a booklet included as an appendix , containing Böhringer's last will—presumably his only ever notebook. He was the second cousin of the previously mentioned emigrants Johann Jakob and Christian Ulrich Böhringer. In the appendix, Böhringer had made precise notes, including reports about the weather and the harvests in 1816–1818.[22] Böhringer wrote:

"1816 habe ich 8 Tage vor Johan[n]estag 1 Morgen Gersten gesäth, die Ursache wegen der späthen Sath ist diese, dass ein 6 Wochen langes Regenwetter die frühere Sath verhindert hatte. Nach diesem regnete es noch fünf Wochen, so dass das ganze Regenwetter vom 1ten Maij bis den 18ten Juli gedauert, worunder dieser Zeit kaum 8 Täge waren, darin es nicht regnete; die Heu-Ernde dauerte bis Jacobi [= 25. Juli] und anfangs derselben ist vieles durch sehr grossen Überschwem[m]ungen theils verschläm[m]t und zum Theil weggeschwemmt worden."[23] On the next page he continued: "Mein lieber Leser, ich habe hieneben gemeldet, dass das Regenwetter bis den 18ten Juli gedauert, aber leider wusste ich es freylich nicht, weil ich es zu bald aufgezeichnet, indem vom 1ten Maij an bis Martini [= 11. November] nur wenige Tage waren, darin es nicht regnete."[24] Nevertheless the damage in Ölbronn was relatively minor. Böhringer reports on the regions further west: "In den Rheingegenden hat sich das Wasser vom Rhein auf viele Felder erstreckt, so dass die Leute, welche ernden gewolt, auf Schiffen die Halmen auf dem Waser abgeschnitte. [25] In Ölbronn there was also no grape harvest for the wine vintage, and Böhringer references the high grain prices. In 1817 he continues with descriptions of major shortages of grain and potatoes. Böhringer reports that royal grain imports from "faraway lands" managed to prevent many families "having to fight against starvation". Nevertheless, in 1817 many residents of Ölbronn decided, as we have seen, to emigrate.

It should be noted that the emigration from Ölbronn between 1800–1820 was on the whole not only economically but also religiously motivated. The Maulbronn district which contained the village was a focal point of the Separatist movement.[26] The Separatists arose as a radical spin-off of the Pietism that was already very strong in Württemberg. As a fundamentalist movement the separatists advocated positions which they derived directly from the bible. They rejected the official church (or state church) and baptized their children themselves. They came into further conflict with the authorities due to their refusal to comply with compulsory schooling, oaths of allegiance and military service. The largest separatist group in the Maulbronn district was in Ölbronn, roughly 60 strong in 1803 in a total population of roughly 830.[27]

After the separatist leader Johann Georg Rapp from Iptingen emigrated to the USA in 1803, 700 followers followed him, amongst them 58 people from Ölbronn who apparently moved "to Virginia" in 1804.[28] Not far from Pittsburgh Rapp founded his first settlement, called Harmony, in which there was full community of goods without private property. In 1814 he left Harmony and moved on to Indiana where he founded what became "New Harmony". In 1817 a further 116 Ölbronner emigrated to the USA.[29] 78 of them are named in 16 different *Vermögensuntersuchungen mit Schuldenverweisung*. By no means were they all labelled as Separatists, but the formulation of the

case of the single Regina Katharina Zeller—that she wanted "to move with the rest of the separatists to America"[30]—allows the conclusion that at least some of them indeed were.[31] In considering the reasons for the 1817 wave of emigration from Ölbronn, we can assume while the aftermath of the "year without a summer" was the final push to actually emigrate, it was in a sense pushing on an open door, a final straw added to the willingness to follow the relatives and friends who left in 1804 and the lack of religious freedom already experienced by many.

Amongst Johann Böhringer's chronicle-like notes we also find the written expression of his pain over the emigration of his son, who left for America with his family in 1830. He wrote: "Den 22ten Aprill 1830 ist unser lieber Sohn Ludwig mit seinem Weib und 2 Kindern, Carolina und Friderike, nach Nordamerika ausgewandert. Diese Trennung war hart, an welcher Stunde unsere Herzen noch lange bluden werden, und nur der Gedanke jenseits wieder zusam[m]en zu kom[m]en, kan unser Leid wieder mindern."[32] This is followed by the dowry that was given to him to take along: money from the sale of goods, a double-barrelled gun, and a precise list of clothing.

Pflegrechnungen

The *Pflegrechnungen*, a vast body of which are also to be found in most municipal and communal archives in Württemberg, are also of significant potential importance to emigration research. *Pflegrechnungen* (also called *Pflegschaftsakten* or *Vormundschaftsrechnungen*) are documents related to legal guardianship. There were two main groups of people who, for various reasons, were not able to manage their assets themselves: minors who were not yet allowed to access their inheritance, and adults who were not in a position to manage their property. The latter were either persons declared incompetent, or people who were long-term or permanently absent, such as emigrants or missing persons. The latter were often soldiers, who had signed on elsewhere, or emigrants of whom no one knew anything. These *Pflegrechnungen* can be of significant help in identifying and accounting for the emigrants from a community, importantly including unofficial emigrants (although there was not, of course, a *Pflegrechnung* for every emigrant, but only concerning those who were required to leave an estate behind and/or only came into one during their absence due to an inheritance.[33]

Normally, an archival *Pflegrechnungen* unit is made up of several books for each accounting period. Per period, usually spanning several years, there is a draft accounting, called a *Rapiat*, and a fair copy. The first accounting, at the beginning of the wardship, is called the *Anstandspflegrechnung,* the final at the end of the wardship is called the *Abstandspflegrechnung*. Here as an

example you see the first or the "Anstands-Pfleeg-Rechnung über Michael Schäfers, aet[atis] 28 Jahr, welche [Anno] 1752 nacher Pensylvanien gezogen ist . . . Vermögen."[34]

Another example is the "Rapiat of the 4th *Pflegrechnung* concerning the assets of Christian Heilmann, born July 30th, 1775 . . . currently absent in America."[35] Christian had emigrated together with his family and the already mentioned Christian Ulrich Böhringer in 1817. The trusteeship began in 1824 and ended in 1846. Because no one had heard further from Heilmann, he was declared dead. This declaration was possible at what would have been the end of the 70th year of life. However, another trusteeship was established for his wife and children, also missing. This trusteeship was continued in Ölbronn until 1888.

Although the *Pflegschaftsakten* of Württemberg have been preserved in the municipal and communal archives and are thus accessible to the public, they are documents of a very personal character. Aside from the account books maintained by the trustee named by the local government or courts, many of them contain loose leaf inserts, including receipts, excerpts from inheritance records, personal notations by the trustee and correspondence. Correspondence from emigrants to their homeland are of especial significance for migration historians, social and everyday-life history, as well as genealogy.[36]

Tickets and shopping lists of supplies for the long passage to the new home are included in some *Pflegrechnungen*.[37] The folklorist and archivist Angelika Bischoff-Luithlen was perhaps the first to point out the analytical value of the Pflegrechnungen in 1975. She wrote that "these files contain the whole variety of fates that befell emigrants. There are letters which for long years went unread: from soldiers who were stuck abroad, from emigrants, above all those in the United States. Aspects of their settling down there are brought to light, transport and travel firms make their invoices, foreign notaries, insurance firms and banks send correspondence. Some wrote of why they could no longer stand it in the [home] country, and others describe the typical Swabian homesickness and wish to return home."[38] Bischoff-Luithlen closes with the sentence: "it is with trembling hands that one closes the bindings."[39]

In the research, *Pflegrechnungen* have been put to work much less as sources, and this began later than in the case of the *Inventuren und Teilungen*. Interestingly, it was precisely this aspect of emigration to America which was the focus of the first two works about Württemberg *Pflegrechnungen* which concern more than an individual. The topic was investigated through a mentalité history and folklore history respectively in two publications appearing in 1996.[40] Correspondence and information typically arose when a ward was in America and laid a claim to his/her assets. He usually had to send a notarized power of attorney back to his homeland, which empowered his

trustee to have the money paid out and transferred to America.[41] It is from just such a case that we find a loose leaf insert in an Ölbronn *Pflegrechnung*, a notarial document from 1813 with the paper seal of the state of Pennsylvania. It belongs to the *Pflegrechnung* of Maria Elisabetha Velte, nee Holderrieth, a separatist who emigrated to join Johann Georg Rapp in Harmony and died in 1825 in Economy near Pittsburgh.[42] Economy was the third settlement established by Rapp after returning from Indiana to Pennsylvania in 1824.

Oftentimes the guardian or trustee was a relative, and thus the records include letters to the family. We find correspondence which is above all concerned with the settling of financial matters and in which the emigrant only gives cursory mention to the rest of their life. Most of the letters, however, allow the assumption that there was otherwise also a personal correspondence. The official nature of these letters is barely noticeable. But their official relevance means they have been preserved, while the rest of the personal correspondence is long since lost. During the archiving and analysis of Ölbronn communal archive I filed 486 trusteeship cases.

In roughly two thirds of these cases wards are named who did not live in Ölbronn and whose assets were managed entirely due to their absence. 338 foreign places of residence are named, and of that 127 of them were cases in America. These can be further subdivided into the 47 where a precise location is given, and the rest in which merely America or North America is named.[43] Of those 47 cases there are ten, so 20 percent, where the person settled in Pennsylvania. Only five of these 127 cases of emigration to America were from the 18th century, all the rest were from the 19th, but four of those older five are concerning Pennsylvania.

While in the second half of the 18th century America occupied an equal place on the list of cited migration destinations alongside places such as West Prussia, Prussian Poland, or the Netherlands (and its overseas colonies in both Indies), in the 19th century this changed drastically. North America, either as a catch-all entry or with the naming of precise locales in the USA, dominated the field. The enormous rise in the number of migration destinations within Württemberg after 1850 is itself an indication of the population's increasing domestic mobility with the appearance of industrialization:

Foreign places of stay of Ölbronn wards, 1701-1900:

Foreign Residence	**1701-50**	**1751-1800**	**1801-50**	**1851-1900**	**Total**
Elsewhere Maulbronn district	2	13	21	14	50
Elsewhere Württemberg	1	10	8	26	45

Baden	1	6	19	15	41
Hessen	-	1	-	-	1
Alsace	-	-	1	2	3
Holland	-	3	1	-	4
England	-	-	-	1	1
Denmark	-	-	1	-	1
West Prussia/Poland	-	5	-	-	5
Switzerland	-	1	1	1	3
Austria-Hungary	1	1	1	1	4
Caucasus/Asia Minor	-	-	2	-	2
North America (gen.)	-	5	44	31	80
North America (by location)	-	-	11	36	47
West/East India	-	3	-	-	3
Emigrated no location	-	1	1	-	2
Military Service	-	3	15	-	18
Remained in Russia*	-	-	4	-	4
Journeyman on a walk	-	4	4	-	8
Gen. 'Abroad'	-	2	1	2	5
Missing	1	5	4	1	11
TOTAL	6	63	139	130	338

*Conscripted to Napoleon's Russian Campagin, 1812.

Amongst the loose leaf inserts of the Ölbronn *Pflegrechnungen* there are two cases which contain letters from emigrants: one of them concerns Karl Nonnenmann, born in 1837 and by then a resident of Marshall, Michigan.[44] He wrote in 1866 that he worked for the railway and earned a good wage, but he also noted: ". . . ich habe bis daher noch nicht mehr Geld machen kön[n]en, denn ich mußte mir zu viel Kleider kaufen, wo ich die Kleider von daheim nicht alle benutzen kon[n]te, den[n] die Wämser und Hosentöhrleinshosen kan[n] ich hier nim[m]er brauchen, den[n] ich fürchte, die Amerikaner bekämen sonst Hörner, wen[n] sie das sehen würden an mir. . . ."[45] In the end Nonnenmann recommended that his brothers should also come to the United States to make more money. If they didn't like it there, they could always move back. Two of the four brothers did indeed take his advice to heart, and emigrated in 1880 and 1882.

The studies of Andreas Hartmann and Christine Rehe give an idea of the sort of information contained in the Württemberg *Pflegrechnungen* as concerns questions of emigration. In the archives of Hailfingen [near Rottenburg] there are 107 *Pflegschaftsakten* files, of those 43 concern emigrants

to America.[46] Because Hailfingen only became part of Württemberg in 1805 and the previous Austrian administration did not maintain *Pflegrechnungen*, all of the files are from the 19th century. Andreas Hartmann compared the emigrants to America named in the *Pflegrechnungen* with the district administration's records of declared emigrants. It turned out that 21 of the 43 emigrants had, until that point, not been identified as such. In terms of the district records' total of 133 emigrants, one sixth of them thus consist of "new" persons.[47] Christine Rehe was able to analyze 58 letters from the 19th century found during her work in the archives of Filderstadt near Stuttgart.[48]

Both the *Inventuren und Teilungen* as well as the *Pflegrechnugen* are thus records of immense potential to the historian of German migration. Not only do they provide familial and material information about the conditions of migrants themselves, the extensive—even excessive—recording of these files allows the researcher to uncover a more complete picture of who emigrated, and when. Moreover, the frequent annexes to the files contain intimate information, recorded by migrating individuals or on their behalf, documenting the details and even experience of emigration itself. They await further use in the discovery of new information in German-American history.

Kreisarchiv Enzkreis
Pforzheim, Germany

Pflegrechnung of Michael Schäfer („1752 nachher Pensylvanien . . .“). 1755–1757. (Gemeindearchiv Ölbronn-Dürrn, Bestand Gemeinde Ölbronn, Nr. 1544)

Inventur of Anna Margretha Berger, wifo of Jacques Berger („vor 7 Jahren in Pennsylvanien gezogen"), 1760. (Gemeindearchiv Ölbronn-Dürrn, Bestand Gemeinde Ölbronn, Nr. 1090).

Notes

[1] Printed version of a lecture held in Philadelphia on July 17, 2017. I thank Dr. Andrew Dodd, Berlin, for the translation.

[2] They have, alternatively been used extensively in studies of domestic demography and socio-economic relations. See particularly Sigrid Hirbodian, Sheilagh Ogilvie, R. Johanna Regnath, eds., *Revolution des Fleisses, Revolution des Konsums? Leben und Wirtschaften in ländlichen Württemberg von 1650 bis 1800* (Ostfildern: Thorbecke, 2015), based on an extensive study of Inventuren and Teilungen; also David Warren Sabean *Property, Production and Family in Neck- arhausen, 1700–1870* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), which makes extensive use of the records.

[3] The use of the archives of smaller municipalities is made even more difficult by the fact that there are no full time, professional archivists available to support researchers. Contacting the responsible district archive, existing in each of Baden-Württemberg's counties, is recom- mended.

[4] "One may rightly claim that the positively excessive administration of everyday life in both city and country in Württemberg has meant the notable preservation of material both qualitatively and quantitatively." Andreas Peter Hartmann, *Pflege-Fälle. Pflegschaftsakten als Quelle zur Amerikaauswanderung, dargestellt am Beispiel eines württembergischen Dorfes im 19. Jahrhundert,* MA Thesis, University of Marburg, 1996, 16.

[5] See the presentation "Südwestdeutsche Archivalienkunde" which can be viewed online: <https://www.leo-bw.de/themenmodul/sudwestdeutsche-archivalienkunde> Rolf Bidlingmai- er, 'Inventuren und Teilungen' in Christian Keitel und Regina Keyler, eds., *Serielle Quellen in südwestdeutschen Archiven* (Stuttgart: Würrtemberg Geschichts u. Altertumsverein, 2005), provides basic information on both source categories. Paul Sauer, 'Quellen zur Amerikaauswanderung in den staatlichen, kommunalen und kirchlichen Archiven des ehemaligen Landes Württemberg' in Willi Paul Adams, ed., *Die deutschsprachige Auswanderung in die Vereinigten Staaten. Berichte* über *Forschungsstand und Quellenbestände* (Berlin: Materialien des John F. Kennedy Instituts für Nordamerikastudien Freie Universität Berlin, no. 14, 1980), 167, names both source series in one sentence, but only in terms of the personal documents they contain.

[6] Until 1826 both the *Inventuren und Teilungen* and also the *Pflegrechnungen* were created at the local district level in the so-called *Stadt- und Amtsschreibereien*. Only after their dissolution (1826) they were handed over to the respective affected municipalities (see Karl J. Mayer 'Quellenverluste durch Schriftgutausscheidungen bei den Oberämtern. Dargestellt am Beispiel von Calw, Neuenbürg und Nagold, 1826–1936,' *Zeitschrift für württembergische Landesgeschichte* 61(2002), 325. From now on, the tasks of the voluntary jurisdiction had to be exer- cised by the local council or a body formed by it, the so-called *Waisengericht* (orphan court).

[7] Bidlingmaier, 'Inventuren', 21. Author's additions.

[8] Ibid., 22, with changes in the 19th century. In the municipal archives the inventories can be searched for and found in different places: within the usually completed division of the archives into the main groups files (A), volumes (B) and invoices (R). The hard-covered inven- tories can be found under the volumes. But as unbound folders the inventories appear also in the subset of the files (depending on the underlying organizational structure of the filing under "913 Vormundschafts- und Nachlaßwesen" [Flattich-Aktenplan] or "084.4 Nachlaßsachen" [Boorberg-Aktenplan]).

[9] Bidlingmaier, 'Inventuren', 25.

[10] On this topic cf. Günther Schweizer, 'Schon die dritte Person nach der genealogischen Berechnung . . . Inventur- und Teilungsakten sowie Kirchenkonventsprotokolle als Quellen einer sozialgeschichtlichen Genealogie,' *Genealogische Quellenjenseits der Kirchenbücher Stuttgart* (2005): 137-39, and Markus Küpker, Janine Maegraith und Sheilagh Ogilvie, 'Von "Beybringen" bis "Verlassthum": Erfahrungen und Erkenntnisse im Umgang mit Inventuren und Teilungen' in Hirbodian Sigrid, Sheilagh Ogilvie und R. Johanna Regnath, eds., *Revolu- tion des*

Fleißes, Revolution des Konsums? Leben und Wirtschaften im ländlichen Württemberg von 1650 bis 1800 (Ostfildern: Veröffentlichung des Alemannischen Instituts, no. 82, 2015), 40 (with a list of relevant studies).

[11] Bidlingmaier, 'Inventuren', 23.

[12] Martin Ehlers, 'Inventuren und Teilungen. Bürgerlicher Besitz und Alltagsgegenstände vor 1900,' *Hierzuland* 31 (2016): 60f.

[13] Wolfgang von Hippel, *Auswanderung aus Südwestdeutschland. Studien zur württembergischen Auswanderung und Auswanderungspolitik im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 1984), 95.

[14] Ibid., 96.

[15] Ibid., 140.

[16] Gemeindearchiv (GA) Ölbronn Nr. 1143 (Beilage zur Inventur- und Teilungsakte Nr. 1153). Cf. Burkhart Oertel, *Ortssippenbuch Ölbronn* (Neubiberg: Selbstverlag des Verf., 2007), nr. 174.

[17] For the following see Johannes Haßbacher, *Ein Dorf an der Grenze: Chronik von* Öl*bronn* (Ölbronn-Durrn, Finkenstr. 4: 1982), 282.

[18] He is named alongside other "willing to emigrate" persons from Ölbronn in the Württembergisches Staats- und Regierungsblatt of May 5th, 1817 see Eberhard Fritz, *Auswanderer aus dem Königreich Württemberg 1816–1820: Auswertung der Auswandereranträge im "Königlich-Württembergischen Staats- und Regierungsblatt*" (Altshausen, 2002), 97.

[19] GA Ölbronn Nr. 1155 (Beilage zur Inventur- und Teilungsakte Nr. 1485). Cf. Oertel, Ölbronn, Nr. 166.

[20] "I did well in emigrating, for I live better in this country than in Germany"

[21] "I can buy and sell when I can and like, other (than that) I needn't give anything to anyone"

[22] GA Ölbronn Nr. 1154 (Beilage zur Inventur- und Teilungsakte Nr. 1453). Cf. Oertel, Ölbronn, Nr. 172.

[23] "1816 I sowed 8 days before the Feast of St John [June 24th] one Morgen of barley. Six weeks of rainy weather prevented an earlier sowing. Afterwards it rained another five weeks such that the wet weather lasted from May 1st to July 18th. Not eight days passed during which it did not rain. The hay harvest lasted until the feast of St James [Juli 25th]. Initially much grass was partly silted up and even washed away by strong floods."

[24] "My dear reader, I previously wrote that the wet weather lasted until July 18th, but I wrote too soon, for even until the feast of St Martin (Nov 11th) there were few days without rain."

[25] "In the area around the Rhine many fields were covered by the river's waters such that at harvest the people cut the stalks from out of the water while in boats."

[26] For the following see Eberhard Fritz, 'Religiöse Rebellen im grenznahen Dorf. Separatisten in Ölbronn im späten 18. und frühen 19. Jahrhundert' in *Der Enzkreis. Historisches und Aktuelles 15* (Ostfildern: Thorbecke, 2016), 79-205, passim.

[27] Ölbronn (including nearby Kleinvillars) had a total population of 829 in 1801 ("souls", including "416 Kommunikanten, 127 Katechumenen, 120 Infantes, 2 Katholiken, 101 Reformierte, 59 Separatisten und 4 "Miserabiles"); Landeskirchliches Archiv Stuttgart A 1 1801 (Message from von Andreas Butz, 21.06.2017).

[28] Haßpacher, Ölbronn 280.

[29] Ibid., 281.

[30] GA Ölbronn Nr. 1142, Inventur- und Teilungsakte (IT) Nr. 1150.

[31] Eberhard Fritz, "Separatistinnen und Separatisten in Württemberg und in angrenzenden Territorien. Ein biographisches Verzeichnis Stuttgart," *Südwestdeutsche Quellen zur Familien- und Wappenkunde 3* (2005): 105-9 names only few. There was however a large number of sympathizers who did not openly declare for separatism. It is possible that separatists from

outside Ölbronn, whom Regine Keller joined, are meant here. Joining groups of separatists was a particularly attractive choice due to their good organizational structures.

[32] "On April 22, 1830 our dear son Ludwig emigrated with his wife and two children, Carolina and Friderike, to North America. This parting was difficult. Our hearts will long bleed over this hour. And only the thought of once again coming together in the hereafter can lessen our sorrow."

[33] Christine Rehe, *Von den Fildern nach Amerika. Alltag von Auswanderern im Spiegel ihrer Briefe. Eine mentalitätsgeschichtliche Annäherung* Filderstädter Schriftenreihe zur Heimat- und Landeskunde 11 (Filderstadt, 1996), 31. Like the *Inventuren*, the *Pflegrechnungen* can appear at different places within the archive structure of a municipal archive: As invoices, they are often in the sub-section Invoices (R); however, they may also be listed in the sub-files file under the Voluntary Jurisdiction Papers. Depending on the underlying organizational structure of the filing, here under "9135 Vormundschaft und Pflegschaften" (Flattich-Aktenplan) or "084.3 Vormundschaftssachen" (Boorberg-Aktenplan)

[34] GA Ölbronn Nr. 1544; cf. Oertel, Ölbronn, Nr. 1184.

[35] GA Ölbronn Nr. 1411; cf. Oertel, Ölbronn, Nr. 696.

[36] Rehe, *Fildern,* 38; See for example Walter D Kamphoefner, Wolfgang Johannes Helbich, and Ulrike Sommer eds., Susan Carter Vogel Trans., *News from the Land of Freedom: German Immigrants Write Home* Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1991. (Nursing bills are not mentioned here as a source for emigrant letters.)

[37] Hartmann, *Pflege-Fälle* 30.

[38] Angelika Bischoff-Luithlen, 'Volkskunde und Gemeindearchiv. Arbeitsnotizen aus Archiven des Landkreises Reutlingen,' in *Forschungen und Berichte zur Volkskunde in Baden- Württemberg 1974–1977* (Stuttgart, Müller & Gräff, 1977), 111.

[39] Ibid.

[40] Hartmann, *Pflege-Fälle* und Rehe, *Fildern.* Hartmann summarizes in detail the legal background of the *Pflegrechnung* management 31-42.

[41] ehe, *Alltag,* 38f. See also the treatment of this issue by A.G. Roeber, *Palatines, Liberty and Property: German Lutherans in Colonial British America* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1993), 118-20.

[42] GA Ölbronn Nr. 1621; vgl. Oertel, Ölbronn, Nr. 1488, und Fritz, *Separatisten* 109.

[43] Further emigrants to the US can be found under the designation "Emigrated no location" (2 cases), "Gen. Abroad" (5) and "Missing" (11).

[44] GA ÖLB Nr. 1514; vgl. Oertel, Ölbronn Nr. 1099.

[45] "I have not been able to put more money together as I have had to buy too many clothes because I can't use the clothes from home here—the waist coats with long sleeves and the trousers with a codpiece (literally: trousers with a little trousers' door) I simply cannot use here, for a fear that the Americans' eyes would pop out of their heads if they saw me wearing those here."

[46] Hartmann, *Pflege-Fälle* 4, 43.

[47] Hartmann, *Pflege-Fälle* 43.

[48] Rehe, *Fildern* 38. Rehe does give a total of 1,1719 known emigrants to America for Filderstadt for the 19th century, but not how many could be identified due to the *Pflegrechnungen*.