

# Tribal Identity in the Moravian Missions on the Susquehanna

Amy C. Schutt  
*Colgate University*

A few days before Easter in 1765 a large party of Christian Indians with two Moravian missionaries left the Delaware River Valley and headed for the North Branch of the Susquehanna River, where they planned to establish a mission at the Indian village Wyalusing. The Moravians were German-speaking pietists who had operated missions among northeastern Algonquian groups beginning in the early 1740s. Sending missionaries from their North American headquarters at Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, the Moravians attracted sizable numbers of Indians to their missions in New York, Connecticut, and Pennsylvania. But shortly before the move to Wyalusing, Pontiac's War (1763-64) had badly disrupted the Moravian mission effort, forcing the converts to move from place to place in search of a safe haven from hostile whites. Placed in Philadelphia barracks by colonial officials as a protective measure, many of the Christian Indians found death rather than security as disease ravaged their cramped quarters. At the end of this dreadful period, the missionaries were hoping to rebuild and expand on the work they had begun over two decades earlier among the Delawares, Mahicans, and other groups being pushed out of their homelands. As they did so, they turned to the Susquehanna Valley, which by the mid-eighteenth century was a multiethnic area with Indian inhabitants speaking many different languages and holding onto many different cultural traditions.<sup>1</sup>

The story of the Moravians' Susquehanna mission reveals how Indians from varying tribal backgrounds, primarily Mahicans and Delawares, responded to each other within the mission setting. Although the Moravians sought to unify the converts into "one people," the converts demonstrated that they were unwilling to blend into a Christian melting pot if it meant surrendering their distinct tribal identities and loyalties. What emerges from the Wyalusing story is evidence of the ways that Indians defined group boundaries even as these boundaries shifted repeatedly. In this period, these Indians were struggling with the question of what it meant to be part of a "tribe" or "nation" distinct from other native groups. For them, these group boundaries were not abstract but rather something they understood concretely in associating with a particular locality, using a certain language or dialect, and choosing specific leaders or spokespersons. The Moravian records suggest that these three areas—locality, leadership, and language—were key markers of tribal identification.<sup>2</sup>

To understand tribal identity is to explore what Indians meant when they identified themselves with particular groups, such as the Mahicans, Delawares, or any of the other ethnic divisions in the region. Sometimes they clarified tribal boundaries with the language of fictive kinship. Thus, the Delawares gained group identity as the “grandfathers” to a large number of other tribes, including the Mahicans, Shawnees, Ottawas, and Cherokees. Indians in the region also understood the Delawares to be “cousins” (sister’s children) of the Six Iroquois Nations.<sup>3</sup>

The appearance of such language suggests tribal boundaries, but we must proceed cautiously in using the words *tribe* and *tribal*. As Morton H. Fried has pointed out, the “notion of tribe” is highly ambiguous. The term *tribe* can mislead by implying a level of political organization, of hierarchy and integration of members, that does not apply to most Indian groups. It suggests definite group boundaries within which various members felt part of a larger structure.<sup>4</sup> But in the case of the Susquehanna Indians the word *tribe* does not refer to a fixed entity with an overarching political organization and clearly defined group boundaries; rather, tribal boundaries were fluid and political arrangements shifted throughout the eighteenth century. Despite problems with the terminology, there is evidence that these eighteenth-century Susquehanna Indians increasingly saw themselves as part of particular tribes, or nations. Fictive kinship terminology was just one sign of these emerging tribal identifications, which extended westward beyond the Susquehanna. As historian Michael N. McConnell notes, there was a growing “collective identity” among such groups as the Delawares and Shawnees in the Ohio Country “as once autonomous or long-separated bands cooperated more closely, approaching our modern definition of ‘tribe’ or ‘nation.’”<sup>5</sup>

The Wyalusing mission, in particular, offers an illuminating example of the formation and role of tribal identities. An influx of Munsee Delawares soon after the mission’s establishment created an increasingly multiethnic setting, which provoked a tribal response, particularly among the Mahican converts. The Moravians’ Susquehanna records provide remarkable detail about the interactions between Mahicans and Delawares at the community level. Wyalusing is a useful case because it exemplifies the larger process of identity formation, of intertribal relations, and multiethnic community building which challenged Indians throughout the eighteenth-century Susquehanna Valley.

This study contributes to a recent trend to consider the histories of interethnic and intertribal relations among native peoples. In his book *Dancing on Common Ground*, Howard Meredith argues, for example, that his study of Southern Plains Indians reveals “a continuing network of intertribal activities and mutual support among the diverse peoples of the region.” He looks at alliances maintained, in part, through shared images and symbols across tribal lines. Gregory Dowd goes even farther in examining intertribal relations by

arguing for not only alliances between groups but also the creation of a new “pan-Indian” identity that blurred tribal lines in the years 1745-1815. My own examination of the Moravian missions is closer to the evaluation of inter-group relations among Northern Plains groups by Howard L. Harrod in *Becoming and Remaining a People*. Like the Moravian Indians, these Northern Plains villagers tempered innovation and dramatically changing circumstances with social continuity, maintaining “core distinctions that supported a sense of identity within each group.” Harrod emphasizes the process by which Indians in the midst of social change were able to “become and remain specific peoples.” Similarly, the Moravian Indians sought continuity in group identity within a world of innovation and dramatic change.<sup>6</sup>

Events, such as epidemics, wars, and European incursions, ensured that tribal boundaries were in flux as populations constituted and reconstituted themselves; however, Indian assertions of tribal autonomy and the Moravians’ eventual recognition of tribal distinctiveness created a degree of continuity that sustained tribal identities and traditions. As Harrod contends for the Northern Plains groups, “cultural interchanges . . . did not always lead to an *experience* of fundamental social change.” Peoples such as Hidatsas and Mandans “preserved a sense that the world experience and the basic identity of the group were intact.”<sup>7</sup> Likewise in the Moravian missions, times of crisis and great change spurred Indians to maintain their tribal identities as the flood of events seemed to threaten older connections and continuities. Transition periods at Wyalusing—such as when the mission was being established, when older converts faced an influx of newer converts, and when the community prepared to leave the Susquehanna—were times when tribal distinctions were most apparent. Even though personal rivalries *within* tribal groups and bonds of friendship *across* tribal boundaries were always important in shaping the community, the converts’ concern for recognition of their own “nation” was a powerful feature of mission life.

In coming to this conclusion, we must proceed cautiously to detect hidden biases in the overwhelmingly Moravian sources. The question to examine is whether or not the Moravians, like so many other Europeans who encountered Indians, overemphasized tribal distinctions as a convenient way to organize and sort Indians and identify Indian leaders. If this were the case, then we would have to dismiss the evidence of tribal affiliation and identity as representing the Moravians’ rather than the Indians’ worldview. Such, however, was not the situation. By the 1760s the missionaries were not eager to embrace tribal distinctions, fearing that tribal loyalties might supersede loyalty to the mission.

One of the Moravians’ anxieties was that the Mahicans and Delawares might be persuaded, or forced, to live apart from each other—perhaps leading to the break-up or weakening of the Moravian mission. In 1765 there were

rumors that the Six Nations had recently agreed to settle the Delawares and Mahicans, who were scattered throughout the Susquehanna region, in two separate towns. Reporting this rumor, the Moravian missionary David Zeisberger commented on the shakiness of the converts' situation, saying that "most of our Indians also do not believe that they will remain here." Hence, with great urgency Zeisberger instructed the Christian Indians to explain to the Six Nations' leaders that "to be sure there are here two kinds of nations, namely Mahican and Delaware, nevertheless they are one people and live together." At another point Zeisberger chided the converts to remember that they were "*one* people not two," meaning that they should not let their tribal identities divide them into Mahicans and Delawares. These comments demonstrate that the missionaries were unwilling to physically separate the Wyalusing population along tribal lines and, indeed, the Moravians tried to downplay tribal identities.<sup>8</sup>

They probably found this difficult to do, however, because Wyalusing, as a physical location, already seemed to have a tribal identity. Its recent history linked it to the Delawares, specifically the Munsees. The Munsees spoke a northern dialect of Delaware, and their homelands had included areas of southeastern New York and northern New Jersey. Since sometime in the 1750s Wyalusing had been the home of Papunhank, a Munsee preacher who had been inspiring his people to revitalize their community by giving up alcohol and embracing pacifism. Drawn at first to the Quakers, Papunhank eventually decided to join the Moravians and became a key leader at the Wyalusing mission.<sup>9</sup>

There is evidence that Indians along the Susquehanna identified particular locations with specific cultural groups. We see this in the converts' expectation that the Six Nations might ask them to live in two separate towns—one for the Mahicans and one for the Delawares. Research on other Susquehanna towns also suggests the important link between ethnicity and location. "Towns," such as Wyoming (present Wilkes-Barre, Pa.), Shamokin (present Sunbury, Pa.), and Otsiningo (present Binghamton, N.Y.), actually consisted of loosely connected tribal enclaves, within groups maintained their cultural distinctiveness. At Otsiningo in 1766, for example, there were at least four distinct areas, representing Nanticoke, Mahican, Onondaga, and Conoy settlements. In 1749 Shamokin reportedly consisted of three identifiable groups—Delawares, Senecas, and Tutelos. The Wyoming area in 1750 included at least a Shawnee town and a Nanticoke town. Extrapolating from this regional evidence, we can understand why Indians would have expected Wyalusing to represent a tribe or several tribal enclaves within a larger area. Under the circumstances Susquehanna Indians undoubtedly viewed Wyalusing in terms of tribal identities.<sup>10</sup>

For the Moravian mission to succeed, Wyalusing could not remain solely a Munsee Delaware location. The Moravians needed to grant recognition and respect to the tribal and ethnic diversity among the converts living there; otherwise various groups, particularly the Mahicans, would feel slighted. A Moravian listing of the Wyalusing inhabitants, which probably dates from early 1767, demonstrates this ethnic diversity. At that time the Mahicans made up about 19 percent of the 103 baptized Indian inhabitants, the Munsees 22 percent, and other Delawares 37 percent. There were also some baptized Indians whom the Moravians referred to as "Wompanosch," comprising 13 percent. Finally, a few individuals (about 9 percent) came from other tribes, such as the Nanticokes, Catawbias, and Conoys ("Canai"). The community also included 68 unbaptized Indians, many of whom were children. Unlike most of the baptized inhabitants, it is not always possible to determine the ethnicity of these unbaptized individuals.<sup>11</sup>

Each of these groups had its own history. The Mahicans (also known as Mohicans but not to be confused with the Mohegans of eastern Connecticut) had once occupied territory bounded by Lake Champlain on the north and Dutchess County, New York, on the south. This homeland stretched west beyond the Hudson River to the Schoharie Creek and east toward the Connecticut River Valley. The Moravians had converted many of the Mahicans in the 1740s at Shekomeko, their village in New York, west of the Taconic Mountains. On the other side of the Taconics lay Pachgatgoch (Kent, Connecticut), where the Moravians set up a mission among the people they called Wompanosch. Because of their shared history along the border of New York and Connecticut, the Wompanosch probably identified most closely with the Mahicans. They do not stand out as a separate ethnic bloc at Wyalusing. Many of them probably felt part of Wyalusing's Mahican bloc. Others may have looked to Pachgatgoch, which still operated as a Moravian mission, as the location that continued to represent their people.<sup>12</sup>

The sub-ethnicities among the Delawares are complex. As we have seen, the Munsees were a distinct northern group with its own dialect. Other Delawares spoke a southern dialect called Unami. Two subgroups of Unami speakers stand out in the historical record from the eighteenth century. One group came from the west side of the lower Delaware River in southeastern Pennsylvania and northern Delaware. The second group of Unami speakers, known as Jersey Indians, came mainly from the east side of the river in southern New Jersey, below the falls at Trenton. Many of the Indians who joined the Moravians came from this subdivision, and the Moravians were most familiar with their dialect which Ives Goddard classifies as "Northern Unami."<sup>13</sup>

At first the Moravians seemed unaware of the importance of balancing these different ethnic interests in the village, particularly the interests of the Delawares versus the Mahicans. Their early organizational decisions at

Wyalusing in 1765 placed two Delaware leaders in the limelight, contributing to the sense that this was a Delaware location. These leaders were Papunhank, whose baptismal name was Johannes, and Anton, whom the Moravians had baptized in 1750. The trip to Wyalusing had been an arduous one, requiring the immigrants to cross the Blue Mountains through the frequent drenching rains of early spring and to struggle through the treacherous "Great Swamp." When the missionaries first arrived, they settled with Johannes Papunhank, Anton, and their family members in a prominent location that symbolized Delaware leadership at Wyalusing. Their lodging on that first night was a large, shingled house that belonged to Papunhank. Standing upon a hillock and housing the Delaware leaders, it made a powerful statement that Wyalusing had a special connection to the Delawares, particularly the Munsees. By sharing this housing with the Delaware leaders, the missionaries David Zeisberger and Johann Schmick showed their dependence on Papunhank's hospitality, making the Munsee leader's position even more conspicuous.<sup>14</sup>

Among their first acts, the Moravians acknowledged Johannes Papunhank's territorial authority by deferring to him on matters involving the inhabitants. Less than a week after arriving, several converts complained of a white man at Wyalusing who was a reputed thief and was threatening to take two Indian scalps before he would leave. Instead of dealing with the troublemaker themselves, the missionaries said, "we cannot get mixed up in the matter, still less forbid him to be here," and they referred the complainants to Johannes Papunhank, who they believed had authority to take action.<sup>15</sup>

By acknowledging and reinforcing Papunhank's status and leadership position at Wyalusing, the Moravians unwittingly undermined their plans to create a unified Christian community. They did this in two ways. First, it was not the norm among these northeastern Algonquians to rely on a central authority, or single leader. Rather, they were accustomed to consensus procedures in contrast to the Europeans' notion of hierarchical decision making which clearly marked off leaders from followers.<sup>16</sup> Investing so much authority in Papunhank, the Moravians unwittingly threatened to split the community by ignoring the Indians' preference for a broadly consultative rather than a single-leader model. Simply put, unity was not achievable by expecting the community to fall in line behind Papunhank. Second, the Moravians' reliance on Papunhank put the Mahicans in an awkward position and contributed to tensions between the Mahicans and Delawares. As we will see, the Mahican leader, known as Joshua Sr., became increasingly dissatisfied at Wyalusing, feeling many slights to his authority among the converts. The causes for Joshua's unhappiness seem multiple; however, developments revealed that Mahican resentment of the Delawares contributed to his troubled state.

A religious revival at the end of 1765 and the beginning of 1766 had the potential to unify the Wyalusing community, bringing Mahicans and Dela-

wares together in a common commitment to Christianity. Such, however, was not to be the case. Joshua's name is noticeably absent from the accounts of the revival, and the Mahican leader was away from Wyalusing repeatedly, often hunting or visiting Bethlehem for extended periods. Other Mahicans followed suit. In May 1766 the Moravian diarist recorded that some of the Mahicans had been gone for much of the previous nine months. During the Mahicans' absence, more and more Munsees experienced emotional conversions and moved to Wyalusing. The Mahicans, who were among the Moravians' first converts, were clearly being outnumbered with the influx of Munsees. Now it seemed that Wyalusing was becoming even more identified as a Delaware town, no doubt contributing to Joshua's discontent.<sup>17</sup>

The important role of the Delaware Anton during the revival also helped eclipse Joshua's leadership position at Wyalusing. Anton led night-time religious meetings. This practice, which mirrored evening worship periods in white Moravian communities, inspired many Indians to request baptism and closer communion with the Wyalusing Christians. On November 24, 1765, a missionary overheard one of these late-night preaching sessions, held by Anton, who displayed an impressive knowledge of the Bible and a powerful preaching style. The missionary wrote: "as I approached Anton's house, I heard noisy weeping. Anton had to repeat to them the entire sermon and the evening service, and added to this still more; he began with the promise of paradise, proceeded with all the prophets, and how the patriarchs waited for Him, which is being fulfilled in these times! He continued further about His life, His baptism, what His father from heaven said." Anton related the other events following Jesus' anguish at Gethsemane: "*Then* you shall hear about his bloody sweat on the Mount of Olives, about all His suffering, death, resurrection, and ascension. Now He sits there [in heaven] with all the wounds that were inflicted for our sins."<sup>18</sup>

Not only did these revivals highlight the spiritual leadership of Anton, but they brought a new highly esteemed Delaware into the community. Especially moving to the Munsees was the baptism of this man they called "Sakima," their sachem whom the Moravians named Abraham. The Moravians baptized Abraham on Christmas Day 1765. With the choice of this day and with the choice of the name Abraham, the first of the Old Testament patriarchs, the Moravians underlined the significance of this baptism. Once again, the Moravians seemed to go out of their way to contribute to the status of a Delaware leader. Because the five other Indians baptized between October 20, 1765, and March 30, 1766, were all Munsee Delawares and because the Mahicans were noticeably absent during this period, this revival affected the community unevenly. From the Mahicans' point of view, this must have seemed like a Munsee revival, one that left them on the margins while Delaware leaders took the spotlight. Joshua's dissatisfaction needs to be understood in this context.<sup>19</sup>

In addition, the Wyalusing residents' early political dealing with the Cayugas, who assumed jurisdiction over the upper Susquehanna region, widened the gap between the Mahicans and the Delawares. Increasingly, the Mahicans, particularly Joshua, felt that the negotiations did not fully represent their interests. Although at first it seemed there would be a careful balance between the Mahicans and the Delawares in discussions with the Cayugas, very quickly this balance was upset. These negotiations revealed that not only localities but also recognition of particular leaders or spokespersons helped define tribal boundaries.

There is a strong indication that the Cayugas approached the Wyalusing negotiations with an awareness of the need to balance the ethnic divisions within the community by recognizing specific tribal leaders. The Cayugas apparently did not think of the Wyalusing inhabitants as "one people," but rather saw them in terms of ethnic blocs, each of which needed to be carefully regarded and recognized. This approach emerged in their request that Anton, Johannes, and Joshua visit them and confer about the new settlement, for in making this request the Cayugas called upon representatives from the three main ethnic divisions at Wyalusing. Joshua was clearly a spokesman for the Mahicans, and Johannes obviously represented the Munsee Delaware bloc. Anton probably spoke for the Jersey, or Unami-speaking Delawares.<sup>20</sup> Anton's connections to the Jersey Delawares appear throughout the Moravian records. Anton had once lived at Tunkhannock, a village south of Wyalusing. Tunkhannock has been identified as primarily a Jersey Delaware town during the time that Anton lived there. After his residence at Tunkhannock, Anton was baptized by the Moravians in 1750 and served as one of the spiritual leaders at the Moravian mission at Meniolagameka, north of the Blue Mountain. Meniolagameka was also a gathering place for Jersey Delawares. Thus, Anton had a history of being a leader, and no doubt spokesman, for these Unami-speakers. It is likely that because of this affiliation the Cayugas called on him to be the third Wyalusing representative in the negotiations. When the message arrived, Joshua was not at Wyalusing, as was often the case in this period. Another convert (a Wompanosch) took his place in the embassy to the Cayugas.<sup>21</sup>

These negotiations did not bode well for the Wyalusing Indians. Instead of granting permission for the converts to continue living along the Susquehanna, the Cayugas urged the group to move north into the Finger Lakes region. Although he did not state this at the time, the Cayuga chief was certainly aware that the lands around Wyalusing might be sold in the near future and that to continue to be under Six Nations' jurisdiction the converts would have to move deeper into Iroquoia. The converts were satisfied with the wood, water, fish, and salt that the Finger Lakes area provided, but they were unhappy with the poor hunting it offered. More distressing to Zeisberger was



the likelihood that the Moravian Indians would be forced to live near unconverted Indians. In particular, Tutelos had settled close to the place selected for the converts at Cayuga Lake.<sup>22</sup>

Although the outcome of these discussions distressed the Wyalusing inhabitants generally, the Mahicans felt especially singled out and insecure once the message was received. Perhaps Joshua's absence from the party to Cayuga made him suspicious about what the Delawares had told the Six Nations' representatives. Zeisberger's letters demonstrate that the Delaware leaders, Anton and Johannes, did not readily join their interests to those of the Mahicans once their residence at Wyalusing was threatened. After the Cayugas' troublesome response, the two Delawares said that "the message [or embassy] had nothing to do with them because they already had their place where they had lived formerly. It had to do strictly speaking with the Mahicans." Therefore, Johannes Papunhank and Anton argued, Joshua would need to respond to the Cayugas alone. Apparently the prior residence of Papunhank at Wyalusing and Anton at Tunkhannock gave them grounds to claim that the Delawares, unlike the Mahicans, could forego further applications for permission to live along the North Branch of the Susquehanna.<sup>23</sup>

Joshua was angry at Anton's and Johannes Papunhank's lack of concern for the Mahicans, and he chafed at the growing dominance of the Delaware faction within the town. It was at this point that Zeisberger reminded the Delaware leaders to think of the community as made up of "*one* people not two." Furthermore, he chided them, saying that "they should not shove all the burden on one alone, that would be too severe." Zeisberger's accusation that the leaders were dividing Wyalusing into two camps indicates that Anton's and Johannes Papunhank's peoples, made up of both Munsee and Unamispeakers, were increasingly forming a single ethnic bloc in the town, set apart from the Mahicans. Although aware of their own ethnic and language differences, Munsees and Unamis were increasingly thinking of themselves as members of a single Delaware tribe, and the Moravian records reflect this growing tribal consciousness.<sup>24</sup>

Joshua's dissatisfaction increased in early 1766 when Anton and Johannes sought the help of Newollike, who was a relative of Anton and a Munsee chief in the area. This action again seemed to favor Delaware authority. Trying a different tactic in their dealings with the Cayugas, Johannes Papunhank and Anton asked Newollike to travel with them to the Cayugas and then speak on behalf of the converts. Joshua publicly agreed with this plan, but he secretly sent a message to Newollike, saying that he, Joshua, would have nothing more to do with the message being prepared for the Cayugas and that "the words were not his." Papunhank's and Anton's appeal to Newollike failed, and their action drove a deeper wedge between the Delawares and Mahicans.<sup>25</sup>

There are hints as early as 1766 of how Joshua hoped to resolve the problem of the Mahicans' role within the Moravian missions. Engaging in conversations with the Bethlehem leaders, Joshua tried to convince them that the Mahicans needed to live in their own town. Zeisberger was not pleased with this suggestion, still hoping to convince the Indians to put aside their ethnic differences in the interests of Christian unity. Puzzled about the content of Joshua's discussions at Bethlehem, Zeisberger reported to Bethlehem on what Joshua was telling him: "he had also withdrawn from us. I do not wish to say that he withdrew from the [Moravian] Brethren. That is probably not his intent. Rather his main concern is to establish a separate town, and he believes that the Brethren in Bethlehem will not forsake him, rather provide him with Brothers and Sisters no matter where he might go, as he actually told me the Brethren in Bethlehem had promised him. I myself thought though, that if the Brethren in Bethlehem had done anything like that, they would certainly have reported it to me. Therefore [I] couldn't believe it, but I thought it could be possible that something like that was discussed with Joshua only in passing, as can sometimes happen, without paying it much attention." Several years later Joshua was still harboring such thoughts. In 1771 the missionary Schmick reported that Joshua had made another trip to Bethlehem. "For what reason," Schmick commented, he did not know: "perhaps he is thinking of beginning a new place not far from Kaskaskung [in the Ohio Country] for the Mahicans." This missionary's speculation suggests that throughout much of the time at Wyalusing, Joshua was longing for a separate town that would represent his tribe.<sup>26</sup>

After more negotiations, the Cayugas finally sent wampum strings in February 1767 confirming the Moravian Indians' permission to remain at Wyalusing.<sup>27</sup> Finalizing this matter helped relieve the ethnic tensions at Wyalusing temporarily, as the Delawares and Mahicans no longer had to wrangle over this issue. For a time it appeared that a balance had been struck between Mahican and Delaware interests so that the groups could live harmoniously on the Wyalusing. Wyalusing, or Friedenshütten as it was now called, entered a fairly peaceful period in 1767. An important symbol of the town's success was the *Versammlungsaal*, or meetinghouse, where religious services were held. In early January a community council consisting of male converts agreed that a larger structure was needed to hold the growing congregation. Construction of a 32 by 22 foot meetinghouse began after Epiphany. Improvements to the new meetinghouse continued into the following year. Indian women made mats out of colored wood that were hung on the walls, as were paintings depicting events in Jesus' life. One was a nativity scene; another showed Christ being bound and whipped since the theme of Jesus' suffering and sacrifice was prominent in Moravian theology. In September 1768 a belfry was added and covered with shingles.<sup>28</sup>

To outsiders, Friedenshütten probably seemed particularly peaceful and orderly in contrast to the rest of the Pennsylvania frontier, which was an especially tense and increasingly violent place in late 1767 and early 1768. As white settlers continued to move onto lands in violation of Indian treaties, the Pennsylvania government sought to restrict their movements and prevent the outbreak of another period of warfare. Conditions seemed ripe for a major outbreak of hostilities for several months after January 1768, when a German named Frederick Stump killed six Indians who were visiting his home in Cumberland County. The next day he and a young male servant murdered several more Indians—a woman, three girls, and a child, who lived about fifteen miles away. Stump was arrested and held in jail at Carlisle, where an armed mob quickly helped him escape.<sup>29</sup>

The Friedenshütten Indians first heard about the murders in early February. Although it was time for most of the residents to leave for their sugar camps, the male converts decided to stay close to the town in order to protect the missionaries from reprisals. Since at least two of the slain Indians were Mahicans, British Indian superintendent Sir William Johnson sent a communication to the Mahicans at Wyalusing and on the Big Island urging them to live all together at Oghquago (Oquaga), Otsiningo, or elsewhere on the Susquehanna, where they “would be more under” his “Eye and Care.” That Joshua and the Mahicans were not attracted by this proposal is further evidence of the relative ethnic harmony at Friedenshütten in mid-1768. Schmick reported that Joshua spoke with the Mahicans who all agreed that they did not wish to live with unconverted members of their tribe because such an arrangement would make it impossible for them to “love the Savior and live for Him.”<sup>30</sup>

After an initial absence, the return of Johann Schmick, with his wife Johanna, in the middle of 1766 also helped ease the Mahicans’ sense of isolation in the mission. The previous year Joshua’s wife Bathsheba (also Mahican) voiced her preference for the Schmicks, baldly stating to the missionary Johannes Roth that she was not happy to see him and wanted to see the Schmicks instead. This preference is understandable since the Schmicks had worked for almost fifteen years among the Mahicans, and Johann Schmick knew the Mahican language far better than Delaware dialects.<sup>31</sup>

Although other missionaries, such as Zeisberger and John Heckewelder, became known for their expertise in the Delaware language, Schmick had immersed himself in the Mahican language and was a compiler of a Mahican dictionary. The mission diaries show that the Mahican language was employed frequently after the Schmicks’ arrival. Schmick also used a Mahican litany and read aloud from Mahican translations, probably some that he had written with Joshua’s help. Joshua had worked with Schmick on Mahican translations as early as the 1750s. Thus, Joshua must have felt a personal investment, even

authorship, in some of the Mahican verses that Schmick used at Wyalusing. Recognition of the Mahican language undoubtedly mitigated the Mahicans' sense of being part of an embattled minority at Wyalusing.<sup>32</sup>

There are many indications that choice of language was no small matter to the converts. One piece of evidence is that the Moravians believed the matter was important enough to comment on it regularly. Throughout the diary they refer to occasions where either Delaware or Mahican was incorporated into worship services and schoolroom lessons. On December 24, 1765, for example, one missionary read aloud in Delaware to 120 listeners who heard the story of Jesus' birth. Frequently the congregation sang verses in Delaware and Mahican as part of *Singstunden*, or "singing services." Children received a multilingual education in the Wyalusing school. The Moravians commented on teaching children to sing verses in Mahican and Delaware, sometimes in combination with English or German. In 1770 Schmick reported that "the children sang Mahican and Delaware verses about the Savior's birth and suffering, which they had learned in school, to the great delight of the gathered Brethren."<sup>33</sup>

The Moravians needed to strike a balance in language use so that different ethnicities received recognition and no tribal group would feel slighted; yet they had trouble achieving this balance without more missionaries trained in both Delaware and Mahican. Although Delaware was not totally neglected after the Schmicks' arrival, it did take second place to Mahican. As Johann Schmick emphasized the Mahican language, the Moravian records show that this could create problems for Delawares who did not understand Mahican. One group of Jersey Indians, most of whom had joined the Moravians recently, preferred to live apart a few miles upriver at a place called Schechschequanunk. The comments of an Indian at Schechschequanunk in 1769 suggest that language was a factor in their preference to remain separate. Pleased that the missionary Johannes Roth had been assigned to Schechschequanunk, this Indian, named James Davis, commented that the last time he had visited Wyalusing, "he could understand little because he did not understand Mahican." Now, he continued, "he was very pleased to have a Brother with him, since he could understand the verses and discourse." James Davis was grateful because Roth depended on Delaware interpreters and was in the process of learning the language himself, making Delaware the primary language of religious discourse at Schechschequanunk. Although previous association with the Presbyterians also set them apart, the quotation from James Davis suggests that language contributed to their sense of having a separate identity and made it difficult to feel as "one people" with the Mahicans.<sup>34</sup>

In contrast to the Jerseys at Schechschequanunk, many Delawares did remain at Wyalusing and seemed to accept the frequent use of the Mahican language. Their seeming ability to cross linguistic lines underscores the point

that ethnic divisions, while highly important to these Indians, did not put Indians in boxes that shut off one group from another. The Munsees probably had an easier time understanding the Mahican language since they originally came from regions bordering Mahican homelands. The Munsee leader Johannes Papunhank apparently could comprehend some Mahican. While the converts were still in barracks in Philadelphia, Papunhank attended his first "reading of the sufferings of our Lord in the Mahican language" and he was reportedly "very pleased with it." Unlike the Schechschequanunk Delawares, some of the other Unami-speakers at Wyalusing had been living among the Mahicans since at least the early 1750s and in the meantime must have gained some understanding of their language.<sup>35</sup>

The founding of Schechschequanunk may have defused some ethnic tensions as did recognition of the Mahicans and their language at Wyalusing; nevertheless, intertribal differences came to the surface again, when the converts learned that the Treaty of Fort Stanwix (1768) might open the lands around the mission to an influx of white settlers. As in the past, a time of uncertainty produced conditions that highlighted inter-group differences. At such a time, Joshua Sr. again appeared to the Wyalusing residents as a central figure representing tribal interests. With increasing pressure on the converts to take part in the negotiations, Joshua felt a growing urgency to join with unconverted Mahicans to represent his tribe at Fort Stanwix. Abraham, a non-Moravian Mahican leader and translator for the Six Nations at Oquaga, strained to convince Joshua to join in the Mahican delegation at the treaty meetings. Schmick reported that "a messenger with one string of wampum from the Mahican Abraham came to the Mahicans here, especially to [ask] Joshua Sr. to come and not remain behind." This development worried Schmick who was always wary of Indian converts' becoming involved in matters that would lead them into close contact with unconverted friends and relations. Thus, Schmick struggled to convince Joshua not to accede to the request from Abraham. Although Joshua finally agreed, the unsettled times surrounding the treaty negotiations highlighted the tribal distinctions among the converts. Abraham's words stood as a reminder to Joshua of his responsibility to represent Mahican interests as life on the Susquehanna became more uncertain.<sup>36</sup>

In time it became obvious to Joshua and other converts that the entire mission would be forced to move into the Ohio Country as the Iroquois sold off lands along the North Branch. Farther west the converts would be living among sizable populations of Delawares. In such a situation, Joshua's own leadership role and the Mahicans' position in the missions seemed gravely threatened. David Zeisberger and a small contingent of converts, including Anton, were already establishing mission communities by 1768 on the Allegheny River and by 1770 on the Beaver River, all in the Ohio Country. Joshua was aware that Munsee Delawares in the Allegheny Valley were court-

ing the rest of the Delawares at Friedenshütten to follow Zeisberger and the others.<sup>37</sup>

Times were unsettled, and as in past times of instability, the community felt the strain. Not all of the tensions followed ethnic or tribal lines. *Intratribal* problems threatened to divide the Delawares. As these stresses increased, however, the Mahicans' long-standing grievances heightened the controversy and moved it forward. Johannes Papunhank became the center of the crisis in 1771 when a Munsee healer or shaman Oniem and a Delaware resident Job Chelloway accused Papunhank of witchcraft. Both blamed him for recent deaths of family members who had converted to the Moravians. Oniem's sister and her husband had sickened and died in late summer, and Job Chelloway's wife Paulina had died in June. Oniem and Job Chelloway circulated rumors that Papunhank was using a magic poison obtained from the Nanticokes. The Indians at Friedenshütten did not approve of the cultural practices of the Nanticokes, in particular their handling of their dead, so any link to this tribe damaged Papunhank's reputation.<sup>38</sup>

Joshua and his wife Bathsheba quickly accepted the rumors and led the movement against Papunhank. Boiling to the surface were all of their frustrations with Papunhank's leadership and with the Mahicans' position vis-à-vis the Delawares. No doubt fearing that the Mahicans would be dangerously subordinate to the Delawares in the Ohio Country, they lashed out at the Munsee leader. Memories of what had happened in 1764 at the Philadelphia barracks gave them reason to suspect Papunhank. Soon after Papunhank had joined the converts there, a devastating epidemic had broken out. Fifty-six converts had died between February and November, largely from smallpox. In its early stages, the epidemic had hit the Mahicans and Wompanosch especially hard, carrying off some of the earliest Moravian converts. One of these was Bathsheba's sister Judith, who had been baptized in 1743 at Shekomeko. Another was Sara, an elderly Wompanosch who had been married to the first Mahican convert, Abraham. On the same day that Sara's body was laid to rest in the "Pottersfield," the Moravians baptized Johannes Papunhank's daughter and named her Sophia. The sadness among the Mahicans and Wompanosch over Sara's death must have stood in marked contrast to the joy of Sophia's Munsee family on that June day. By the end of the epidemic, the Mahicans and Wompanosch had lost at least twenty-nine to disease, compared to about nineteen Delawares. None of the latter were Munsees, and Johannes Papunhank's family emerged unscathed. Joshua's and Bathsheba's animosity toward Papunhank is understandable in this context.<sup>39</sup>

A message from the Nanticokes that the rumors against Papunhank were false helped settle the 1771 controversy. Perhaps even more important in calming the situation, Moravian leaders in Bethlehem persuaded Joshua to reconcile with Johannes and with the missionaries, who had stood by Johannes

Papunhank in the controversy. Generally, Joshua seemed more ready to take advice from Bethlehem than from the missionaries with whom he was in daily contact. The elders at Bethlehem probably reassured Joshua that the Mahicans would not be neglected in the Ohio Country after Friedenshütten was abandoned in 1772. And indeed, they soon designated a new Mahican town in the Muskingum Valley of the Ohio Country. The name of the new town, Gnadenhütten, no doubt had symbolic importance to Joshua because it harkened back to the previous mission on the Mahony where the Mahicans had been a dominant presence. Furthermore, the arrival of Johann Schmick in 1773 at Gnadenhütten ensured that the Mahican language would supersede Delaware dialects in religious discourse there. Despite the presence of non-Mahicans at Gnadenhütten, the town acquired a separate, Mahican identity to such an extent that the Moravians had a difficult time convincing other converts to move there when the nearby Delaware-Moravian town Schönbrunn became overcrowded.<sup>40</sup>

The establishment of Gnadenhütten in the Ohio Country was the culmination of the Mahicans' struggle for recognition within the Moravian missions. Gnadenhütten is one more example of how Indians turned to localities, to physical space, to define tribal identity. Within a larger multiethnic setting, Indians sought to define and maintain boundaries of their own cultural group. They saw these boundaries as most secure when they could associate their people with a particular place. Even if some outsiders from other tribes joined their town, it was important for these Indians to see their town as representing, and symbolizing, the identity of one particular tribe. The Moravian records suggest how language helped define the tribal character of a locality and helped establish group boundaries. It was also important to the Indians that the Moravians recognize leaders from each of the mission's tribal groupings. Too much authority granted to one, such as Papunhank, threatened the ethnic balance of the mission and had to be redressed.<sup>41</sup>

The missionaries resisted, but eventually acquiesced, to tribal loyalties and affiliations. Although the Moravians suspected tribal divisions might splinter the converts and draw them toward unconverted Indians out of tribal loyalty, they found the Indians' desire for tribal recognition so strong that they had to alter their own visions of unity in order to win and hold onto converts. This is not to suggest that the identities of these Pennsylvania Indians were static or that these Indians held onto unchanging tribal groupings impervious to outside forces. What the Moravian records show is that a sense of continuity was important to these peoples, even more so because their world was undergoing dramatic change. Recognition of their language, leaders, and localities allowed these Indians to experience continuity even as they absorbed remnants of other cultural groups and adjusted to each other's cultures. We are mistaken if we assume that tribe and ethnicity lost their meaning in this

multicultural society as many different people met and intermingled. To the Native peoples living through these changing times, continuity of identity was profoundly important and they educated the missionaries about concrete ways to respect and recognize their tribal differences.



## Notes

1. "Reise Diarium des Br. Schmicks und David Zeisbergers mit den Indianer Geschw. aus Nain und Wechquetank an die Susquehanna nach Machilusing, von Apr. u. May 1765," item 1, folder 1, box 131, Records (Microfilm) of the Moravian Mission among the Indians of North America (hereafter RMM). The originals of these records are held at the Moravian Archives, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania. Quotations from the Moravian records are my own translations from German. David Zeisberger to Nathanael Seidel, May 19, 1765, item 6, folder 2, box 229, RMM; John Heckewelder, *A Narrative of the Mission of the United Brethren among the Delaware and Mohican [sic] Indians, from Its Commencement, in the Year 1740, to the Close of the Year 1808*. . . (Philadelphia: McCarty and Davis, 1820), 90-94; W. C. Reichel, "Wyalusing and the Moravian Mission at Friedenshuetten," in *Moravian Historical Society Transactions*, vol. 1, nos. 4/5, pp. 180-222; J. Taylor Hamilton and Kenneth G. Hamilton, *History of the Moravian Church: The Renewed Unitas Fratrum, 1722-1957* (Bethlehem: Interprovincial Board of Christian Education, Moravian Church in America, 1967; 2d ed. 1983), 279. For a view of the Susquehanna Valley in the eighteenth century, see Peter C. Mancall, *Valley of Opportunity: Economic Culture along the Upper Susquehanna, 1700-1800* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1991).
2. Zeisberger to Seidel, Oct. 20, 1765, item 14, folder 2, box 229, RMM. For an example of the Moravian use of the word *Nation*, see John Heckewelder to Elders' Conference, Bethlehem, Mar. 3, 1780, item 11, folder 3, box 215, RMM: "Our three congregations consist of 3 nations (*Nationen*): Delawares, Munsees, and Mahicans." Elsewhere the records refer to two "nations" within the mission, Mahicans and Delawares (presumably Munsees were included in the latter grouping). Wyalusing diary, June 12, 1765, item 1, folder 2, box 131. There are also numerous references, as one might expect, to the "6 Nations" of the Iroquois throughout the records. A fourth marker of tribal identity would be lineage, which is very difficult to examine via the Moravian records. Primarily coming from matrilineal societies, these Indians would probably have identified with their mother's tribe, first and foremost.
3. Archer Butler Hulbert and William Nathaniel Schwarze, eds., "David Zeisberger's History of the Northern American Indians," in *Ohio Archaeological and Historical Publications* (Columbus: Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Society, 1910), 19: 108-10; Michael N. McConnell, *A Country Between: The Upper Ohio Valley and Its Peoples, 1724-1774* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1992), 48.
4. Morton H. Fried, "On the Concepts of 'Tribe' and 'Tribal Society,'" in *Essays on the Problem of Tribe: Proceedings of the 1967 Annual Spring Meeting of the American Ethnological Society*, ed. June Helm (Seattle, 1968), 4-5; Morton H. Fried, *The Notion of Tribe* (Menlo Park, Calif., 1975), 106-11. Eleanor Leacock also discusses the problems of thinking in terms of tribal organization. Eleanor Leacock, "Ethnohistorical Investigation of Egalitarian Politics in Eastern North America," in *The Development of Political Organization in Native North America: 1979 Proceedings of the American Ethnological Society*, ed. Elisabeth Tooker (Washington, D.C.: American Ethnological Society, 1983), 17-18.
5. McConnell, *A Country Between*, 3. McConnell stresses the importance of ethnic or tribal divisions among the Ohio Indians, a view that I share based on my reading of Moravian records.
6. Howard Meredith, *Dancing on Common Ground: Tribal Cultures and Alliances on the Southern Plains* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1995), 1; Gregory Evans Dowd, *A Spirited Resistance: The North American Indian Struggle for Unity, 1745-1815* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992); Howard L. Harrod, *Becoming and Remaining a People: Native American Religions on the Northern Plains* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1995), 65. Richard White's *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815* (Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 1991) emphasizes the multiethnicity of Indian villages but downplays tribal divisions within these villages. For a study that, like Dowd's and in contrast to mine, emphasizes a growing "Indian" identity "transcending old tribal divisions," see Daniel R. Mandell, *Behind the Frontier: Indians in Eighteenth-Century Eastern Massachusetts* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1996), quotation on p. 6.
7. Harrod, *Becoming and Remaining a People*, 28.

8. "Die meisten von unsern Indianern glauben auch nicht, daß sie hier bleiben werden." Zeisberger to Seidel, June [28?], 1765, item 9, folder 2, box 229, RMM. "so sagte ich ihnen, daß sie denen Chiefs droben müsten deutl. machen, daß sie hier wol Zerley Nationen neml. Mahikander u. Dellawares [aber?] doch ein Volck wären u. beisammen wohnten, u. weil sie nicht mehr so leben könnten u. wolten, wie andere Indianer, so wolten sie gerne ihren Lehrer bey sich haben." Wyalusing diary, June 12, 1765, item 1, folder 2, box 131; Zeisberger to Seidel, Oct. 20, 1765, item 14, folder 2, box 229.
9. Ives Goddard, "Delaware," in *Handbook of North American Indians*, ed. William C. Sturtevant, vol. 15, *Northeast*, ed. Bruce G. Trigger (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 1978), 213-39; C. A. Weslager, *The Delaware Indians: A History* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1989), 36-37; Herbert C. Kraft, *The Lenape: Archaeology, History, and Ethnography* (Newark, N.J.: New Jersey Historical Society, 1986); Ives Goddard, "The Ethnohistorical Implications of Early Delaware Linguistic Materials," in *Neighbors and Intruders: An Ethnohistorical Exploration of the Indians of Hudson's River*, ed. Laurence M. Hauptman and Jack Campisi, Canadian Ethnology Service, no. 39 (Ottawa: National Museums of Canada, 1978), 88-102; Heckewelder, *Narrative*, 77; Paul A. W. Wallace, *Indians in Pennsylvania*, 2d ed. (Harrisburg: Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, 1986), 180; George P. Donehoo, *A History of the Indian Villages and Place Names in Pennsylvania* (Harrisburg, Pa.: Telegraph Press, 1928), 87-88; Bethlehem and Nain extract, Aug. 27 and 29, 1758, item 10, folder 1, box 125; and Nain memorabilia, 1759, item 3, folder 2, box 125, RMM. For more on Papunhank (or Papoonan), see Dowd, *Spirited Resistance*, 31-32; and Jane T. Merritt, "Dreaming of the Savior's Blood: Moravians and the Indian Great Awakening in Pennsylvania," *William and Marry Quarterly*, 3d. ser., 54 (Oct. 1997): 734-35.
10. Delores Elliott, "Otsiningo, an Example of an Eighteenth Century Settlement Pattern," in *Current Perspectives in Northeastern Archeology, Essays in Honor of William A. Ritchie*, ed. Robert E. Funk and Charles F. Hayes III, Researches and Transactions of the New York State Archeological Association, vol. 17, no. 1 (n.p., 1977), 98; William M. Beauchamp, ed., *Moravian Journals Relating to Central New York, 1745-66* (Syracuse, N.Y.: Dehler press, 1916), 18, 103. See also Marshall Becker, "Native Settlements in the Forks of Delaware, Pennsylvania, in the 18th Century: Archaeological Implications," *Pennsylvania Archaeologist* 58 (Mar. 1988): 43-60.
11. Friedenshütten (Wyalusing) Catalog [1767], item 1, folder 4, box 131, RMM. I determined tribal identities by crosschecking these names with the Fliegel catalog, folders 2 and 4, box 3191, RMM, which enumerates converts and notes their tribal affiliations. Within the miscellaneous group that makes up 9 percent of the baptized, I have included two individuals whose tribal identities I could not determine.
12. T. J. Brasser, "Mahican," in *Handbook of North American Indians*, ed. Sturtevant, 15: 198-212; Patrick Frazier, *The Mohicans of Stockbridge* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1992), 59-60, 248-49 n. 11; Ted J. Brasser, *Riding on the Frontier's Crest: Mahican Indian Culture and Culture Change*, Ethnology Division Paper no. 13 (Ottawa: National Museums of Canada, 1974). J. Taylor Hamilton and Kenneth G. Hamilton state that the "last missionary was recalled from it [Pachgatgoch] in 1770." Hamilton and Hamilton, *History of the Moravian Church*, 663 n. 84.
13. My description of Unami speakers follows Marshall Becker's classifications. Marshall Becker, "Native Settlements in the Forks of the Delaware, Pennsylvania, in the 18th Century: Archaeological Implications," *Pennsylvania Archaeologist* 58 (Mar. 1988): 43-60; idem, "The Boundary between the Lenape and Munsee, the Forks of the Delaware as a Buffer Zone," *Man in the Northeast* (no. 26, 1983), 1-20; idem, "A Summary of Lenape Socio-Political Organization and Settlement Pattern at the Time of European Contact: The Evidence for Collecting Bands," *Journal of Middle Atlantic Archaeology* 4 (1988): 79-83. See also Goddard, "Delaware," 213-15; and idem, "Ethnohistorical Implications," 90.
14. "Reise Diarium nach Machilusing"; Zeisberger to Seidel, May 19, 1765; Heckewelder, *Narrative*, 93; Wyalusing diary, May 9, 1765, item 1, folder 1, box 131.
15. "sie solten mit Joh. Popunh. darüber reden, wir können uns damit nicht einlassen u. noch weniger ihn verbieten hier zu seyn." Wyalusing diary, May 12, 1765, item 1, folder 1, box 131.
16. Russell Lawrence Barsh, "The Nature and

Spirit of North American Political Systems," *American Indian Quarterly* 10 (Spring 1986): 192-93; Weslager, *Delaware Indians*, 62-63; Goddard, "Delaware," 216; Brasser, "Mahican," 200.

17. Wyalusing diary, May 4, 1766, item 1, folder 3, box 131. For a summary of Joshua's absences, see Carl John Fliegel, comp., *Index to the Records of the Moravian Mission among the Indians of North America* (New Haven, Conn.: Research Publications, 1970), vol. 1, p. 223.

18. "Diesen Abd. wolte ich besuchen gehn, als ich nach zu Antons Haus kam; hörte ich ein überlautes geweine, Anton mußte jhnen die ganze Predigt u. die Abd Vers. wieder hollen, u. that noch viel mehr hin zu; fing bey der Verheissung im Paradis an, ging alle Propheten durch, wie die Altväter auf ihn gewartet daß sey nun erfüllt zu dieser Zeit! Fuhr weiter fort von seinem Leben, von seiner Tauffe, was sein Vatter vom Himmel gesagt: Den solt jhr hören, von seinen Blutigen Schweiß am Oelberg von allen seinen Leyden Sterben auferstehn u. Himmel Fahrt: Nun sitzt Er da mit alle den Wunden die jhn für unsre Sunden geschlagen seyn." Wyalusing diary, Nov. 24, 1765, item 1, folder 2, box 131.

19. Wyalusing diary, Dec. 25, 1765, item 1, folder 2, box 131; Fliegel catalog, folder 2, box 3191; Zeisberger to Seidel, June 28, 1766, item 20, folder 2, box 229, RMM; Wyalusing diary, Sept. 22, 28, Oct. 9, 16, 19, 20, 1765, Jan. 2, 1766, item 1, folder 2, box 131. Goddard notes that *sakima* is an Unami word for "chief." The Munsee word is *kikhkay*. *Sakima* was certainly the more familiar term among the Moravians, who knew Unami far better than Munsee. The use of *sakima* may reflect the Moravians' language bias. It may also reflect the presence of a "jargon" or "pidginized form," as Goddard traces, of Unami which various groups in the area could understand. In spite of the rise of this jargon, it is interesting that the Moravian converts still sought recognition of their own tribal languages, that is, they sought continuity in the midst of change. Goddard, "Ethnohistorical Implications," 92, 90.

20. Zeisberger to Seidel, June [28?], 1765, item 9, folder 2, box 229; Wyalusing diary, June 12, 1765, item 1, folder 2, box 131.

21. Becker, "Native Settlements," 44-48; idem, "Boundary Zone," 7-8. For Anton's connections to Tunkhannock, see Gnadenhütten, Pa.,

diary, July 25, 1750, and Oct. 7, 1752 (app.), item 1, folders 1 and 3, box 117, RMM; and Bethlehem baptismal register, Jan. 28/Feb. 8, 1750, Moravian Archives, Bethlehem, Pa. According to this register, Anton's wife, Johanna, came from "the Jerseys." For Anton's leadership role at Meniolagameka, see Gnadenhütten, Pa., diary, Nov. 14, 1751, item 1, folder 2, box 117.

22. Wyalusing diary, June 27, 1765, item 1, folder 2, box 131; Zeisberger to Seidel, June 30, 1765, item 10, folder 2, box 229, RMM.

23. "Johannes u. Anton sagten: Die Botschafft ginge sie nicht an, denn sie hätten schon ihren Platz wo sie vorher gewohnt hätten, es ginge also eigentl. die Mahikander an, darum sollte Joshua die Belte beantworten, worüber er sehr verlegen aussahe u. nichts dagegen zu sagen wuste. Ich sagte darauf zu ihnen, sie wären ein Volck u. nicht zwey, sie müsten die Sache hübsch gemeinschaftl. tractiren." Zeisberger to Seidel, Oct. 20 (quotation) and Sept. 22, 1765, items 14 and 13, folder 2, box 229, RMM.

24. "sie soltens nicht einem allein auf den Hals schieben, das wäre zu schwer," and quotation in previous note. Zeisberger to Seidel, Oct. 20, 1765, item 14, folder 2, box 229.

25. Zeisberger to Nitschmann and Seidel, Apr. 8, 1766, item 18, folder 2, box 229; Wyalusing diary, Mar. 31, 1766, item 1, folder 3, box 131.

26. "Nun aber ist es klar genug warum er uns so lange aufgehalten u. die Sache verzögert hat, denn er hat sich ganz von der Botschafft u. also auch von uns los gesagt, ich will nicht sagen, daß sich von den Brrn. losgesagt, das ist wol seine Meinung nicht, sondern seine Hauptsache ist, ein Town vor sich anzufangen und glaubt bey sich, die Brr. in Bethl. werden ihn nicht verlassen, sondern ihm Brr. u. Geschw. mitgeben wo er auch hinginge, wie er auch gegen mich geäußert, daß die Brr. in Bethlehem ihm solches versprochen. Nun dachte ich wol bey mir selber, hätten die Brr. in Bethl. so was gethan, so würden sie mich doch davon berichtet haben, habe es also nicht wol glauben können, ich dachte aber, es könnte mögl. seyn, daß so etwas nur discursive mit Josua gesprochen worden, wie es manchmal geschehen kan, ohne drauf viel zu attendiren." Zeisberger to Nitschmann and Seidel, Apr. 8, 1766, item 18, folder 2, box 229; Schmick to Seidel, Jan. 7, 1771, item 5, folder 11, box 221, RMM.

27. Schmick to Oeconomats Conferenz [Oct. 1766 or later], item 2, folder 10, box 221, RMM; Friedenschütten diary, Jan. 11, 19, 20

and Feb. 23, 24, 1767, item 1, folder 4, box 131, RMM.

28. Friedenshütten diary, Jan. 2, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 17, 18, 1767, item 1, folder 4, box 131; *ibid.*, June 30, Oct. 10, Dec. 24, 1768, item 1, folder 5, box 131; Schmick to Seidel or Thrane, June 19, 1768, Schmick to Seidel, Aug. 14, 1768, and Schmick to Seidel, Sept. 18, 1768, items 15, 16, 17, folder 10, box 221, RMM.

29. G. S. Rowe, "The Frederick Stump Affair, 1768, and Its Challenge to Legal Historians of Early Pennsylvania," *Pennsylvania History* 49 (Oct. 1982): 259-60; "Letter to the Magistrates of Cumberland County Directing the Arrest of One Frederick Stump charged with the murder of a number of peaceable Indians," Jan. 19, 1768, in *Pennsylvania Archives*, 4th ser., vol. 3, 350-51; John Penn to "Brother Newoleeka," Jan. 23, 1768, in *ibid.*, 362-64; John Penn, "Proclamation directing the arrest of Frederick Stump and his servant charged with the murder of ten friendly Indians on Middle Creek, and offering a reward for their apprehension," Mar. 16, 1768, in *ibid.*, 387-89.

30. Copy of letter from Sir William Johnson to "Brethren of Wyalosing & of the Big Island," Mar. 18, 1768, item 14, folder 10, box 221, RMM; Schmick to Seidel or Thrane, June 19, 1768, item 15, folder 10, box 221, RMM; Friedenshütten diary, Feb. 9, Mar. 2, 3, 8, Apr. 5, 8, 1768, item 1, folder 5, box 131.

31. Roth to Seidel, Sept. 2, 1765, item 1, folder 7, box 221, RMM.

32. Gnadenhütten, Pa., diary, Dec. 4 and 5, 1751, folder 3, box 117; Friedenshütten diary, May 23, 1766, Dec. 18, 19, and 30, 1769, item 1, folder 3, box 131; *ibid.*, July 28, 1771, item 1, folder 8, box 131. Schmick left a manuscript Mahican/German dictionary that reveals the extent of his knowledge of Mahican. The original is at the American Philosophical Society. The published version is: Carl Masthay, ed., *Schmick's Mahican Dictionary* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1991). Although he used Mahican more, Schmick apparently could understand some Delaware. On one occasion, he noted that the words of a Cayuga were translated into Delaware for him. Friedenshütten diary, July 17, 1768, item 1, folder 5, box 131.

33. Wyalusing diary, Dec. 24, 1765, item 1, folder 2, box 131; *ibid.*, Mar. 24, 1766, item 1, folder 3, box 131; Friedenshütten diary,

Mar. 12, 19, Aug. 7, and Dec. 18, 24, 1769, item 1, folder 6, box 131; *ibid.*, Jan. 7, 1770, item 1, folder 7, box 131; Jan. 12 and 18, 1771, item 1, folder 8, box 131.

34. Friedenshütten diary, Feb. 21, 1768, item 1, folder 5, box 131; *ibid.*, Feb. 3, 1769, item 1, folder 6, box 131. "*Redte James Davis mit mir von seinen Herzen, wie der Hld seit 2 Jahre an sein Herz geklopft, u. wie ihne manchemahl die Augen über gegangen, wenn er in Friedenshütten besucht* [cancelled: *wie wohl er die letzte Zeit wenig verstanden denn mohicandisch verstehe er nicht*] *und nun freue er sich gar sehr einen Br. bey sich zu haben, da er die Verse u. Rede verstehen konnte u. alles freue sich drüber.*" Schechschequanuck diary, Feb. 9 (quotation) and 19, 1769, item 1, folder 1, box 133, RMM. (Note: the first part of James Davis's comments has been cancelled, but is readable and fits logically with the next part of the entry so I believe it is valid to use it). For a list of the residents at Schechschequanuck in 1772, see Reichel, "Wyalusing," 222 (app.). For an indication of Roth's studies of Delaware, see Johannes Roth, "Ein Versuch! Der Geschichte unsers Herrn u. Heylandes Jesu Christi. In daß Delawarische übersezt der Unami von der Marter Woche an bis zur Himmelfahrt unsers Herrn im Jahr 1770 u. 72. zu Tschechschequanung an der Susquehanna," bound manuscript, American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia, Pa.

35. *Um 10 Uhr wurde der Anfang gemacht mit Verlesung der leydens Geschichte unsers Herrn in mahicandischen Sprache, und es wurde meist der ganze Tag damit zugebracht, viele Thränen . . . sonderl. wurde unser Johannes Pepunhang der es zum erstenmahl hörte, gar sehr davon angethan.*" Philadelphia Barracks diary, Apr. 20, 1764, item 1, folder 2, box 127, RMM. There is some evidence that the Moravians treated the Presbyterian converts differently. Maria, one Presbyterian convert at Schechschequanuck, complained that Johanna Schmick did not call her "Sister," as she did other baptized women at Friedenshütten. Schechschequanuck diary, Apr. 24, 1769, item 1, folder 1, box 133. Maria was the mother of the Jersey Indian Jo Peepe, who had probably been converted by the Presbyterian missionaries David or John Brainerd. Hunter mentions "Joseph Peepe" as "one of Brainerd's converts." William A. Hunter, "Moses (Tunda) Tatamy, Delaware Indian Diplomat," in *Northeastern Indian Lives, 1632-1816*, ed. Robert S. Grumet (Amherst: Uni-

versity of Massachusetts Press, 1996), 263.

36. Friedenshütten diary, Sept. 17, 18, 23, 25, and Nov. 9, 1768, item 1, folder 5, box 131.

"*Kam 1 Maquaischer u. 1 Mahicander von Anahochquage, letzterer als Bote vom Mahicander Abraham mit 1 String of Wampum an die hiesigen Mahicander u. besonders an Joshua Sen. zur Treaty zukommen u. nicht auszubleiben*": Schmick to Seidel, Sept. 26, 1768, item 18, folder 10, box 221, RMM. Schmick to Seidel, Nov. 15, 1768, item 19, folder 10, box 221, RMM; Peter Marshall, "Sir William Johnson and the Treaty of Fort Stanwix, 1768," *American Studies*, 1 (Oct. 1967): 149-79; "Deed determining the Boundary Line between the Whites and Indians" and Map of Ft. Stanwix Treaty Line 1768, in *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New-York*, ed. E. B. O'Callaghan (Albany: Weed, Parsons, 1857), vol. 8: 135-37.

37. Friedenshütten diary, Mar. 25, Apr. 15, 24, 29, 30, May 4, 15, Sept. 6, 1771, item 1, folder 8, box 131, RMM. See Goschgoschünk (1768-69) and Lawunkhannek (1769-70) diaries, box 135, RMM; and Langundo Utenünk (Friedensstadt) diary, box 137, RMM.

38. Schmick to Seidel, Sept. 25, 1771, item

10, folder 11, box 221, RMM; Roth to Seidel, Sept. 30 and Oct. 15, 1771, items 15 and 16, folder 7, box 221, RMM.

39. Philadelphia Barracks diary, Feb. 9-Nov. 5, 1764, item 1, folder 2, box 127. For the death of Bathsheba's sister Judith, see June 5, 1764, and for the death of Sara and baptism of the Munsee Sophia, see June 10 and 11. To determine the ethnicity of each of these individuals, see Fliegel catalog.

40. Schmick to Seidel, Oct. 2 and Nov. 5, 1771, items 11 and 12, folder 11, box 221, RMM. On the establishment of Gnadenhütten, see Schönbrunn diary, Oct. 4, 5, 9, 1772, folder 1, box 1411, RMM. On overcrowding at Gnadenhütten, see Schönbrunn and Gnadenhütten combined diary, Apr. 27, 1773, item 1, folder 2, box 1411; and Schmick to Seidel, May 28, 1775, item 12, folder 12, box 221.

41. For a printed record of the Moravians' Ohio years, following the Friedenshütten period, see Herman Wellenreuther and Carola Wessel, eds., *Herrnhuter Indianermission in der Amerikanischen Revolution: Die Tagebücher von David Zeisberger 1772 bis 1781* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1995).