HOPING to encourage the British government to enact a naturalization bill for the American provinces in 1708, William Penn exhorted its leaders to recognize that it was in "the interest of England to improve and thicken her colonies with people not her own." 1 The rapid development of Penn's own colony in subsequent decades entirely vindicated his view, as successive waves of German, Scottish, and Irish immigrants came to play a vital role in increasing the population, expanding the area of settlement, and stimulating economic prosperity. So quickly did foreigners pour into the province that by mid-century Pennsylvania was the only colony in which the English stock constituted a minority of all whites.

Despite a longstanding recognition that the interaction of different ethnic groups has influenced virtually all aspects of cultural life and social development in the state, there are few estimates for the national origins of Pennsylvanians prior to the collection of extensive documentation on immigration and nativity in the mid-nineteenth century. Researchers utilizing the 1790 census attempted to determine the European descent of Pennsylvania's white stock in 1909 and 1932, but in both cases later scholars judged their work to be flawed. A recent investigation of the numbers of Scottish, Irish, and Welsh descendants in 1790 improved on earlier figures, but also seems to have overstated each group's numbers. Furthermore, only the initial study of 1909 calculated the distribution of national stocks among the state's counties, and its findings are no longer considered trustworthy. This article will demonstrate more reliable procedures for assessing the contributions of different European countries to Pennsylvania's population growth during the eighteenth century and present new data on the ethnic composition of the state and each county as of 1790.

The Census Bureau's pioneering 1909 study attempted to determine
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the European ancestry of each Pennsylvania county's population. The researchers examined every surviving manuscript from the 1790 census and assigned each white household to a particular ethnic background according to its surname. The Bureau's endeavors produced the first ethnic profile of eighteenth-century Pennsylvania based on statistical evidence.\(^2\) (See Table 1.)

Unfortunately, however, the procedures followed in determining each family's ancestry cast serious doubt on the conclusions. The Bureau's clerks had little training that could prepare them to differentiate among more than 27,000 phonetically distinct cognomens and their many written variations. They frequently based their decision on how a name sounded, and apparently did not recognize that numerous commonly-held surnames were shared by two or more nationalities. They also failed to appreciate that many non-British cognomens were commonly modified by simplifying their spelling or anglicizing their pronunciation. The practical impossibility of assigning each individual to a specific ethnic background biased the results toward overstating the British — in particular the English — component of the population, especially in states like Pennsylvania that had attracted substantial numbers of German, Dutch, or French immigrants.

The American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS) sponsored a major study, published in 1932, that avoided the problems inherent in attempting to classify the ancestry of every white household listed on the first census. Its primary investigator, Howard F. Barker, devised a methodology to ascertain the size of each national stock using only names found among that group. He selected surnouns characteristic of a particular European country and determined what percentage of the home population bore them in order to obtain a multiplier expressing the ratio of the general population to holders of those names. Assuming that immigrants would carry those same names to America in roughly the same proportion as they were distributed in their native land, he counted how many times they appeared in the 1790 census and then multiplied this figure by their corresponding numerical constant. The resulting answer approximated the number of Americans in 1790 whose forebears had left the country in question. (For example, if 10 percent of all the people in a European nation carried twenty names and the 1790 census listed five hundred individuals with them, then the probable number of persons in the United States belonging to that ethnic group would be ten times five hundred, or five

thousand.) This methodology eliminated the necessity of determining the nationality of individuals with names common to several groups, and seemed to offer the best prospect for discovering the impact of different waves of European emigration upon population growth in British North America.1

Howard Barker used these procedures to calculate the size of the English, Scottish, Scotch-Irish, Irish, and German components of the United States population. The responsibility for determining how many Americans were of Dutch, French, and Swedish descent lay with Marcus L. Hansen, then the leading authority on immigration history. Hansen chose not to follow Barker's example and devise surname coefficients for the last three groups, although he knew of sources that would have enabled him to do so. Hansen founded his estimates upon a detailed investigation of how many Dutch, French, and Swedes settled in North America. He based his final projections of probable population increase upon existing research on colonial demography and patterns of internal migration. His conclusions nevertheless were highly impressionistic and often amounted to little more than well-informed guesses.

The ACLS data stood unchallenged until Forrest and Ellen Shapiro McDonald demonstrated in 1980 that increasing the number of distinctive names used could produce more reliable statistics. The larger number of names would represent a greater percentage of the European population under investigation, and would produce a smaller, more precise, numerical constant for approximating that nationality's presence. The McDonalds developed appreciably improved lists of surnames characteristic of the Scottish, Irish, and Welsh peoples and then showed that the ACLS estimates for these groups and for Americans of English ancestry required substantial change. They did not correct any of their predecessors' estimates for non-British stocks, nor did they make any distinction between Americans whose forebears had emigrated from Protestant communities in Northern Ireland or directly from Scotland. Their work nevertheless directed attention to the need for a thorough revision of currently accepted data on the national origins of white Americans in the first census.4

TABLE 1

*Distribution of Pennsylvania's White Population Estimated by Census Bureau, A.C.L.S., and F. and E. S. McDonald*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>59.0*</td>
<td>35.3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welsh</td>
<td>no data</td>
<td>no data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotch-Irish</td>
<td>no data</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>2.0**</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unassigned</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes Welsh.* **Includes Scotch-Irish. †Taken from A.C.L.S.

The McDonalds' research leaves no doubt that statistics describing the ethnic backgrounds of Pennsylvania's white population can be significantly improved. Completing the re-evaluation of the ACLS study begun by the McDonalds requires compiling lists of characteristic family names (with their corresponding coefficients) for Pennsylvania's Swedish, Dutch, and French communities. It is also necessary to increase the number of surnames used by the ACLS researchers in calculating the German stock to lessen the likelihood that a small sample might distort the results. The distinctive names selected by the McDonalds to ascertain how many Scots, Irish, and Welsh lived in the state should also be refined by eliminating a few surnouns that unduly inflate the figures for each group, and then substituting others more representative of that nationality. Finally some means must be found to measure the separate contributions of Northern Ireland and Scotland to the growth of America's Scottish-descended population.

The example of the Welsh can illustrate how to determine each national stock's approximate proportion of Pennsylvania's population through surname analysis once these changes have been accomplished. The McDonalds used twelve names in their research, but the reliability of their results was suspect because all save one (Morgan) are exceptionally common in England as well. This article will instead employ sixteen cognomens held by 15 percent of the Welsh people that
are much less common in England: Bebb, Breese, Griffith, Howell, Humphreys, Jenkins, Lloyd, Morgan, Owen, Pritchard, Pugh, Rees, Rowlands, Tudor, Vaughan, and Wynne. The corresponding numerical constant is 6.5 but it must be reduced to 4.9 in compensation for the fact that about one-quarter of all persons from these families in Great Britain reside in England. The 1790 census counted 544 Pennsylvanians with these sixteen surnouns. Multiplying that figure by 4.9 and dividing the product by the 73,332 heads of households enumerated by the census takers indicates that 3.6 percent of the state’s white inhabitants were of Welsh extraction. After obtaining an estimate for each of the non-English stocks in an identical fashion, their combined percentage is subtracted from 100 percent to give the English portion.

Pennsylvania’s Dutch population derived almost entirely from the seventeenth-century colonizers of New Netherland. The simplest manner of devising a multiplier is to identify the most common Dutch names in the province after emigration ceased following the English conquest of 1664. A series of allegiance lists, tax rolls, and censuses taken between 1687 and 1714 fortunately survive for five counties and New York City that enumerate 1,436 Dutch citizens; these documents record the great majority of adult male Hollanders at that time, and allow their total number to be determined quite accurately because in most counties with mixed populations, Dutch, English, Scots, and French were identified by nationality, depending upon which groups were in the minority. Fourteen percent of the Dutch on these documents had thirty-seven family names, yielding a coefficient of 7.3.

Most of the French settlers in Pennsylvania were descended from Protestant refugees who fled to England and migrated overseas from

---


there. Many of the earliest Huguenots in the colonies brought children born in England, and without doubt virtually all adults who came to North America more than a generation after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685 had been born there rather than France. Examining the baptismal registers of Huguenot churches in England for a sample of names representative of this exiled community reveals that 7 percent of 26,932 children born in three French Reformed churches from 1581 to 1750 held fifteen surnouns, equal to a numerical constant of 14.7

The best available source for developing a list of distinctive names to estimate the size of the German stock is a compilation of foreign oaths of allegiance taken in Philadelphia between 1727 and 1808.8 The registers record the identities of 29,758 German-speaking immigrants and indicate that an additional 35,000 dependents came with them, totalling approximately two-thirds of all German arrivals in British America. Ninety distinctive names included 12.5 percent of the 30,000 signers of the allegiance oath, equal to a numerical coefficient of 8.

A special listing of Swedish householders and the number of persons in their families survives from 1693. Nearly all Swedes living a century later would have been the progeny of the 942 persons enumerated, since emigration from Scandinavia had ceased long before the roster was compiled. Sixteen percent of the population bore eleven names, giving a coefficient of 6.3.9


9 The 1693 listing is printed in Israel Acrelius, A History of New Sweden . . . (1759), trans. by William M. Reynolds, in Historical Society of Pennsylvania,
The surname lists and multipliers compiled by the McDonalds for the Irish and Scots can be utilized once certain minor adjustments have been made to improve their reliability. Eliminating three nondistinctive names whose inclusion greatly skews the results toward a high count of Irish (Hayes, Hughes, and Johnston) and replacing them with Cavanaugh, Riley, Sheehan, and Whelan leaves fifty-four surnames held by 20 percent of Ireland's indigenous Gaelic stock, producing a multiplier of 5. All the McDonalds' seventy-two Scottish names were retained except for seven commonly found in England (Bell, Gibson, Scott, Shaw, Wallace [Wallis], Watson, and Williamson) and Kennedy, which is most numerous in Ireland beyond Ulster. The Scottish coefficient was then changed to 3.7 from 4.0 by adding M'Donald, M'Kenzie, M'Kay, M'Lean, M'Leod, M'Intosh, and M'Gregor, plus their derivative forms of Donald, Donnel, Kenzie, Kay, Cloud, and Gregor.

The McDonalds failed to provide any measure of the separate contributions of Northern Ireland and Scotland to American population growth, preferring to list families descended from either locality simply as Scottish. Since Ulster Scots and immigrants from Scotland carried the same names, the methodology employed here cannot differentiate between them. Current research indicates that about 114,000 persons came to North America from Ulster during the six decades after 1718, compared to perhaps 62,500 from Scotland. If Northern Ireland and Scotland provided settlers for Pennsylvania in the same general proportion as they did for all the British colonies, then two-thirds of all individuals bearing Scottish names would be descended from the former rather than the latter. Arbitrarily assuming that two-thirds of all those identified as "Scots" were actually Scotch-Irish is not a perfectly satisfactory manner of distinguishing between the two groups, but it is the only practical solution available.


10 The additional names and their frequency in Ireland are in Robert E. Matheson, Special Report on the Surnames of Ireland (Dublin, 1909), 7-8. The other names are given in McDonald and McDonald, "Ethnic Origins," 196-97.

11 The additional names and their frequency in Scotland are in ACLS, "Report on Linguistic and National Stocks," 211. The other Scottish names are given in McDonald and McDonald, "Ethnic Origins," 192-94.

Using the lists of distinctive surnames described above and the returns of the first United States census, the European ancestry of white Pennsylvanians in 1790 can be recalculated comprehensively. The total number of distinctive surnames identified for each ethnic group on the census rolls is as follows: sixteen Welsh names, 544; fifty-four Irish names, 1,034; seventy-one Scottish names, 4,503; ninety German names, 3,485; eleven Swedish names, 72; thirty-seven Dutch names, 134; and fifteen French names, 49. Table 2 shows the revised estimates of national stocks derived from these figures for the state and its counties.

The revised figures support the McDonalds' assertion that the ACLS researchers underestimated the actual proportions of Scots and Irish — only slightly in the case of the total percentage of Scots and Scotch-Irish, but by more than half with the Irish. (See Table 2.) The McDonalds' results, however, produced an exaggerated count of Scots, Irish, and Welsh, due to the inclusion of certain nondistinctive names, and so were higher than the revised statistics by margins ranging from 18 to 64 percent. The corrected figures indicate that the High and Low Dutch constituted almost 40 percent of all whites, with the remainder of the population divided almost evenly between the combined English-Welsh stock and the Gaelic element (all Irish and Scots).

Using lists of distinctive surnames to calculate the distribution of ethnic groups in counties with only a few thousand inhabitants entails a significant risk of statistical distortion. The absence of families bearing some of the more common names or the overrepresentation of households with less widely held cognomens can skew the results in either direction. The number of white households enumerated on the 1790 census ranged from 866 in Luzerne to 8,940 in Philadelphia County, with the typical county inhabited by about 3,200 families. The trustworthiness of data on ancestral origins for units of analysis as small as these is consequently much less certain than for the state, which included over 73,000 white households. The accuracy of statistics compiled by extrapolating national descent from surname frequencies will inevitably vary by locality, especially in the case of small counties. Calculating estimates in this manner can still provide a

13 In a very few cases involving the Dutch and French, adjustment had to be made at the county level. In Luzerne Co., with only 866 households, the methodology resulted in a figure of 3.4 percent for the Dutch, which was reduced by half after making a visual inspection of the census rolls. Because 28 Van Horns were listed in Bucks, their overrepresentation produced a figure of nearly 8 percent, which was reduced by compensating for the Van Horns. Identical problems also resulted in a downward revision of the initial estimates for the Dutch in Fayette and the French in Bucks.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Welsh</th>
<th>Scotch-Irish</th>
<th>Scottish</th>
<th>Irish</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>Swedish</th>
<th>Dutch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allegheny</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedford</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berks</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>85.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucks</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dauphin</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntingdon</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luzerne</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mifflin</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia Co.*</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Philadelphia</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Excluding city of Philadelphia.
reasonable indication of where different groups were most numerous and give a general idea of their size in various localities. The following survey of settlement patterns will briefly describe the distribution of national stocks within Pennsylvania in 1790.

The English and Welsh

English Quakers constituted the largest category of immigrants to Pennsylvania through the mid-1720s, taking up land throughout Delaware, Chester, Philadelphia, Montgomery, and Bucks counties.\(^\text{14}\) By 1790, 40 percent of the English and Welsh stock still lived in those counties, but they were a minority everywhere except Bucks. Persons of English descent numbered just one-third of all whites in southeastern Pennsylvania during the late eighteenth century, and one-quarter of the state's population.

Many descendants of the state's early English immigrants moved west with the frontier. Also attracted to the frontier were others of English extraction, including many from the Chesapeake, some from New England, and even a few recently arrived emigrants from old England. Several thousand Yankees moved to northeastern Pennsylvania seeking inexpensive land from Connecticut's Susquehanna Company; they were most conspicuous in Luzerne, the only county (besides Bucks) where Anglo-Saxon blood predominated.\(^\text{15}\) Southwestern Pennsylvania drew numerous pioneers from Virginia and Maryland, many of whom actively supported Virginia's territorial claims to the region.\(^\text{16}\) The English stock contributed to the state's frontier expansion much more significantly than has been previously appreciated, furnishing a quarter of the settlers in central Pennsylvania and a third in western Pennsylvania, in each case providing a greater portion of the local population than the Scotch-Irish.

William Penn's "holy experiment" also stirred the imagination of many Friends in Wales. Representatives from six Welsh monthly meetings conveyed a request to the proprietor in 1681 that a district be reserved for their countrymen "within which all causes, quarrels, crimes and disputes might be tried and wholly determined by officers,


\(^{15}\) Henry C. Bradsby, History of Luzerne County, Pennsylvania, with Biographical Selections (Chicago, 1893), 40-42, 47-53.

Pennsylvania settlement patterns in 1790

DISTRIBUTION OF NATIONAL STOCKS IN PENNSYLVANIA, 1790

WESTERN PA.
population 62,491
ENGLISH 33%
SCOTS-IRISH 26%
SCOTS 13%
IRISH 12%
Germans 11%
WELSH 3%
OTHERS 2%

CENTRAL PA.
population 82,679
ENGLISH 26%
GERMANS 25%
SCOTS-IRISH 23%
SCOTS 11%
IRISH 10%
WELSH 2%
OTHERS 3%

EAST CENTRAL PA.
population 143,274
GERMANS 64%
ENGLISH 16%
SCOTS-IRISH 8%
SCOTS 5%
IRISH 3%
WELSH 2%
OTHERS 3%

SOUTHEAST PA.
population 134,864
ENGLISH 33%
GERMANS 31%
SCOTS-IRISH 12%
IRISH 8%
WELSH 7%
SCOTS 6%
OTHERS 3%

(Figures Represent Percentage Of White Population Only)
magistrates, and juries of our own language."  

Penn eventually sold forty thousand acres known as the Welsh Tract for this purpose, mostly situated south of the Schuylkill River, in Delaware, Chester, and Montgomery counties. A sharp decline in emigration from Wales after 1720 precluded the possibility of similar communities developing elsewhere in the colony, and the Welsh stock remained heavily concentrated in the Tract’s vicinity. As late as 1790, half of Pennsylvania’s Welsh-descended population lived in either Chester, Delaware, Montgomery, or Philadelphia counties.

The Germans

Pennsylvania’s first German settlement, Germantown, was founded only one year after Philadelphia. Despite William Penn’s efforts to promote emigration from the European continent, the number of Germans entering the province remained modest until the late 1720s. From 1727 to 1755, however, a torrent of refugees from the Palatine provinces swept into Pennsylvania, bringing at least fifty-eight thousand newcomers to the colony. Their descendants constituted nearly two-fifths of all whites in the state by 1790.

The heartland of the Pennsylvania Dutch lay in five east-central counties: Northampton, Berks, Dauphin, Lancaster and York. Fifty-seven percent of the German stock resided in that area, where they constituted a majority of nearly two-thirds. The German population of the state’s four most western counties was small by comparison, only 11 percent, but Germans composed one-quarter of all whites in central Pennsylvania and nearly one-third in the southeastern counties along the Delaware River.

The Scots

Scottish immigration to Pennsylvania was moderate, though steady, until the Seven Years’ War ended. Few Scots arrived before 1763

---

18 Ibid., 37, 38.
except for indentured servants from the Lowlands; after then, however, the colony began receiving its first substantial influx of Scots, most fleeing the harsh poverty of the Highlands and many travelling in family groups.\(^{21}\) Emigration accelerated rapidly during the decade prior to Independence, virtually ceased during the Revolution, and then resumed in the 1780s as more Highlanders sought to escape heavy rents and poor harvests.\(^{22}\) Scots were most numerous in the regions that opened up for white habitation in the years after 1765, when the volume of their emigration was heaviest; consequently, almost 60 percent of the Scottish stock lived in either western or central Pennsylvania by 1790. Although it is common for many persons to view the English and Scots as similar in background, the very considerable number of Highland emigrants who landed during the quarter century after 1765 probably constituted the largest number of recently arrived, non-English-speaking foreigners in the state by 1790 and, as a group, may have been less assimilated than the long established German community.

\textit{The Ulster Scots and Irish}

In contrast to the Scots, a heavy migration from Ireland had been underway since the early 1700s involving both Ulster Scots and the island’s indigenous population. Both groups of Irish tended to migrate during the same periods and move to the same general regions.\(^{23}\) Despite the religious antipathy between Protestants and Catholics in Ireland, their neighbors seem not to have differentiated between them, considering each to be fully Irish (much as the English do today).\(^{24}\) By 1790, the combined Irish stock equalled more than a fifth of all whites, with Ulster Scots in the majority by a two-thirds margin.

Since emigrants from Ireland had been disembarking at Philadelphia in large numbers since 1717,\(^{25}\) their posterity was rather evenly distributed throughout Pennsylvania. Contrary to popular conceptions, the Irish stock was not unduly concentrated on the frontier; almost half (46 percent) lived either in the Pennsylvania Dutch coun-


\(^{22}\) Ibid., 22, 23, 33-38.


\(^{24}\) Ibid., 149-51.

try or in the long settled, southeastern counties, where they composed 28 percent of Philadelphia’s citizens. Even in the state’s four most western counties, the Ulster Scots and Irish comprised only 37.8 percent of the local population, a figure just slightly larger than that for persons of English and Welsh background living there, 35.9 percent.

The Swedes, Dutch, and French

Forty-four years prior to Philadelphia’s founding, the Swedish government planted the first European outpost in Pennsylvania at the confluence of the Delaware and Schuylkill rivers. The Swedes, whose ranks included a sizeable contingent of ethnic Finns, maintained this colony until 1655 when a Dutch military expedition forcibly annexed it to New Netherland. By 1697, the Swedish-speaking population of the Delaware Valley had increased to approximately 1,200, half of whom lived in southeastern Pennsylvania.\(^{26}\) The Swedes initially dispersed throughout Delaware and Philadelphia counties, and then ventured up the Schuylkill River into Montgomery County.\(^{27}\) Their descendants in 1790 probably totalled over 2,500, of whom about 55 percent still resided in the counties of Delaware, Philadelphia, and Montgomery. By that time, however, they had intermarried so extensively with other nationalities and abandoned so much of their Scandinavian culture that they would have been barely recognizable as a separate ethnic group had the Swedish monarchy not continued to subsidize the expense of supporting Swedish Lutheran ministers among them.\(^{28}\)

Some Dutch settled along the lower Delaware River after New Netherland acquired the territory in 1655, and a few Dutch Quakers emigrated directly from Europe in response to William Penn’s promotional literature. For all practical purposes, however, Pennsylvania’s Dutch stock derived from pioneers who left New York or New


Jersey after the mid-1690s. For two decades after 1695, a steady stream of Dutch from New York settled in Bucks County; they clustered around Neshaminy and Bensalem, and several families even became politically prominent in that predominantly Anglo-Saxon community.\(^{29}\) Another group of Dutch blazed a trail from New York to the Minisink region of Northampton County and established several farming communities around Stroudsville.\(^{10}\) More than one hundred Dutch families left Bergen County, New Jersey, in the 1760s for York County; the Jersey settlement at Conewago, site of the only Dutch Reformed congregation west of the Susquehanna River, prospered at first, but then declined in numbers as many members abandoned it to acquire less expensive lands further west.\(^{31}\) By 1790, one-third of all the Low Dutch in Pennsylvania inhabited the three counties mentioned above, from which many others migrated to various parts of the state; most of the remainder derived from families that drifted individually or in small parties from New York or New Jersey to the frontier of central and western Pennsylvania.

The French, unlike most other nationalities, came to Pennsylvania in separate households or scattered groups and rarely lived in close proximity to one another, a circumstance that greatly lessened the likelihood that their children would retain a sense of ethnic identity.\(^{32}\) Most, in fact, belonged to Huguenot refugee families that had lived for one or more generations in either England or the German Palatinate, and so had already assimilated much of their adopted country’s culture. Aside from a small enclave of Huguenot families in Lancaster County’s Pequa Valley that briefly maintained a French Reformed minister, the group established no significant centers of population in Pennsylvania.\(^{33}\) As of 1790, the French stock included fewer than one percent of all whites, was widely distributed through the state, and had long since abandoned any identifiably Gallic traits that might distinguish them from their neighbors; they were, in effect, an invisible ethnic group.


\(^{30}\) E. Gordon Alderfer, Northampton Heritage: The Story of an American County (Easton, Pa., 1953), 51-53.


\(^{33}\) Ibid.
Conclusions

Statistics describing the European origins of late eighteenth-century Americans tend to convey a false impression of ethnic homogeneity. Members of the same ancestral stock often differed profoundly from one another. Completely dissimilar ways of life and separate languages made Scottish Highlanders a distinct people from Lowlanders. The German community included refugees from both Switzerland and the Rhineland, besides encompassing religious sects as different as Lutherans and Mennonites. Descendants of the earliest Quaker settlers, recent English emigrants, and most Virginians newly arrived on the Pennsylvania frontier were all Anglo-Saxons, but they really had little else in common by 1790. The data presented above should be used carefully, for it represents only the first step in reconstructing the rich mosaic of local cultures in post-Revolutionary Pennsylvania.

The figures on national descent given here furthermore are incapable of indicating the cumulative effects of intermarriage and acculturation. Both factors had been progressively reducing the social distance between all groups since the 1680s. The 1790 census provides some confirmation of this phenomenon by listing such names as Dority Snyder, Co[o]nrod Rian, Owen Murphy, Gustavus Graham, Lodwick Christey, and Cam[p]ble Lefever.

Strictly speaking, estimates of national descent measure only the extent to which certain European immigrant stocks had contributed to Pennsylvania's population growth by 1790. The refined statistics are as accurate as existing sources and research into nomenclatural frequencies permit at this time. As such, it is hoped that they will improve the ability of historians to assess the impact of different groups on demographic growth, frontier expansion, and numerous aspects of social life more accurately than previous data have allowed.