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ETHNOHISTORY AND ARCHAEOLOGY
IN SEARCH OF THE PRINTZHOF;
THE 17TH CENTURY RESIDENCE OF
SWEDISH COLONIAL GOVERNOR JOHAN PRINTZ

by

Marshall Joseph Becker
West Chester State College

ABSTRACT

The location and identification of the remains of the Printzhof, the trading station-residence of Johan Printz, had been the goal of a W.P.A. excavation in 1937. Those excavations revealed a complex cluster of foundations believed to have been part of the building in question. Subsequent loss of the field data, and the lack of control over the provenience of the recovered artifacts from the excavations led to an attempt to recover information from this site (36DE3) in 1976. The extent of the previous disruptions was so great as to place increased reliance on the ethnohistoric evidence.

A search of the literature relating to Swedish architecture, Governor Printz' activities, and local historical documents yielded scant information which would provide for precise identification of these foundations and the associated artifacts. However, the scattered Swedish settlement pattern, features of rebuilding seen in the foundation, and the dates of large numbers of pipe fragments and bottles, and other indirect evidence strongly suggest that the remains of the Printzhof have been identified.

Introduction

Archaeological problems dating from the historic period are often resolved through the careful use of ethnohistoric research. Indeed, such "above ground archaeology," as John Cotter (n.d.) terms it, is indispensable to every excavation of the historic period. Therefore, when consideration was given in 1976 to re-excavating a site thought to include the remains of a structure long believed to be the residence of Johan Printz, the third Swedish colonial governor on the South (Delaware) River, primary concern was directed toward gathering the ethnohistoric evidence which might prove essential to interpreting the archaeological data.

ETHNOHISTORY 26/1 (Winter 1979)
Unlike his predecessors Printz chose not to conduct his affairs from Fortress Christina, at the Indian site of Hopokohocking (modern Wilmington), but to locate his residence and fortified site up the Delaware River on Great Tinicum Island. Construction of this post, the first seat of government located permanently in what is now the state of Pennsylvania, began in 1643. The Swedish name for the post was Nya Gotheburg (New Gottenburg).

During the 1930's, as part of the W.P.A. activities, excavations were conducted at several state parks in Pennsylvania. Donald Cadzow's excavations at Governor Printz State Park in 1937 located a complex series of foundations which he believed to be the remains of these important early buildings. Unfortunately, these data were never published and almost all of the field records have been lost. In 1976 the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission staff determined that a second excavation of this site (36DE3) was in order to attempt a verification of Cadzow's ideas and to provide direct archaeological evidence from the site. A careful review of the documentary records relating to the Swedish settlement and to Johan Printz in particular has provided more forceful evidence to support the belief that the Printzhof has been located.

The Historic Record

Johan Printz, the son of a pastor, took advantage of the opportunities afforded by the age of exploration to alter his economic and social position within 17th century Swedish society. Printz spent years as a soldier, later became a knight and ultimately a nobleman. His military exploits led him to become familiar with architecture throughout the empire (see Armstrong 1860:18-19, fn. 4). Given his ambitions and aspirations one might presume that Printz would attempt to replicate on Tinicum Island a house constructed on the order of a Swedish noble's gärd (manor house).

A gärd of the 17th century consisted of a series of wooden buildings arranged around a courtyard and often enclosed by a fence. The close proximity of structures within a gärd complex would explain why the fire of November 25, 1645 (see below) destroyed all the buildings at Nya Gotheburg. By 1646 the complex had been rebuilt, supposedly on a more grand scale, and stood until destroyed by another fire in the early 19th century. An early etching from Uppland, Sweden, depicts such a gärd (Lundberg 1940:611). The form of the fence enclosure in the etching was very much like that which Europeans depicted surrounding Indian villages (see Becker 1976a:51, fig. 7).

The populations resident along the South River (Delaware) included English trading stations and a colony of Dutch patroons established by the

Swedish government south of Fort Christina (Smith 1862; Ferris 1846:54). The “Swedish” colonial population along the Delaware, including Finns and other “Scandinavian” populations, were never numerous (see Johnson 1911). Fernow's (1877:648) “Swedish” census of 1680 for the Delaware River is of interest. The scattered residential pattern is quite evident and the low density is impressive. Andreas Hudde (New York Hist. Coll., N.S. 1:429) also documents Swedish settlement patterns. Hudde was the Dutch commissary and his important observations form the basis for Smith's description (1862) of New Sweden. Hudde described New Gottenburg, which he found on the same side of the river as Fortress Christina, and about two (Dutch) miles further up. Hudde noted that some plantations continued nearly a mile; but few houses only are built, and these at considerable distances from each other. The farthest of these is not far from Tinnekonk. . . . Farther on, at the same side till you come to the Schuykill, being about two miles, there is not a single plantation, neither at Tinnekonk, because near the river nothing is to be met but underwood and valley lands (in Smith 1862; also see Johnson 1930:256-257).

Matinicum Island: Confusion in Names

The census of 1680 (Fernow 1877:648) lists the population on “Matinicum Island” which Danckaerts (1925:97-98) located between Borden-town and Burlington, New Jersey (see also Fernow 1877:614). This is not the Tinicum Island of Johan Printz. The orthographic variations in these names created confusions which continue to plague us. Danckaerts says that “Matinnaconck” Island is the best and largest in the South River, being four English miles long and two in breadth. His statement that the Dutch governor made a pleasure ground of it, and built gardens, good houses and other structures leads one to suspect a confusion in his writings. Danckaerts' description sounds very much like a description of the Swedish Governor Printz' activity on Tinicum as described by Lindström some fifteen years before. Lindeström (1925:172) earlier had said that Governor Printz had built on “Tennkonck” (Tinicum) Island a church and a house “with a pleasure garden, summer house, and other such.” Either the Dutch governor replicated Printz' buildings or, more probably, Danckaerts was indirectly quoting from Lindeström and confused the names of the islands and the governors.

The actual high ground of Tinicum Island appears to have been quite limited in area (see Thomas Holmes's survey of 1861, in Fisher 1919:1). The delta of the Schuylkill, Darby Creek, etc. have all silted in considerably over
the past 300 years. Lindeström (1925) has “Tennaknock” marked on his map with the letter “X,” and locates “Tinnekonck’s Eijlandh” (Matinicus Island, now Burlington Island) further up the river.

These variations in spelling reflect a common problem of translating words from Indian languages, compounded by the relatively low rate of literacy among the Europeans. The Swedish colonists, like their European kin, had a low rate of literacy. European society schooled only the elite in reading and writing. The extensive documentation offered by Fernow (1877) indicates that few 17th century colonists could read. Most Europeans signed official documents with their marks, in exactly the same way as did the native Americans. There does not appear to have been any embarrassment regarding this illiteracy. The rapid increase in literacy during the 18th century led increasing numbers of people to learn to write their names, in place of making their marks.

Various aspects of European technology were rather rudimentary in the 17th century. Aside from a basic knowledge of the storage techniques which characterize agrarian societies and the technology imported from Europe, the early colonists were nearly on a technological par with the native populations. Only after European skills and organization were established in the New World did the colonists become differentiated from and hostile to their hosts.

Oral tradition concerning the main structure, the church, and numerous other buildings of Nya Gothenburg locate this architectural cluster beneath and around the present site of the Corinthian Yacht Club. A basic history of the settlement of New Gottenberg is provided by Ashmead (1884), who offers references to most of the better known sources. King’s investigation (1973) attempts to identify the location of the Printzhof through a title search (see also King and Handcock 1970). King’s presentation (1973:30-41) of a chain of title showing the land owners of what is now Printz Park provides a strong suggestion that this may be the actual property upon which Governor Printz built his residence-trading station.

The importance of river transport to the early settlers is well understood. The location of the various buildings of Nya Gothenburg must relate to the river bed as it was in 1643. In order to develop a better understanding of the history of the river an expert in geomorphology, with a specialization in shoreline reconstruction, was contacted. Dr. John C. Kraft, who has successfully applied his skills to numerous similar archaeological problems in this area (Kraft 1977; Kraft and Thomas 1976) as well as throughout the world (Kraft, Rapp and Aschenbrenner 1975; Kraft, Aschenbrenner and Rapp 1977), was unable to initiate a project but indicated his interest in it. Informants living in Tinicum Township now indicate that Little Tinicum Island as recently as 1900 was 100 meters longer on the South end, but this area has since eroded (Becker, Field Notes 1976).
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Subsidence of this island has not resulted in the area of the excavation being drowned, possibly due to increasing deposition of soils and most certainly due to extensive modern filling operations. The flood of 1842 (see Ashmead 1884, under “Tornado”) covered the entire island with several feet of water.

Ethnohistoric Data: General

The exact date of the original construction of the Printzhof is uncertain. The term Printzhof, often taken as the name for Governor Printz’ home, is believed to refer to the entire gore located on the southwestern margin of Tinicum Island. Only by inference can one determine that Printz probably lived in a block-house, and that the ultimate fate of this structure was early decay. A review and new interpretation of the relevant data are in order.

The instructions (dated August 15, 1642) which Printz was given prior to his departure for the New World directed him to select a place of residence and to find a suitable place for a fortress by which he could close up (control trade on) the South River (Arceilus 1874:35-36). Printz was to have the rank of Lieutenant Colonel and the title of Governor of New Sweden (Linn and Egle 1899:795-806).

Printz, accompanied by Johan Campanius and a small company of settlers, left Gottenburg on November 1, 1642 and, three and one-half months later, reached the South River via Antigua and the southern route (Hazard 1850:69). The southern route may have been preferred for winter travel, but it took the voyagers away from the New England area were wampum for trade was to be secured at low prices. Trading stations of the Dutch and English, as well as the Swedes, were already long established on the South River and the appointment of Printz may have been intended to improve the Swedish position in local trade with the Minquas (Hazard 1850:86).

Printz landed at Fortress Christina on February 15, 1643. His grant for Teneck Island (variably spelled, see Clay 1858:23) is dated November 6, 1643, but Printz probably did not live at Tinicum until completion of at least a portion of the “complex” of buildings. Letters from Printz to Oxeisterna (April 14, 1643) and Brahe (July 19, 1644) are dated at Christina. Printz held court at Christina on July 10, 1643, but the records of the court in session on January 10, 1644 indicate only “New Sweden” and not a specific location (Johnson 1932.229, 244-247). The ambiguity of this place-designation may reflect Printz’ move to Tinicum. Work at Tinicum probably began in the summer of 1643 and may have been completed by the winter of 1644. The
construction of a fortress-residence at Tennaconk (meaning “island”) provided a better “blockade” of the Dutch Fort Nassau. The supposed construction of a blockhouse, rather than a fortress, may reflect a haste and lack of manpower to move earth, or a desire to have a residence which combined a blockhouse with a trading post.

In the 17th century the term *blockhouse* meant a structure blocking access of the river passage, and did not necessarily refer to a log structure built on a rectangular plan. The position of an earthworks fort called Nya Gothenburg, believed to have been built on the southwest edge of Tinicum, is supposed to have been distinct from Printz’ residence, but this is in question. A fort would have controlled the passage of ships on the river while the residence (blockhouse) served as a trading post and defense against the Indians. The position of the structure excavated in 1976 would not give good command of the river unless Little Tinicum Island were shorter than it is at present. From all the evidence one may assume that the blockhouse in this case was of log construction with a rectangular plan, and that it also served as Printz’ residence (The Printzhof).

Relations between the Swedes and the Dutch in the 1640’s were passively hostile. Both often relied upon each other to survive in the face of a stressful environment. These interactions were rarely cordial, and the construction of fortified posts were designed to ensure access to local trade and tobacco growing lands. The construction of the Swedish fort Elsfung on the opposite (New Jersey) shore was part of this program (see Hazard 1850:69-71).

When de Vries left New Amsterdäm on October 8, 1643 he included in his travels a brief tour of four forts on the South River (de Vries 1857:123). Five days sail out of New Amsterdam he reached Fort Elsinburg (also Elleborg, etc., see Campanius 1834:46) at the mouth of the South River, described as being near Reed Island and on (or near) the Varkenskill (Hog Creek), now Salem Creek. The exact location and configuration of this “fort” are unknown (see Hazard 1850:70-71 for a discussion). Elsfung is always described as a fort, indicating an earthwork construction rather than a blockhouse. De Vries, according to Smith (1862:31, 36-37), found this fort unfinished (see De Vries, Voyages, New York Hist. Coll. III:123). Printz built Elsinburg (also called Myggengren) because of the mosquitoes, to protect the channel from the east side of the river. Printz claimed that he had been finished within eight months of his arrival on the South River (see Hazard’s *Annals*, p. 71), but like Nya Gothenburg the work did not go rapidly. Tiny Elsinburg was abandoned about 1653, after the Dutch constructed Fort Casimir (ca. 1651?) nearby (see Hazard 1850:126).

Christina was the second fort reached by de Vries; New Gothenburg the third; and Fort Nassau the last. De Vries visited with Governor Printz between October 13 and 18, then continued a (Swedish?) mile further up the river to Fort Nassau. On the 19th de Vries and Governor Printz went to “Minquaik,” the site of a little fort and some houses. This location must refer to that of Fortress Christina since the Dutch named the Brandywine River the Minquaik after the Indians then in control of the area. This suggests that de Vries rejoined Printz on the 19th and that both went to Fortress Christina, where the houses afforded them shelter. Since these are the only houses mentioned in this portion of de Vries’ account this reinforces my belief that the Printzhof complex had not been built at that time (October 1643). The creeks and locations of importance in this account are noted in Lindeström’s report (1925) and are carefully identified by their various names by Campanius and Du Ponceau (Campanius 1834:47-50).

The burning of the Printzhof complex, supposedly through the carelessness of Swan Was, took place on November 25, 1645 (Old Style or Julian; December 5, New Style or Gregorian) according to Printz’ report for 1647. Information concerning this incident is vague (see Hazard 1850:84). Just what buildings existed and which burned is totally unknown. Johnson (1930:257n) states that all the buildings of the complex burned except the barn, but he offers no references. Another version states that all of the buildings burned, with the exception of the dairy. A fort was supposedly located to the southwest of the buildings. Fisher (1919:2) placed this fort about where the Western Lockers of the Corinthian were built, and reported that grape shot and small cannon balls were supposed to have been found there. Confusion may exist as to whether this “fort” was an earthwork without a structure or if the term “fort” has been applied to a blockhouse. Whether the Printzhof was also the blockhouse mentioned is discussed below under “Architecture.”

Campanius (1834:79-80) noted that the church was consecrated on September 4, 1646, and a burial place laid out. A report of the construction of this church according to the Swedish fashion is supposedly included with Printz’ report of February 20, 1647 (Armstrong 1860:152-153, fn. 2), which would suggest that construction took place in 1646. This suggested that a church was added only after the rebuilding of the Printzhof. The Reverend Johan Campanius officiated at this church, generally believed to have been situated just southwest of the 1976 excavations where the Corinthian stands, until May of 1648. Here he “instructed” the “savages” and learned the Lenape dialect. His translation of the Catechism into Lenape may be the first such work in the New World, but it was not published until 1696, long after Elliot published the Bible in Mohegan in the 1660’s. This church declined with the Swedish dominion on Tinicum Island and was supplanted by the church at Christina, finished in 1700, and that at Wicaco. A description of Swedish churches, including references to that at Tinicum, in this area is offered by Becker (Ms. B:12).
Hudde's report on the South River (November 7, 1648) provides the best survey of Dutch-Swedish relations for that period of time (Hazard 1850; Linn and Egle 1890:116; Johnson 1930:256-257). Hudde had been appointed as the Dutch Commissary of Wares on October 12, 1645 and came to examine conditions at a time when the Dutch were beginning to assert their control over the region between the Connecticut River and the Virginias. Relations continued to deteriorate and the Dutch took control in 1655 (see Hazard 1850:103-106).

The area to the south and west of Tunincum is extensively marked with geographical and residential features on Lindeström's map (1925), indicating considerable Indian and Colonial activity in that location prior to 1654. The mouth of Crum Creek is only 1500 meters southwest of Tunincum Island and is an area occupied by the Okehogging band (Becker 1976a:31). On his map Lindeström has what appears to be the word Kackhaicon written below Kroke Kijen (Crum Creek). Kackhaicon, written to the right of Uplandz Kijen and Stillensland, is not listed in Johnson's appendix. This could be the place on or near Darby Creek, and the sound of the word is much like Okehogging. Darby Creek was then called Tenakonskif, the island creek. Johnson (1930) equated the Swedish settlement of Upland (later Chester) with the area which the Indians called Meckopenacka. Johnson also identified Kyrrke Kill with Ridley Creek and Tenakon Kill with Darby Creek.

Since Printz was in residence at Tunincum between 1644(? ) and 1653 (Hazard 1850:87, passim) there were probably members of this Indian band alive in 1700 who had seen Printz or mescheszt ("large belly," Lindeström 1925:222) when they were children. Hudde refers to an encounter in 1646 (in Hazard 1850:87; Johnson 1930:263) at which he was told of an Indian named Meerkeet, a sachsen said to have been residing near Tinnekon. Meerkeet may well have been the father or a lineal ancestor of one of the Okehogging Indians (Pokais, Sepopawny, and Muttagooppa) known from colonial documents of the period around 1700 (see Becker 1976a:33). Other Indians whose names appear in the records relating to affairs in the area of Crum Creek during the period around 1650 also may be related to the Okehogging band.

In addition to trading with the native population, Printz maintained close contact with leaders of other colonial settlements. He communicated in both Dutch and German. German and Dutch speaking universities were often those preferred by Swedes for ecclesiastical studies in the 17th century. Printz wrote to Governor Winthrop in Latin, possibly because Winthrop knew none of the continental languages which Printz spoke. These linguistic clues provide an indication of the relationships among the early settlers, and demonstrate how cultural techniques such as building styles may have been diffused throughout the colonies. The spring house, for example, is not an
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English feature but was introduced by northern European settlers.

Despite the lack of economic success of Printz's company the governor suffered no loss. Some suspect that Printz made clandestine and profitable sales of fur to his own account while allowing the trading colony to suffer considerable losses.

The Swedish-Danish War ended in August of 1645, but provisioning the colony continued to be a problem. The records indicate that in all only a dozen ships were despatched from Sweden to supply the South River Colony, and not all arrived safely (see Clay 1858:23; Johnson 1938a). This dismal record would certainly explain why Printz made his departure aboard a Dutch ship. After his return to Sweden, Printz became governor of the Jönköping District (Campanius 1834:69) and continued in a politico-military career. He left behind him, in the care of his daughter and son-in-law, his estates at Tunincum and also at Printzdorp, a plantation which had been granted to Governor Printz about 1647 (see Figure 1).

At least one unconfirmed report from 1655 (Hazard 1850:195-196) alleges that the Dutch destroyed "... New Gottenburg, laying waste all the houses and plantations without the fort, killing the cattle..." and so on. Rysingh (in Hazard 1850:201) wrote a letter of protest on October 29, 1655 concerning the looting by the Dutch of Tennekonk, Printzdorp, and other settlements along the river.

When the Swedish ship Mercury, one of the few to come from Sweden, arrived on March 30, 1656 the Dutch refused permission to land. In the summer of 1657 and again in 1660 the Dutch tried to impel the Swedes to gather in villages, but the Swedes resisted (Ashmead 1884:278). Armgarth Printz Pappegoya continued to reside at the Printzhof despite being robbed of all she had (Hazard 1850:193). In 1660 she is reported as being unable to remove her residence, "... the heavy buildings not permitting her to change it, and the church where she usually worships being upon that spot" (Hazard 1850:307). On May 29, 1662 she sold her rights to Tunincum Island to Joost de La Grange for 6,000 guilders and ultimately relocated at Printzdorp (also Printzesdorp). Smith (1862:47, 82-83) locates Printzdorp southwest of Upland Kill on the basis of several specific documents (see also Johnson 1930:43).

Dankaerts and his companion spent a night at Upland in 1679 and had time to look around on the following morning so that they could see the "remains of the residence of Madame Papegay, who had had her dwelling here when she left Timonk" (Dankers and Slyuter 1867:186). This ruin must have been an intermediate residence since "Ufooe Papagaw" is listed in the census of 1680 as one of the two people at "Printzdorp" (Fernow 1877:648); and another two were resident at "Tinicum" while some seven were at Upland. However, this census does not list Robert Wade at Upland (see
Park a survey of relevant literature was undertaken. In attempting to determine the ethnic associations of the foundations one must be cautious about the process of interpretation. Foremost among the reservations one should maintain is the realization that the frontier situation may have led to expediences which influenced the size and shape of a structure. Second, the multiethnic technology of the New World settlements reflected the skills of available craftsmen, very few of whom had been specialists in the areas to which they were applying their skills. Construction features derived from a specific region in Europe may have been recognizable prior to 1680. The foundations excavated in 1976 appear to be Swedish in style only based on the appearance of corner fireplaces. After 1680-1685, with the arrival of the English in large numbers, architectural traits appear to have coalesced. Jasper Danckaerts (see below) appears to have seen a clear difference between “ethic” house styles during his visit in 1679. However, only descriptions such as Danckaerts’ and other primary data can be used in an evaluation of the ethnic origins or affiliations of particular architectural styles, and these reports are often contradictory (see Becker 1975:9, 17). One also must avoid simplistic attempts to associate “rigid” architectural forms with specific ethnic styles, as is the case with Williams and Williams (1962:14, Fig. 3), unless direct evidence can be provided (see Becker Ms.B.:19). Waterman’s (1950) information is not more useful. Log houses are believed to be a Scandinavian architectural technique (see Mercer 1924).

In 1000 A.D., when the first Scandinavian explorers were already touching at various points in North America (Thörclanson 1930), the basic house pattern in northern Europe was relatively uniform. During the next centuries adaptations and economic change caused this pattern to become more complex and more varied. Lundberg (1940:611-612, 620) traced the origins of the gore and suggested how this developed into a house compound by 1660. Such compounds, with the houses touching or linked by fencing, probably served as models for Swedish colonial settlement patterns. Lundberg (1940:616) also illustrated several variations of Swedish 17th century architecture including a megaron style house and one with a series of adjoined rooms with a corner fireplace in an interior corner of the main room. Lundberg also illustrated a building with a second floor which overhangs the first, a style which is commonly used with blockhouses. Square house plans also were common in Scandinavia (Erixon 1953:39). Other variations are summarized by Becker (Ms. B.:20). Stone foundations were generally built under the entries and walls of the main structure. The entry often was the central unit in a Swedish house, forming a hall, like an enlarged foyer in an English house. The Morton Homestead in Prospect Park, Pennsylvania is an outstanding example of this building form. The older part of the Morton House, dating from 1654, is of squared oak split plank construction, the more
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In order to determine if historic data regarding “Swedish architecture” might serve as a clue to the identity of the foundations uncovered in Printz

Fig. 1  Map locating the Printzhof site on the Delaware River.

Dankers and Sluyter 1867:183), nor very many of the large numbers of Quakers then in the area.
References to the Printzhof

According to Johnson (1930:41-42) Printz called the Indians to a gathering at the Printzhof in September 1653 before he took leave of them. Whether to secure continued peace or for last minute trade is unknown. Printz’ son-in-law, John Pappegoya, acted as governor of the outpost from the end of 1653 until May 23, 1654 when Director Johan Rysinge took charge of New Sweden. Pappegoya continued to reside with his wife at Tunicum, but Rysinge lived at Christina (Wilmington). Within two weeks of his arrival, Rysinge sailed up to Tunicum to conduct the business of the colony. Lindestrom has left us an account of this visit to the Printzhof in 1654, but he did not describe any of the buildings. “In the same year, on the 3rd of June, Director Mr. Johan Rijisind and I went up to Tennaconch, thus Printzhof is called in the Indian or Renappi language” (Lindestrom 1925:124-125). Since they stayed for two weeks in order to meet with ten sachems representing three Indian tribes on June 17, the purpose of this visit must have been to introduce the new governor and to assure the Indians of continued friendly relations. New Sweden, however, was conquered by Stuyvesant in September of 1655 and thus ended Swedish claims to the area.

An illustration depicting the building complex at Tennaconch has been lost from one of the most useful manuscripts relating to the Swedish “settlements” on the Delaware; the manuscript of Jasper Danckaerts. Only three days before Danckaerts (1913:98) arrived at Tunicum in 1679 he recorded the most complete description of a Swedish log house of the 17th century American settlements and contrasted its effectiveness with that of a Quaker or English house. On Saturday, November 18, 1679 he wrote the following:

The house, although not much larger than where we were last night, was somewhat better and tighter, being made according to the Swedish mode, and as they usually build their houses here, which are block-houses, being nothing else than entire trees, split through the middle, or squared out of the rough, and placed in the form of a square, upon each other, as high as they wish to have the house; the ends of these timbers are let into each other, about a foot from the ends, half of one into half of the other. The whole structure is thus made, without a nail or a splice. The ceiling and roof do not exhibit much finer work, except among the most careful people, who have the ceiling planked and a glass window. The doors are wide enough, but very low, so that you have to stoop in entering. These houses are quite warm and tight; but the chimney is placed in a corner.

Danckaerts continued down the river, noting that Quakers were settled all along its length. Like Danckaerts and Suyter, who were members of the Labadist religious sect which ultimately settled in Maryland, the Quakers were seeking an area in which to practice their “unusual” beliefs without government restraints. On Monday, November 20, 1679, Danckaerts visited another Quaker home, and later traveled on to Takany (Tacony), which he described as a village of Swedes and Finns on the west side of the river. The following day he reached Tynakonk, which he described as being, with Matinakonk, one of the two best and largest islands in the river. Danckaerts carefully noted that this island, one and one-half by two English miles (which are one-quarter the length of Dutch miles), is called Tinakonk and not Matinikonk.

This Tinakonk, is the island of which M. Arnout of La Grange had said so much; but we were disappointed in comparing it with what he had represented, and what M. la Motte has written about it. ... On this point three or four houses are standing, built by the Swedes, a little Lutheran church made of logs, and the remains of the large block-house, which served them in place of a fortress, with the ruins of some log huts (Dankers and Sluyter 1867:177-178).

Court records of that same year, 1679 (Armstrong 1860:152), note that the fences around the churchyards at Tinnagcong and at Wicaco, as well as the buildings, were out of repair. This transcription may be in error since the church at Wicaco may not have been built at this time. Danckaerts made a sketch of the manor for his journal, but that sketch and others were not among the six which survived with the original manuscript. The elder M. de la Grange (see Danckaerts 1913:49, fn.4) had purchased Tunicum from Mrs. Pappegoya (née Printz) in 1662 or 1663 (see Smith 1862:91) and praised the island highly as well as reporting on iron mines as part of its wealth. Danckaerts found no evidence of the mine and was surprised that the “settlement” was so meager. Most of the island was marsh which was under water during high tides (see Ashmead 1884:282-283). Lehman (1826:144) later observed that the highground of the island was but 500 acres, but banking (diking) had added 2200 acres.

Since Lindestrom in 1654 made no comment regarding the home of Governor Printz but refers to the entire complex as the Printzhof, and Danckaerts notes a decayed blockhouse and some Swedish built houses still standing and some in ruins, one may suspect that the idea of Governor Printz having built a large “home” is a fiction derived from authors bent on romanticizing the past.

The original manuscript of Johan Camanius has not been scrutinized for clues to the Printzhof configuration, and all we have is the publication of
The importance of Andreas Hudde’s description of the Printz residence should now be considered. Hudde’s report has only a brief mention of Tinekonk, the residence of Governor Printz (Johnson 1930:256-257).

This is a pretty strong fort, made of hemlock (groenen) logs laid one under the other; but this fort, with all its buildings, was burnt down on the 5th of December, 1645.

The original Dutch manuscript should be examined to determine if Hudde was using a word for fortress (earthworks) or the word for blockhouse where the translators have read “fort.”

Printz certainly lived in a blockhouse constructed at Tincum. He also may have constructed an earthwork “fort” on the southwestern tip of the island which, with a few guns could control shipping. The blockhouse, which was too far up the western side of Little Tincum to control shipping, would provide a home for the governor and a defensive post for the “settlement” against European raiders and Indian threats. If the blockhouse was placed to control the channel then the ancillary buildings for which there is no direct evidence, may have been clustered on the landward side. If the blockhouse was in ruins by 1679 when Danckaerts visited, this suggests that the termination of residence in the blockhouse may have coincided with the departure of Madam Pappegoy (Armgart Printz) about 1662, or even earlier with the Dutch devastation in 1655. Residents in this area may have continued to live in Swedish log cabins such as seen in 1679.

This thesis is supported by some obscure data provided by Henry C. Murphy, editor of the Dankers and Sluyter manuscript. Madam Pappegoy’s sale of the Printzhof became an issue of considerable litigation, aspects of which should be scrutinized for details which may be of value in determining what buildings existed in the 1670’s. Hazard (1850:400-404) refers to the suit (October 12-14, 1672) of Armgart Printz, plaintiff against Andrew Carr and Mrs. La Grange. Hazard refers to the Albany Records, Court of Assizes, Vol. II:293-300 and to an entry in the Albany Records (General Entries Vol. IV:260-262) which deals with an appraisal of the Printzhof and details of the estate as of March 2, 1673. These manuscript volumes of the Albany Records at the New York State Library, Albany, were never published. Mr. William Gorman of the Manuscripts and History Section of the New York State Library (pers. comm. 1977) noted that the original volumes of the Albany Records were ruined by fire in 1911. Volume IV was completely destroyed and the remaining portions of Volume II do not include pages 293-300. Publications relating to these court records (e.g., Van Laer 1869; Femow 1902) were searched without success in the hope of finding a reference to the same material or similar information.

The battle over title and possession of the estate ended favorably for Mrs. Pappegoy, who on March 22, 1675, sold the manor to Otto Earnest.
Cook (Koch?) for 1500 guilders in zeewant (Ashmead 1884:278-278). Ashmead notes, without reference, that this sale reserved out the fenced-in church and churchyard to allow for devotions and burials. The younger Mr. M. de la Grange later petitioned for his rights, thereby renewing the legal suit. This matter was finally settled in the Upland Court in 1683, with the “plaintiff paying to the defendant thirty-seven pounds and ten shillings, and also delivering the block-house and timbers in the same agreement mentioned” (Dankers and Sluyter 1867:182n; see also Smith 1862:145-146). Thus, four years after Danckaerts’ visit, the wood in the ruined blockhouse appears to have had value. An informant living at Ticicum in 1679 told Danckaerts (Dankers and Sluyter 1867:180) that an earlier legal battle between Madam Papegay and the widow de la Grange resulted in a judgment in favor of Madam Papegay which included payment for buildings which the widow de la Grange “had allowed to go to waste.” These reports all suggest that the blockhouse-residence was a ruin by 1700 and that the alleged home of Governor Prinitz in subsequent reports may have been a lesser structure. The Swedish “houses” seen and described by Danckaerts may have been outbuildings which were part of the same gore.

Only eighty-two years after Danckaerts’ visit, H. M. Muhlenberg (1942:1-460) visited the site of the first cemetery in this part of the country (July 31, 1761). On Tenac Island (Ticum) Muhlenberg found the remains of the first Christian church in the area and molding bones from its cemetery (see Becker ms. B:30).

An undated and possibly eyewitness account of the Printzhof is as follows:

Mrs. Morris a widow of 76 yrs of age living near there, who had seen the Printzhof Hall, describes it as 1½ story high—having a double hipped roof—the house of brick—with a long Piazza in front—and a ground floor of a big hall in the middle—running through—with two good rooms on one side, and one room and the Stairway on the other side—

In the front of this house was, as says tradition,—a church—a graveyard,& the fortrefs called in our parlance, Fort—the River invasion all along the Banks, have long since, washed out all remains out of sight. At the site which is now (a) Hotel, were seen (formerly) bones of the dead, sticking out of the river bank—as having been there probably the site of the burial place—This related by W. Smith—the father of Step[n] H. Smith, our informant (Watson ms.2-3).

Earlier Watson (ms.:2) had said that the site of Prinitz Hall now had a three storied “White house (plastered brick) of double front” built over it. This site of the Printzhof was “close to the front of the River bank—some 3 or 400 ft south from the Lazaretto premises—...”

Were the Ticicum and Rosedale Inns one and the same? This account suggests that the structure at the site of the Corinthian was a hotel at the time of writing and that the Ticicum Inn building was a private house. The handwriting of the manuscript attributed to Mr. Watson suggests a script style of 1790-1800, indicating that either Mr. Watson was an old man in 1852 or that the manuscript was written prior to 1852.

The old building, “situated on the upland of the island, which is said to be the ancient mansion of Governor Printz” was largely destroyed by fire during the summer of 1822 (Lehman 1826:31; also Watson ms.2:2). Lehman secured these data from the oldest residents of Ticicum in 1826, some of whom were in their eighties and were assumed able to recall events probably as early as 1750. By 1750, however, the residence of Prinitz or his daughter may have been long in decay and one or another of the early structures on the island may have been taken for “The Printzhof.”

The Ash map (Ash 1848) depicts four parcels of property, with five houses, in the area believed to be that in which the Printzhof stood. The left center parcel, then owned by Jonathan Shreve, may represent the core of the Corinthian Yacht Club property and the original house which became part of the Club building. The log house and the associated stone spring house are not depicted or identifiable on the Ash map (see also Bridgeport Quadrangle 1967).

B. H. Smith’s map (1880:plate 16) shows a road to the northwest of Printzhof, now Wannamaker Avenue (Route 420), crossing the western end of the island. The Printzhof is located about eighty meters west of the end of this road, some eighty meters from the water. On Smith’s map the church (1646) is placed about fifty meters southwest of the Printzhof, along the edge of the island, and the “Fort” is situated about 150 meters due west of the Printzhof. These locations appear consistent with all available evidence. Some details of the Governor Prinitz Park area may also be found on the Ticicum Inn (1890) deed.

Archaeological Attempts at Verifying Identification:
The 1937 Excavations

As noted earlier a previous excavation led by D. Cadzow had attempted to document through direct evidence the identification of these foundations as being those of the Printzhof (see King 1973:27-28). Searches for the field notes or drawings were without success until 1978. A plan of the Cadzow excavation recently was recovered, but found to be significantly deficient in every aspect. The quality of the excavations and the field records of that period were such that now they could not be utilized in interpreting the significance of the site.

Cadzow’s excavation completely exposed the original walls and his subsequent probes or attempts at consolidation thoroughly disrupted all
original foundation pits. Every stone appears to have been reset, suggesting that he left no part of the foundation undisturbed. Artifacts from all fills were removed and sorted into categories (metal, pottery, glass) but never washed nor processed, nor was context recorded. A few pieces had tags affixed indicating general locations and depths. However, these are few in number and dependent on field records to determine where they were found. Approximately 75 percent of the material was removed by Cadzow and the remaining 25 percent recovered in the 1976 excavation.

Cadzow left all of the foundation walls exposed. In many cases these were four courses high, but nearly forty years of exposure in a public park has resulted in considerable destruction. The basal courses of these foundations do survive and provided information useful in the interpretation of the developmental sequence of these foundations.

One of the goals of the 1976 excavation was the recovery of data relating to the previous excavations. Cadzow had a crew of fifty to sixty laborers who stripped the upper levels of soil down as deep as eighty to one hundred cms. over the entire southern area of the park. Once Cadzow located the foundations he continued down into the foundation trenches, obliterating any evidence of construction techniques. The limits of his work are designated by dotted lines (see Figure 5). The 1976 work indicated that the stones were all reset, but not in the original order. Thus junctions were disrupted, making interpretations difficult.

A trench excavated in 1976 (Ops. 3A-3E, see Figure 3) between the foundations and the sea wall located a series of previously excavated Indian grave pits. No artifacts or skeletal material were found in 1976 suggesting that these had been thoroughly cleared by previous workers.

Prof. John Witthoft (pers. comm.) related to me that Cadzow had once said that the excavation produced large quantities of Colonial and Indian artifacts, and disputes regarding the supposed disappearance of silver and pewter artifacts recovered in 1937 appear in correspondence of the period. No catalogue was produced and the boxes of artifacts stored at the American Swedish Museum appear to contain items of no interest to the excavator. A review of these problems is offered by Becker (Ms. B.:35-36).

Goals and Strategy of the 1976 Excavations

The aims of the 1976 work were to:
1. Re-excavate and record the area excavated by D. Cadzow in 1937 in order to salvage information (see King 1973:27-28).
2. Review archeological data to determine if this foundation is that of the original Printzhof.
3. Seek other buildings in the park, through a cesium magnetometer survey and the excavation of a series of test pits, which may have been related to the original gøre.

4. Determine how best to stabilize exposed foundations.

A survey of the literature suggested why Cadzow had chosen this site in 1937 (Becker Ms. B.:37-38). Mapping problems in 1976 were complicated by the presence of metal water pipes and iron-rich fills used to level the park surface. The magnetometer survey (Figure 2, large rectangle) was useless in the context of these introduced anomalies. Details regarding this survey as well as the testing program (see Figures 2 and 3) within the park are all presented elsewhere (Becker Ms. B.:37-40). The great extent of Cadzow's excavations, and his treatment of artifacts, completely eliminated any means by which various structures could be dated. Evaluation of foundation sections was made dependent on construction details. The locations of other buildings in the target zone, all of late date, are discussed by Becker (Ms. B.:38-40). None of the evidence indicates the presence of buildings of an early date other than the primary structure in the target area (Figure 4I, II). Modern excavation techniques revealed only two features not disturbed by earlier work. One was a witch-bottle, carefully hidden outside the southeast corner of what appears to be the original structure (Becker 1978). This bottle, of a 1740 shape, appears to be one of the rare pieces of evidence for the survival of witchcraft in Chester County well into the 18th century. The second, and more significant feature, was a deposit of mixed Indian and Colonial artifacts revealed at the northwestern corner of the 1976 excavations. These deposits sealed an early well, which could not be completely excavated during this season. This important feature is a possible source of information regarding the relationship between the early Swedish settlers and the local Indians (see Becker 1976a).

The description of the archeological evidence through excavation which eliminated nearly all contexts for artifacts and distorted architectural and other features, left us with only one means by which archeology could be of value in this program. The careful recording of data regarding the foundations, despite the earlier consolidation efforts, has provided a useful analytical foundation which may be used to complement the ethnohistoric evidence. In order to facilitate the description of these data the information will be presented in order of reconstructed chronology (cf. Becker Ms. B.:Table 3).

The earliest structure on the site is represented by a small rectangular foundation 18'4" (5.60m) by 20'5" (6.26m). These walls (Figure 4I) are set at the lowest elevation, and considerably below the level of the walls of the contiguous foundation, section III (Figure 4). A few stones in the northwest corner (Figure 4D) indicate a corner fireplace. This is believed to be the original Printzhof. Probably associated with this early foundation is a conical dug well (Figure 4B, C) which was sealed by a deposit of mixed Indian-Colonial artifacts probably dating to 1640-1650. A great deal of 17th century material was recovered by both excavations, but the contexts were
Fig. 2  Map of the north end of Governor Printz Park, Essington, Penna. showing locations of 1976 test excavations and the resistivity survey.

Fig. 3  Map of the south end of the Park locating the 1976 excavations.
disturbed in 1937. Kaolin pipes (Becker Ms. A.) comprise the most easily dated early artifacts, but early glass bottles also abound. A small pit (Figure 4A) also may be of Colonial date (see also Becker Ms. B.: Figure 2).

A section of the south wall (Figure 4E) was later filled with stone. The original opening reflects the location of a door at that point. The original southeast cornerstone (Figure 4H) is in place.

The enlarged Printzhof, replacing that destroyed by fire, appears to incorporate the area denoted as section II (Figure 4). This larger structure also has a fireplace in the northwest corner, the right hand pier or support indicated as Figure 4G. The other support is indicated by a dashed line. The corner of the foundation of the earlier structure may have served as a support for the chimney stack. This structure was at least 28'8" (8.20m) by 23'4" (7.20m) in plan, with the possibility that it was larger. Quite possibly a foundation section to the south of the structure (Figure 4I) may have been part of this enlarged building, but no linkages have been demonstrated. Possibly this section (I) as well as wall "J" were part of the expanded structure, which had fallen into decay by 1700.

A third structure (Figure 4III) appears to have been built on this site about 1750. During this construction foundations were extended from the western corners (Figure 4M), but their shallower depth reflects general siting and filling around the original structures. The western extensions are of a different masonry type as well, indicating a different date. Cadzow's work disrupted all of the stonework, obliterating all joints at these corners. This third structure appears to have had a fireplace centered on the west wall, indicated now by three support stones (Figure 4K). On the north side of this fireplace are two large stones which appear to be a threshold (Figure 4L) leading to a brick entry or stoop to the west.

Renovations in the original section (I) of the house may have been made at this time. Two supports for summer beams (floor joists) may have been added (Figure 4N). The opening in the south wall was closed and probably a chimney added over the foundation area now outside this opening (Figure 4E). The witch bottle may have been added at this time (Figure 4O). For dating and inferences about the placement of the bottle outside a hearth area see Becker 1978. The brick pavement south of structure I, and within structure III (Figure 4P) may also relate to this third. The extension to the north of section III appears to date to a later period and will be discussed below.

The dimensions of this third structure, which dates from about 1750, are 18'4" (5.60m) by 38'4" (11.6m) provide one of the best indications that these foundations represent those of the Printzhof (see Becker ms. B.: Table 1). The U.S. Direct Tax listing for 1798 ("Glass Tax") for Tincum Township lists a frame house 19' by 37' on two acres, owned by John Taylor and occupied by Benjamin Rue. The remarkable congruence of these measurements appears to validate King's (1973:32-33) title search which shows John Taylor as owning the land in 1798, and Benjamin Rue being a recipient in 1800 of one tract of the whole containing a bit over two acres. Other listed structures in the area (see Becker ms. B.:42-44, Table 2) do not match King's description with this degree of accuracy.
Shortly after the Glass Tax was levied, during the period from 1806 to 1822, the building known as the Printzhof is said to have been destroyed in a fire. Features evident in the plan (Figure 4) that may post-date 1822 include the well, with cobble walls, and possibly the extension of the north side of section III. The late placement of the date of this extension is indicated by the difference in the stonework and the fact that it appears to have been built over a drain (Figure 4R) leading to the well, which may have become a cesspool serving the Tinicum Inn (see Becker ms. B:51).

A drain (Figure 4S), nearly two meters below the base level of the foundations, was located off the southwest corner of the enlarged structure. This drain, with red brick walls and flagstone base and cap, was not followed and its function remains unknown. A summary of construction sequences for this suspected Printzhof has been published in conjunction with the witch bottle report (see Becker 1978:6, Figure 5).

The structure to the east of the Printzhof probably dates from the 19th century. This structure (Figure 5) measures 21'10" (6.70m) by 33'8" (10.2m). Cadzow's trenches in its foundation (Figure 5F) are evident, as are three unusually deep holes apparently dug by Cadzow (Figure 5A). An unusual square pit (Figure 5B) was also dug in 1937. The large openings in the west wall separated by a large pier (Figure 5C) suggest that this structure was built as a carriage house. An opening on the south side, with bricks incorporated in both jams, appears to be an entry.

A small section of wall at the northwest corner of this structure (Figure 5D) was not original to the structure. The stones are set separately from the north wall of the structure and the masonry style differs from the original parts of the foundation. Perhaps the unidentified group of stones (Figure 5E) relates to this rebuilding. Three groups of stone (Figure 5E, G, and H) do not appear related to the structure and may reflect activities of the 1937 excavations.

Another feature which had an unknown function is a brick socket near the southeast corner of the original structure (Figure 4T). This feature consists of two layers of red brick, the lower forming an apparent socket base and the upper layer acting as low wall. The lower bricks are set directly on sterile soil and the upper only partly overlaps the lower, being supported primarily by sterile soil.

Features of still later date are two storm drains (Figures 4U, 5I) which appear to run to the sea wall at the river's edge. These probably related to the Tinicum Inn, a structure which may have been contemporary with the carriage barn illustrated in Figure 5. The Tinicum Inn was built approximately between 1822 and 1852 as a private house. This later became the Rosedale Inn, and ultimately the Tinicum Inn. The carriage house appears to relate in time and appropriate location to this structure.
A barn located in the northwest corner of the present park area also may have been related to this house and carriage house. Excavations in 1976 (Figure 2, Test pit 7) located what appears to be a foundation wall of this barn. The footer trenches for the foundation contained large numbers of local beer bottles of the period circa 1880. This barn may have stood until the 1930's when the park was developed. The Tincum Inn itself was torn down between 1930 and 1937, and the Cadzow excavations (1937) appear to have concentrated to the south of the Inn's location. Test trenches to determine the location of the Tincum Inn foundations (see Figure 2) ran from the main excavations (see Figure 3) into the area of the cesium magnetometer survey. Although no foundation walls were discovered the results of the survey and two test pits (Figure 2:5, 11) indicate extensive debris in this area which appears to reflect a demolished structure of appropriate date.

Conclusions

Although no direct evidence has been produced to support the assertion that the Printzhof has been located, the indirect indicators are considerable. In order of strength the following consideration suggest that the site of the Printzhof has been located:

2. Evidence from the excavation suggesting that the rebuilding of the larger structure (II), with a corner fireplace, was with a general plan similar to the smaller structure (I). Dimensions of the structure including sections I and III (5.60m wide by 11.60m long) appear to tally with suspected Printzhof on 1798 Glass Tax list.
3. Pipes clearly of a mid-17th century date.
4. Native American and Colonial artifacts in an undisturbed and mixed context, suggesting early contact.
5. The great distances separating early Swedish farmsteads renders improbable that this foundation represents anything but the Printzhof complex.

Although there were numerous Swedish structures scattered along the river, of which this is certainly one, the intervals appear to have been sufficiently great to eliminate the possibility that this structure is other than the Printzhof. Other structures in the complex (or gøre) might lie on ground just beyond the area of the State Park and future excavations may support the conclusions reached at this time.
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ABSTRACT

Treaties signed in 1739 between Jamaican Maroons and the English colonial government defined their relationship and legally encapsulated the Maroon communities. While seemingly in accord, the two sides had fundamentally different views of the treaties: to the government they were ordinary legal documents; to the Maroons they were sacred charters. After documenting this divergence of views into the present, the paper considers the problem of how a relationship is maintained between parties who take irreconcilable views of it.

Colonial Treaty As Sacred Charter of the Jamaican Maroons

It is a commonplace observation that when two very different societies are engaged in a common enterprise, their members are likely to view it differently; it will have a distinctive meaning and place in each society's schema. When the common enterprise stems from a treaty defining the relationship between the two societies, this difference in viewpoints may be obscured by the fact that both parties give assent to a common text, a document that sets out explicitly what their relationship is to be. But the interpretation of such a document by the two parties may be quite distinct to begin with, and their reinterpretations of it over time, as circumstances change, may diverge markedly. A divergence of views may occur as a result of conscious manipulation by one side or the other, to gain political advantage, but it may also occur more innocently, as an unfolding of incompatible underlying assumptions that have long been present, implicitly, in the background.