

Our Immigrant Ancestor

ADAM HAMAKER

and

his Family

Compiled 1954 by

J. L. Hamaker

Lynchburg, Va.

Hammacher
Hamacher
Hammaker
Hamaker
Hammacker
Hamacker
Haymaker

It is a matter of historical record that our first American ancestor and his many descendants have differed in the way of spelling the family name as is indicated above, and in the homeland still other spellings have been adopted as we shall see presently. The reasons, if any, which prompted these deviations from what must have been an original form we shall refer to later on but here we will consider the question how, and where, and when the name originated.

We have no information about the parentage or birthplace of our Adam Hammacher. There have been many guesses, family traditions and even what were supposed to be authoritative statements, but as to the value of all these we may let the reader judge for himself after having read the following statement of facts.

Concerning the previous history of our immigrant Hammacher, the Philadelphia Port Records tell us next to nothing. The names and ages of all males of 16 or over who arrived with Adam are given, and of these there were 56. There were also 28 women but nothing more is said of them. There is no word about children although it is practically certain that there were some. All passengers are called, collectively, Palatines, and they embarked at Rotterdam.

Some of these matters will be discussed elsewhere and here it need only be stated as a fact that Rotterdam was the main port of embarkation for immigrants from all parts of north west Europe, and especially from the entire Rhine valley, from Switzerland to Holland.

The term Palatine, as used here, was nothing more or less than a synonym for German. Some justification for this usage will also appear elsewhere but much of it may be attributed to the ignorance of the English ship-masters as to what were after all the personal affairs of their German passengers. It is certainly true that many of these so-called Palatines did not come from the Palatinate.

Since no other positive information as to the origin of the name or persons of John and Adam Hammacher has come to light in this country the next best place to look for information would seem to be in the land from which they came. Hence the present writer, while living in Switzerland and Munich and Berlin for brief periods and while crossing much of the western part of Europe in various directions, and thus passing through many cities, towns, and villages, had many opportunities to learn where, if any, our kin are still to be found and also to find evidence of their presence in the past. The evidence obtained was abundant, positive and surprising, showing that the Hammacher clan is still very much alive and represented by large numbers spread over a consider-

able area of the lower Rhine valley, and that former representatives of the clan have left their mark on the history of the area for the many hundreds of years now gone by.

It might be suggested that not all these variant spellings were derived from the same name and, in the absence of any reliable historical account, the best that can be said is that they all occur together in the same locality, except in isolated cases of individual migration. But this suggestion will also be considered.

In the process of collecting evidence on these questions statistics were accumulated covering thousands of names from scores of cities, towns and villages fairly representative of a large part of north west Europe. These statistics were secured from many available sources such as library catalogues, business directories, telephone books, city directories and also through correspondence and personal interviews. When these figures are collected and summarized we are led to the conclusion that if one were to draw a circle around the city of Cologne at the distance of 100 miles we would probably include within that circle 90 or 95% of all Hamakers in Europe. (Using the form Hamaker to include all variations.)

Cologne has probably the densest Hamaker population, with about 300 Hamacker, 20 Hamecher, 12 Hamaecker and 1 Hammacher; For Dusseldorf 100 Hamacher, 3 Hammacker and 1 Hamacker; For Bonn there are 20 Hamacher, 5 Hamecher; For Dortmund 19 Hamacher and 8 Hammacker. The towns and villages about these cities usually have a quota of each of the three most common varieties. These places all lie within the circle of which Cologne is the center.

If we pass beyond this circle, even within Germany we will find only a scattering few, one or more, even in the large cities, e. g. 1 in Paris, 1 in Zurich, 1 in Munich, a silversmith who said he came from Godesburg, near Cologne, 1 in Osnabruck, 1 in Mannheim, one in Munster, 1 in Middleburg, 3 in Brussels, 2 in Hamburg, 3 in Hannover, 3 in Nurnberg.

In the Dutch city of Amsterdam there were nine names as against three and a half columns of Horst which is a typical Dutch name and one associated with the Hamakers in America.

In Berlin as one would expect there are a few but only a few. And these, as far as known, came from the Rhine valley, specifically Lennep, near Cologne. Richard Hammacher, engineer, writes that he and his brother Frederich, in Essen, as well as Carl von Hammacher of Aachen, came from the Lennep branch of the family. The most eminent of all the Hamachers in Europe was Friedrich Hammacker, born in Essen, 1824, died in Berlin, 1904.

He was also a member of the Lennep branch of Hammackers, was long a member of the Reichstag. His portrait was painted by von Lenbach and hung in the Lenbach villa in Munich between the portraits of Prince Luitpold of Bavaria and that of Prince von Bismarck. This, in the German way, was placing him next to royalty.

Family names are a relatively recent invention. In Germany they were not generally adopted until the fourteenth century. But place names came into being with man himself, for we are told that "God planted a garden eastward in Eden" for the man he had created and from there on, Adam and his descendants gave a name to every place which was of interest to them - not only real places but also many which were wholly imaginary.

And yet when it came to giving his family a name this same man seemed strangely lacking in imagination. The best he could do was to adopt a name which already belonged to something else, such as the names of beasts and birds, of stars and flowers. But the ones we are especially interested in in connection with our family name are the names of places and the names of men's occupations.

These two were exceptionally common and it would be only natural if we should find the origin of our name in one or the other of these sources.

The oldest known record of a name at all resembling ours occurs on an old map of Germany of the period of about the tenth century. At a point on the Rhine about twenty five miles below (north of) Cologne there was a place labelled

FLUR HAMACKER.

This name does not occur on a modern map but instead we find there the small town of Kaiserswerth. The word Flur may here be translated as the equivalent of meadow. As to the origin and meaning of the Hamacker we shall defer to the opinion of an expert German historian whose findings will be presented a little farther on.

When we take up the question of the meaning of the name, Hamaker, and its origin, the matter of spelling becomes of critical importance and, besides, the word ham has had two very different meanings. One was equivalent to the English hame - part of a harness. This was evidently the interpretation adopted by the family of Gottfried Hammacher who was "Scheffe von Bonn" in the latter half of the seventeenth century (Gottfried died in 1680). This was a family of minor nobility and the coat of arms bore a

pair of hames on the shield which could mean only that for them the name meant hame-maker, a maker of hames.

But in Gottfried's time the name was already centuries old and he could not be expected to know much about its origin, especially since in those days few could write and names were rarely written. The record of the place Flur Hamacker is dated in the year 1090 but its history has been traced back to a point several centuries before that. Here at Kaiserswerth on an island in the river there is an institution which was founded by the Benedictines as a mission station before the people here had been converted to Christianity. Dr. Heinrich Kelleter has written a history of this station from the time of its founding. Incidentally, he gives an interpretation of the origin of the name Hamacker and the story itself is interesting enough to bear retelling.

Baeda (The Venerable Bede) in writing his Chronicles of the Church, tells of St. Willibrord, who about 692 A. D. set out, with eleven companions, for Friesland to spread the gospel. They had the support of Pepin II and Willibrord went to Rome to get the blessing of the Pope.

The brethren left in Friesland elected one of their number, Suitbert, to be ordained Bishop. They sent him back to Brittonia to be ordained by Bishop Wilfrid in Mercia. Suitbert applied to Pepin for a permanent station. This was granted through the influence of Pepin's wife Plectrudis.

The land granted was an island in the Rhine and was known by the natives as "Auf dem Ufer. Kelleter now goes on to say that his understanding is that the original name of the island was Ham (later Hamm). Ham was equivalent to Ufer and meant bank or shore, and more specifically a shore which was protected by an artificial earthwork or levee.

Since "acker" is the German word for cultivated land, Hamaker (or Hammacker) would mean cultivated land protected by a levee. Now we can assume I suppose, that at that early date such areas were rare, or even otherwise unknown and that therefore this descriptive term became a proper noun, i. e. the name of a place.

This in brief is the gist of Kelleter's story and there seems to be no reason for questioning his conclusions regarding the origin and meaning of the name, but there is a sequel to the story itself.

The fifth Bishop of Utrecht was known by the name Harmackerus. He died in 807 and is buried in the church of St. Savior at Utrecht. His name is spelled in various ways and the Latin ending was in conformity with the general practice of scholarly men of those times. He is said to have been a Frisian (Friesland at that time extended over a considerable area of the lower Rhine valley)

and the See at Utrecht was established as a mission post from the monastery at Kaiserswerth, and was within the domain of the Bishop of Cologne. Seemingly the inference to be drawn is that the fifth Bishop of Utrecht was a native of Flur Hammacker.

At this time few family names had become established. The most common way of distinguishing one John from another John was by his occupation or trade. Next to this was his place of origin or residence. In the case of Gottfried, mentioned above, we have an example of the first method while in Harmackerus we have the other.

We are now left in a quandary. Did we all spring from the land of the levee of 1200 years ago, giving us the right to call ourselves Ham-ackers, or are some of us upstart families of Hame-makers, only three hundred years or so old?

If we elect the latter alternative we are still faced with questions; e. g. why was there only one family of hame-makers whereas smiths and millers and bakers sprang up in every community in every land? And again, why did this unique family of hame-makers happen to originate in the very midst of the ham-ackers?

Rudolph Hammacker was another one of the ancients who deserves to be mentioned. He was born in Osnabruck in 1528 and was Burgomeister of his native city from 1565 to 1587. Nothing is known of his lineage and there is only one of his name in the city directory of today. He was a man of unusual ability but allowed himself, in his office as burgomeister, to be used in the interests of The Church in her efforts to stamp out heresay and destroy all who would not be bent to her forms.

However, he deserves to be remembered for a book which he wrote at a time when few books were being written. As burgomeister he kept a record of legal enactments and processes and of other notable events. He prefaced his account of the events of his time by a history of the city, much of which is based on tradition and is in part inaccurate or even mythical.

The chief interest of the book lies in the language which was a low German dialect bearing a relation to modern High German comparable to that which the language of Chaucer bears to modern English.

The book, as published by the Historical Society of Osnabruck in 1927, is accompanied by a translation into modern high German, and a lexicon.

Assuming that our name did come originally from that place-name on the Rhine, we may be justified in concluding, on historical grounds, that the correct form of the name would be that:

1. the first part of the name may be properly either Ham or

Hamm and that

2. the second part should be acker or aker (as aker, in English, is the older form of acker or acre).

This conclusion would mean that the form used by our Adam was not the original form.

In any case as a matter of general agreement and custom, a man's name is what he says it is although in actual practice if he makes a change it may get him into trouble.

1740 IN PHILADELPHIA

On the 30th of September, 1740, Commander William Chilton, captain of the ship Samuel and Elizabeth, appeared before the officials of the Provincial Council at Philadelphia to make his report concerning the passengers who had arrived aboard his vessel. With him came the adult male passengers of ages 17 and up. He declared that his list of passengers consisted of 56 men and 28 women. He gives the ages of the men but no further information about the women. He makes no mention of children although there must have been some. This list of names of the men with their ages is then placed in the record of the Council. The record continues with two lists of signatures of these men as they take the oaths of "allegiance" and "abjuration".

In these three lists appear the first authentic references to our common Hamaker ancestors as they appear on the first day of their arrival in America. As written by themselves they are:

Johann Adam Hammacher (age 23)

Johann Huberich Hamacher (age 27)

The ages are given only in the Captain's list.

Concerning the nationality, or homeland, of his passengers the Captain calls them all, together, "Palatines". But this term must not be interpreted literally, for at this time it had become quite customary to call all German immigrants Palatines. The Captain further states that his ship had sailed from Rotterdam and Deal. The stop at Deal was to get "clearance" as required by British authority.

Although Johann Adam and Johann Huberich were probably brothers, we have no positive evidence that they were. The difference in spelling the surname is likely due to carelessness, on the part of Huberich, to give the sign of doubling the m as when one fails to dot an i or cross a t. Also, Adam's signature is in every way superior to that of Huberich. The Johann in both

names is no evidence that they were not brothers since it was not unusual to give brothers, in part, the same name. It may be that this was done in compliment of the godfather.

In subsequent records we never find the Johann used with the Adam and, conversely, the Huberich is not used with the Johann. However, since there have been so many Johns in later generations we shall hereafter distinguish these two as Adam, and John H respectively.

Also, at this point the history of the two families divides. We know of no further association of the two but there are times when, from this distance, there arises difficulty in determining to which family a certain reference applies. When we next hear of John H it is as a resident of Columbia, on the Susquehanna, and hence it may be more intelligible to speak of him as John of Columbia. From later developments we may reasonably assume that Adam was accompanied by his wife Eva, or Eve, and one or two infant children. His oldest son was Adam, and John is said to have been born in 1740.

These few items are all the information we have concerning our first American ancestors, Adam and Eve, at the time of their landing on American soil, but they give us a very definite picture of a situation. Briefly expressed, we see, not an adventurer, but a young man who came to America to make a home for his wife and children, and that fact will set the pattern for all his future movements. What these may have been we shall see more clearly if we pause here to take stock of what lay before him.

Penn's Colony was one of the last to be established. But up to this time all the settlements were along the sea-coast and adjacent navigable bays and rivers. Back of the settlements lay the untamed wilderness which had not yet been penetrated by roads and which still harbored the Indians with whom the settlers were not always on friendly terms. Hence, for the sake of mutual protection and for access to the broad highways of the seas and rivers the settlers had not dared to wander far into the interior.

After one has become reasonably familiar with the movements of the pioneer settlers in a general way, it is possible to read between the lines, with a fair degree of certainty as to what was happening in individual cases. We can be sure that our Adam had already made his plans as to what he would do after landing at Philadelphia. He knew beforehand of friends, possibly of relatives, certainly of fellow-countrymen, in Lancaster County, and to them he would make his way without loss of time. Both Church and land records give positive evidence that this is just what he did.

One thing that is remembered of Penn and is still repeated is his treaty with the Indians. This was important not because there had not been other treaties but because this one differed from others in that it was founded on a basic principle of the Quaker doctrine - to live peaceably with ones fellows.

So it is not strange that the first important settlement of the interior was founded in the southeastern part of Penn's forest about sixty miles west of Philadelphia. It was not Penn's Quakers who formed this settlement but a group of German Mennonites who were basically so much like the Quakers that they also believed they could live in peace with the Indians and dared to live among them.

Another factor which made it possible for these people to live in such an isolated situation where there still was no road, until they made one and then it was only through a long stretch of uninhabited forest. This was the fact that they were a self contained social group. They were prepared to take care of themselves. They needed no help from others and consequently were not seriously dependant on lines of communication.

This point will stand out more clearly if we compare two groups of settlers. First consider the ship load of prospective settlers brought to Jamestown by Captain Newport, as told by Professor Howison, who writes:

"Captain Newport arrives with a ship from England containing another supply of settlers and provisions. We find in the shipping list the usual superabundance of indolent gentlemen and dissipated cavaliers with a few laborers and fewer mechanics. But in this ship came eight Poles and Germans skilled in making tar, pitch, glass mills and soap ashes. "

In contrast to these we have the isolated settlements at Tulpehocken and in the northern area of the Shenandoah valley, - there about 1723, -and the earlier settlements of the Mennonites on the Paequa and Conestoga creeks in a district which was later organized as Lancaster County.

The pioneer could live in the forest with little more than his gun and an ax. But these people were prepared to establish a highly developed civilization without much help. They brought seeds and implements with them by which they could make a beginning but they also had the skill and purpose to do the rest. Their arts included everything from farming to printing books.

A few of these German settlers had arrived at Philadelphia before 1700. Most notable among these was Francis Daniel Pastorius, and a settlement was soon formed not far from Philadelphia which came to be called Germantown. The other

settlements were established farther up the valley of the Schuylkill, such as Skippak and Oley, the latter near the locality where the city of Reading now stands.

A little farther on, in 1723, a group of German refugees from central New York formed the settlement of Tulpehocken. These had traveled far through the wilds of New York and then followed the Susquehanna down to the mouth of the Swatara creek which they then followed upward to the east and thus came to the watershed between the valleys of the Swatara and the Schuylkill.

In 1710 a small advance group of the Mennonites arrived at Philadelphia and from there proceeded directly westward, passing first through the Welsh settlement then through the Welsh mountains at Gap. This brought them into the drainage area of the Susquehanna and here they secured a grant of 10,000A on Pequea creek, a few miles south of the present city of Lancaster. In 1715 a larger contingent of Mennonites arrived and thus formed the most considerable settlement west of Philadelphia. A little later, 1719-1729, the followers of Alexander Mack settled farther up on the Conestoga and its branches. This was the beginning of the "Church of the Brethren", commonly called Dunkards.

All these settlements continued to grow with the additions of new arrivals and new centers of settlements were established from time to time, gradually extending the area to the north and west.

In 1729 the county of Lancaster was organized with the town of Lancaster as its county seat. With the surrounding area well settled with an intelligent, energetic and expert class of farmers the city of Lancaster soon became the largest inland community in all of colonial America.

CHANGING NAMES AND BOUNDRIES

For the reader who would reconstruct the geographic setting of the events of 1740 with the aid of a modern map there are many pitfalls. Some of these should be pointed out before we go farther with our story. Names in many cases have been changed and political boundries have been changed. The Lancaster County of 1729 was much larger than it is today. In 1785 Dauphin County was organized from that part of Lancaster County lying north of the Conewago Creek and in 1813 that part of Lancaster County lying north of South Mountain, and up to that time known as Lebanon Township, was incorporated, with a part of Berks in a new county which was given the name Lebanon County. At a still earlier date Lancaster County extended yet farther to the north

and westward beyond the Susquehanna and south to the Maryland border.

Likewise nearly all the townships have been reshuffled and divided. This is well illustrated by the case of Warwick Township which is the township in which the old town of Manheim lies. (The township of Manheim does not include the town of that name.)

The land records state that the warrant for a survey of land, awarded Adam Hamaker in 1749, had reference to an area in Warwick Township. But that record becomes ambiguous when we consider the fact that since then the Township of Warwick has been divided into four townships, viz: Penn, Elizabeth, Clay and Warwick. Hence that tract of land would have to be sought for somewhere in any one of those four townships. Hence, to avoid error, in interpreting the records one must take into account the date of the record.

PENN LAND PATENTS

The Penns disposed of their land in "quantities to suit the purchaser", and the purchaser was also permitted to determine the bounds on all sides. The prospective settler also often took possession by the "squatter" method i. e. without permission or formality of any kind.

In order to secure title to any unoccupied land the first step was to apply for a survey. The authority for making such survey was called a "warrant" and the date of its issue was recorded and is still on file.

The surveys were platted and the plats preserved in bound volumes. They give the "metes and bounds" and state the township and county in which located, but there is often no more definite location indicated except that the names of owners of abutting properties, if any, are given.

The purchaser paid a stated sum per acre and engaged to pay a small tax per annum.

A "Patent" was given the purchaser when he had fulfilled his part of the contract. The patent was equivalent to a deed and was written on parchment. This final step was taken apparently at the pleasure of the purchaser and the original applicant could at any time dispose of his equity so that the "return" was often made by a third person and of course he received the patent. The dates of the issue of the patent with the name of the patentee are also on record.

These records were originally on file in Philadelphia, which was the seat of the Penn Proprietary government, and frequent

reference is made in these documents to this effect, but after the "Commonwealth" was established the records were transferred to the State House at Harrisburg.

These land records are of great value to the student of colonial history and we shall have frequent occasions to refer to them. They often upset those fanciful tales called "family tradition" but instead give us the most definite and unquestionable historical facts.

Now we may outline the fortunes of Adam within the framework of the following facts:

When he left Philadelphia he was accompanied by his wife Eva, his first born son, Adam, and possibly the infant John.

We have evidence that son John was born at sometime during the year of 1740 and the recorded statement that Adam Jr. was the oldest son. Therefore, we can say that Adam and Eve began their life in America with these two infant children. For the next ten years we have only a half dozen of the briefest references, but these are all highly significant and give us an excellent background on which we may draw an imaginary picture of their life in the new world.

THE FIRST TEN YEARS

The records of the Moravian Church state that Anna Maria, Daughter of Adam and Eve Hammacker, was baptized on December 19, 1743, in Lancaster County.

The records of the Reformed Church, of Lancaster, show that Maria Salome, daughter of Adam and Eve Hammacker, was baptized on March 24, 1745.

Again in the records of the Moravian Church Maria Eve Hammacker, , daughter of Adam and Eve Hammacker, was baptized on November 7, 1746.

And again, by the records of the Moravian Church, Elizabeth, daughter of Adam and Eve Hammacker, was baptized on January 10, 1748.

The above facts must not be taken to mean anything in regard to the church affiliation of Adam and Eve. It is practically certain that they did not belong to the Moravian Church in Germany because there were none in the Rhine Valley, and later on they were members of the Church of the Brethren. At this time the population was thinly scattered throughout the forests. There were only poor roads or none at all and although there were many religions represented among the immigrants there were very few ministers and they so widely scattered that in many localities

any particular denomination might be entirely without a pastor.

But babies continued to be born without reference to such matters as the denomination of the only available pastor. Hence if the parents were accustomed to having babies baptized the question of denomination came to be of secondary importance.

Brumbaugh, in his History of the German Baptist Church, states that among the members of the Conestoga Church were Sister Hammaker and her daughters Maria and Eva. This was of the year 1763.

Falkenstein says of the Big Swatara Church of the Brethren in 1770: That meetings are held in private houses in Mount Joy Township, that preachers are George Miller and Adam Hammaker, (not ordained), and that among the members are A. Hamaker, wife and daughter, John Etter and wife (Ann Hamaker).

In 1749 Adam began to invest in land. He secured a warrant for thirty acres in Warwick Township and it was in Warwick Township that the Moravians had just begun a settlement which they called Lititz. Now if Adam had been a Moravian he would have held close to Lititz but the very next year he was taking up land farther to the west. He was granted a warrant for 100A in Rapho Twp.

Adam and Eve had now been living in the American forest for ten years. They had a family of 6 small children and yet if the mystery of the dark woods with the occasional vague threat of the Indians had ever given them cause for fear they seem to have passed such things by. They were ready to advance farther. The very next year they took a long jump into a more remote region. In 1751 Adam bought, from one James Long, his rights in a tract of land in Hanover Twp in the extreme northwest border of what was then the limit of Lancaster Co. This was later included in a new county called Dauphin.

The fact that Adam was investing in land gives us no information as to his financial status. We do not know that he had a shilling when he arrived in this country and we have no record of his having made any attempt to establish a home. To secure a warrant for a tract of land cost next to nothing but it gave him the privilege of improving the land and making a home there, if he chose, until such time as he could pay the very small sum per acre which the Proprietaries asked for the land. In the meantime, at the convenience of the surveyors, the land would have been surveyed and its boundaries definitely established. The purchaser would pay for the total acreage minus "6% for roads and highways". The settler, if he chose to do so, was at liberty at any time to sell his interest in a given tract and take up another warrant. When the acreage was fully paid for the Pro-

prietaries issued a "patent" for the land.

The mere fact that Adam twice took the preliminary steps toward establishing a permanent home might indicate that the growth of his family impressed on him the need for doing so. At any rate the move to Hanover lasted for ten years and the next and last move was justified by subsequent events.

The next question would be: Why all these moves? And the answer to that might rest as is usually the case, on the man's occupation. The best, indeed the only reply we can make to that will also depend on subsequent events. We shall learn later that Adam was deeply interested in mills and milling, as was also John H. of Columbia. And this interest was not merely a personal, accidental one. It was so deeply ingrained in the blood—that it lasted through the five successive generations up to the time when the country mill itself was crowded out of existence by the advance of our modern mechanized type of social economy.

Since those mills played a principal role in the domestic affairs of every family, practically from the very beginning of the process of conquering the forest, it is necessary to review briefly the course of events in the life of the pioneer.

A man with an axe and gun could go into the woods, find a likely spot near a spring, chop down a few trees, lay up a few logs in such a way as to enclose a small space and cover that with a pile of branches and he would have a shelter which would suffice for the needs of such hardy persons while he goes about making more important and more permanent preliminaries toward building a comfortable house. With his gun he may obtain also what food would be necessary during this period.

So far no mill would be called for. But while our pioneer is cutting down the trees he is also clearing the land and at once he plants his seed. Corn and wheat would be among the first and most essential and their produce might be had by the end of the first season. The woodsman-farmer could carry his grain out to the nearest mill but such a situation creates a need and hence a demand for the mill to come to the farmer.

But there will also immediately arise another demand. Our woodsman is not content with his make-shift shelter. During the fall and winter he proposes to build a cabin, also of logs but provided with floors and doors and an adequate roof. There are no roads and the nearest sawmill is far away. Besides he has the logs for all the lumber he needs and he has little money. The locality needs a sawmill.

Sawmill and gristmill may readily be combined and moreover, both may be operated by the same water power. And so the old fashioned country mill was the first highly specialized industry to

follow in the wake of the pioneer. Every small community had its mill. Lancaster county is threaded by numerous small streams and the mills were strung along the streams like beads on a string. The last Hamaker mill to be built in this district was on Conoy creek. It was one of seven between Elizabethtown and the Susquehanna River, a distance of about seven miles as the crow flies, though of course the creek took a somewhat winding course.

It is important to note that milling required expert knowledge and skill but for the millwright who built mills with their internal equipment and the source of the water power on the outside, there was needed a special type of engineering which applied only to mills. A millwright might be quite efficient as a miller but it could not be inferred that a miller was also a millwright. And yet these early millers were trained in such a way as to be capable in both fields.

If our Adam was a millwright he would have been moving from one mill site to the next from time to time. But even if he were only a journeyman miller he was not tied to the soil as a farmer would have been. He was likely to move from one job to another. That is to say as long as he was not the owner of the mill. And it was apparently in Hanover where he became his own employer. At any rate here he remained for about ten years and, if we interpret the scanty records correctly, when he moved to Derry Township in 1762 he left his son John in charge of the Hanover mill. This mill is located about five miles north of Union Deposit, within a few hundred yards of where the Union Deposit road intersects Route 22.

THE DERRY HOMESTEAD

In the year 1762 Adam was granted a Patent for 295A in Derry Twp., on the Swatara Creek, in that large loop which the creek makes between Hummelstown and Union Deposit. His land adjoined the area which was later laid out to form the village of Hummelstown. In the same year he bought an additional 106A from John Garber, adjoining his tract on the east and extending over Spring Creek. Here he built another mill and it was this tract which he bequeathed, in his will, to his son Christian.

At this time Adam was investing heavily in land and held a large acreage up to the time of his death in 1783. Moreover, much of this land was of the very best in Dauphin Co. He well illustrated the oft repeated statement that the Pennsylvania Dutch were notable for good judgment of what was the best land.

In 1765 he applied for a warrant for another 119 1/2A and received the patent for this in the next year. In 1773 Adam bought

a tract of 174 3/4 A from Brindle and Beyer. This tract lay in the loop of the Swatara just south of Hummelstown. This property, because of the striking oxbow curve of the creek, came to be known as Fiddler's Elbow. On it he had a mill which at the time of his death was being operated by his two sons, Philip and Samuel, to whom he willed the place.

In the year 1762 Adam sold a parcel of land to John McClure. This transaction is of especial interest to us for the fact that the deed was signed by Adam and his wife Ann. This being the first intimation we have that Adam now had a second wife.

The old Adam Hammacker homestead lies just outside the town limits of Hummelstown and near the Swatara Creek at a point where the road from Hummelstown to Union Deposit makes a bend from a northerly to a northeasterly direction. The buildings nestle under the brow of a low hill and are not visible until one reaches the bend of the road just referred to. The barn, which is of the Dutch bank-barn type, makes use of the hill for the ramp, or bank, which gives entrance to the barn-floors. The home stands to the north, on the other side of the lane leading in from the highway.

The barn is in good condition but shows the results of many years weathering. The lower story - the stabling part - is of stone. The upper parts are frame, unpainted but adorned on the gable end by one of those characteristic Dutch ornamental circles.

The house is also true to type with one unique peculiarity. The smokehouse which usually is a small detached outbuilding is here incorporated in the main building, taking the place of what would otherwise be a room.

While these buildings are old it is not likely that they date from the time of Adam. But we have no evidence bearing on the question of date of construction.

If now we return to the highway and proceed on toward Union Deposit we come to a point where the road crosses Spring Creek, previously referred to. This is the site of the mill which Adam left to his son Christian. There is probably no vestige of the mill left and probably none of the original buildings remain. An old home was demolished a few years ago and a new one erected. All that remains is a memory.

Now on these more than 400 broad acres there is room for still another farm, the one Adam left to his oldest son, Adam Jr. To see this homestead we return to a point near Hummelstown where another road branches off and runs due east. This road today is called the Hershey road although the now thriving town of Hershey had not been dreamed of for a hundred years after the time of Adam.

Immediately we turn over on the Hershey road we see, a half mile before us on the sloping fields to the left of the road, a fine example of the better class of Pennsylvania Dutch farm homesteads. A lane, several hundred yards long, leads directly to a point between house and barn. Just before we reach the main buildings we see on our right and directly in front of the house, a two story brick spring-house, a rather exceptional dignity to bestow upon a spring-house. The main house, itself is, of course, also of brick and would not appear out of place in the residential suburbs of a city.

On our other side stands the barn, which is also of the best type of Dutch farm architecture. The only special feature about the barn is the memorial stone in the gable which bears the inscription:

BUILT BY ADAM AND MOLLY HAMAKER
1820

This Adam was Adam III, son of Adam, Jr. who was also known as Adam Esq. as he held the office of Justice of the Peace.

Another item to be noted about this farm is the two apple trees which stood behind the barn when I first visited the place. They were the largest apple trees I had ever seen and were most certainly planted in the time of Adam I. On a later visit these trees had disappeared but they had given me actual contact with the times of our first Adam as nothing else had done. Now they remain a sacred memory.

And now there is Fiddler's Elbow! The Swatara swings around Hummelstown to the west and south and south of Hummelstown it makes a complete S shape curve, the upper curve forms a long narrow loop which almost completely encloses the 174 acres of that farm. West of Hummelstown a road branches off the Harrisburg pike and runs straight south through the length of the elbow. At the lower end it crosses the Swatara on a long covered bridge. The bridge is old but it was not there in the time of Adam. Instead, somewhere near there stood the mill which is gone now leaving only faint traces of the old mill-race. But higher up still stands the old log house - probably the best memento we have of old Adam. It is a large, two story log house covered with sheeting on the outside so that one would not suspect its being a log structure. There are some other interesting and old features about that house. A stairway in the center runs up to the attic and with it runs a handrail in one unbroken piece from bottom to the top. The floors are insulated with a clay-straw composition packed

into a space between the floor boards proper and a sub-floor between the joists. There is of course a large cellar without which no Dutchman would think to build a house.

The barn has the appearance of being very old without, however, being in any sense out of repair.

The most definite and indestructable reminder of the days of the old mill is one of the old mill-stones which lies embedded in the ground in front of where the yard gate used to be. The fence and gate are gone but the stone left a fine impression on my photographic plate.

This was the place which Adam willed to his two sons Philip and Samuel but which they soon left to go west. One wonders; did they not have a heart? And besides, they did not get very far west, as we shall see later.

Before we leave this elbow farm let's go back and take a good look at that covered bridge. Although it may have had nothing to do with the history of our Adam, it is the finest example of its kind known to me and is still in use, and here is also a good point at which to get a lasting impression of the Swatara - a noble and historic stream.

In the Recorders Office, in Lancaster, may be found two fat volumes which are marked X and Y. These contain copies of wills which were originally written in German and when offered for probate were placed on file with the note that since they were written in German they could not be recorded. Many years later those which were still on file were translated and then recorded in these two volumes. Now: In "Book Y, vol. 2", p. 288, we find the will of "Adam Hamaker", dated 1784, and we read as follows:

THE WILL OF ADAM HAMACHER, SENIOR

In the name of God Amen the 29th August 1783. I Adam Hamacher of Derry Township Lancaster County being sick in Body but of sound understanding And as it is appointed for all Men once to die, I recommend my Soul into the Hands of my faithful Creator, and my body to the Earth to be buried in a Christian-like manner And touching such temporal Estate where with God hath blessed me, I order in the following Manner.

First it is my last Will and Testament, that my wife Ann Anna shall have Two Hundred Pounds in good Money, when the Place is sold then she shall have the aforesaid Sum in yearly Payments of Twenty-five Pounds until it is paid. And she shall have the Bed, and as much Household Furniture as she has

occasion for, and her Saddle, and a Horse Creature and a Cow, to be kept fed and pastured for her like their own Creatures and she shall have a right to live in the House, but if she cannot live with them, they shall provide another Place of Habitation for her, and she shall have as much room in the Cellar as she has occasion for, and the half of the Garden, and as many apples as she may use, and they shall give unto her 60 Pounds of fat Pork, 40 Pounds of Beef, 14 Bushels of Wheat, and 6 Bushels of Rye, and sow one quarter of an acre with Flax-seed for her where they sow their own, and deliver her six Pounds of Wool, all which she shall have every year and also have Firewood brought home and made small, and she shall have 50 Pounds in Money, which she shall have as long as she remains a Widow and no longer, the said sum shall be paid as follows, 5 Pounds yearly till the whole is paid, that she shall have and no more than is mentioned above, the sum to be paid out of the whole Estate, and she shall have a Chest which she may choose.

And my sons Adam and Christian shall have the Plantation where on they dwell, and shall pay every year 60 Pounds in Good Money and that for the space of three years, after which Time the Plantations shall be appraised by disinterested Men if they can keep them, but if they should not be able to manage them, then the Executors shall have a Right to sell, and to divide among the Heirs and whatever they shall have paid in part for the Plantations within the three years shall be refunded to them. When the Plantation is appraised the first Payment shall be Two Hundred Pounds and 50 Pounds every year in good Money till it is paid.

And my Sons Philip and Samuel shall have the Plantation as is above mentioned, and shall pay 60 Pounds good Money every year for the space of three years, after which the Plantation shall be appraised by Men, and if they cannot manage it, then the Executors shall have a Right to sell and divide it among the Heirs, and whatever they shall have paid within the three years shall be repaid to them when the Plantations are sold. When the Plantation is appraised the first Payment shall be Two Hundred Pounds and the Rest in yearly Payments of 50 Pounds good Money.

And my son John shall have 5 Pounds in Money aforehand, and no more than any of the others.

And I do appoint my sons John Hammacher and Adam Hammacher to be Executors of this my last Will and Testament, and Martin Brandt Guardian.

(Signed) Adam Hamaker (seal)

Witnesses were George Minich and Henry Etter

John Hammacher and Adam Hammacher the Exrs. affirmed the 16th day of Jan'y 1784 Cor. me. (Signed) James Jacks, Regr.

To James Jacks, Esquire Register for the Probate of Wills and granting Letters of Administration in and for the County of Lancaster.

I David Hamacher one of the Sons of Adam Hamacher late of Derry Township in the County aforesaid do hereby enter a Caveat against the Proving of a Certain Writing said to be the last Will and Testament of the said Adam Hamacher dec'd and also against granting Letters of Administration on the said Estate until I am heard there on Witness my hand and seal this 7th November 1783.

Test: (Signed) David Hamacher (seal)
P. Hoofnagel

I David Hamacher one of the sons of Adam Hamacher late of Derry Township Lancaster County deceased the within Caveator, do upon mature Consideration withdraw the said Caveat being convinced I had no Just reason for the same and allow the writing purtporting to be the last Will and Testament of the said Adam Hamacher deceased to be proved according to Law Witness my hand and seal this 16th day of January 1784.

Wit: Philip Gloninger (Signed) David Hamacher (seal)

INDENTURE OF '93

In the County Court House at Harrisburg there is on record a document which is of very special interest to us and we shall frequently refer to it as the Indenture of '93. It is too long to be reproduced verbatim, chiefly because of the endless repetition of technical legal phrases which have no significance to us. Therefore, after repeating the introductory lines we shall restate, briefly in the language of the layman, each item in order as presented.

HEIRS OF ADAM HAMAKER Decd.

to

ADAM HAMAKER

This Indenture made the
Eighteenth day of February
in the year of our Lord One
Thousand Seven Hundred and

Ninety Three Between Henry Hamaker of Mifflin County in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania yeoman and Mary his wife Abraham Hamaker of Dauphin County Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

aforesaid yeoman Peter Hamaker of Lancaster County in the Commonwealth aforesaid yeoman Isaac Hammaker of Dauphin County in the Commonwealth aforesaid yeoman David Hamaker of - - County in the State of Virginia yeoman and Ann his wife Francis Groff of Lancaster County in the Commonwealth aforesaid yeoman and Eve his wife Anthony Shoemaker of Lancaster County in the Commonwealth aforesaid yeoman and Elizabeth his wife Adam Lombard of - - - County in the State of Virginia yeoman and Salama his wife John Etter of Lancaster County in the Commonwealth aforesaid yeoman and Ann his wife and Samuel Hammaker of Franklin County in the Commonwealth aforesaid yeoman and Ann his wife (They the said Henry Hamaker Abraham Hamaker Peter Hammaker Isaac Hammaker David Hammaker Eve the wife of the said Frances Groff Elizabeth the wife of the said Anthony Shoemaker Salama the wife of the said Adam Lombard Ann the wife of the said John Etter Christian Hammaker and Samuel Hammaker being the children of Adam Hammacker late of the County of (then Lancaster but now) Dauphin aforesaid yeoman Deceased) of the one part and Adam Hammaker of the County of Dauphin in the Commonwealth aforesaid Esquire (Eldest son of the said Adam Hammaker Deceased) of the other part WHEREAS the late Proprietaries of the then Province of Pennsylvania by their Patent bearing date the Twenty First day of May in the year of our Lord One Thousand Seven Hundred and Sixty Two Recorded in the office for the Recording of Deeds for the City and County of Philadelphia in Patent Book AA Vol. 3 page 313 etc. did give and assign forever a certain tract or piece of land situated in Derry Township in the (then Lancaster but now) Dauphin County aforesaid in the said patent bounded and described as follows to-wit - - - - - containing two hundred and ninety five Acres and the usual allowance of six per cent for roads and Highways and WHEREAS the said Proprietaries in and by their certain other patent bearing date the Twentieth day of August in the year of our Lord One Thousand Seven Hundred and Sixty Six Recorded in the office for Recording of Deeds for the City and County of Philadelphia in Com: Book A Vol 3 Page 197 etc. did give grant and confirm unto the said Adam Hammaker his heirs and assigns forever a certain other tract or piece of Land situate in Derry Township in County of Dauphin aforesaid bounded and described in the said Patent as follows to-wit - - - - - containing One Hundred and Nineteen Acres and a half and allowance of six acres pec. for roads &c And WHEREAS the said Adam Hammaker in and by his last will and Testament bearing date on the Twenty ninth day of August in the year of our Lord One Thousand Seven Hundred and Eighty three duly proved and remaining in the Registers

Office at Lancaster did give and devise the two tracts or pieces of Land above described unto his two sons Adam Hammaker and Christian Hammaker, subject to the Payment of the Valuation or Appraisement Money which was thereof made and ordered to be paid to the other children according to the directions contained in the will and last will and testament aforesaid as in and by the said will and testament will more fully and at large appear relation thereto being had and Whereas the said Proprietaries in and by their certain other Patent bearing date on the Twenty fourth day of August in the year of our Lord One Thousand Seven Hundred and Sixty Four Recorded in the Office for Recording of Deeds for the City and County of Philadelphia in Patent Book AA Vol. 4 Page 520R did give grant and Confirm unto John Brindle his heirs and assigns forever a certain tract or piece of land situated in Derry Township in the County of Dauphin aforesaid in the said Patent bounded and described as follows to-wit - - - - containing One Hundred and Seventy Four Acres - - - - and Whereas the said John Brindle and Catherine his wife - - - - (sold to Adam Hammaker Oct. 21, 1773) And Whereas Joseph Shearer in and by his indenture bearing the date of the seventh of October in the year of our Lord One Thousand Seven Hundred and Seventy Six (Sold to Adam Hammaker - - - - a certain bank of land on Swatara Creek in Paxton Township for the use of joining a mill-dam thereto Beginning - - - -) And Whereas the said Adam Hammaker in and by his last will and testament aforesaid did give and devise the above described tract or piece of 174 Acres unto his sons Philip Hammaker and Samuel Hammaker subject to the payment of the valuation thereof to the other children as aforesaid and whereas the said Adam Hammaker being also in his life time and at the time of his death by virtue and in pursurance of some good and lawful grants warrants location or conveyances to him made seized and possessed of two certain other tracts or pieces of warranted or located Land one of them situated in West Hanover Township - - - - on Swatara Creek containing about Nineteen and one half Acres the other on Mahontongo Creek part in upper Paxton Township and part in Northumberland County - - - - containing about Three hundred Acres of which said two tracts of warranted or located land the said Adam Hammaker made no disposition either by will or otherwise and died intestate thereof therefore the same descended to his children as heirs and Whereas the said Christian Hammaker and Samuel Hammaker having agreed to sell and convey to said Adam Hammaker Esquire (party thereto) his heirs and assigns as well as all their certain and respective moieties or shares and estates in the above described tracts of land divided unto them severally in and by the last will and test-

ament of the said Adam Hammaker deceased as also their several and respective shares parts and estates of and in all the other lands and real estate of the said deceased And all the other children and parties above named have likewise agreed to sell and convey their several and respective shares parts and estates of and in all the above mentioned lands and real estate of the said deceased unto the said Adam Hammaker Esquire his heirs and assigns forever NOW this Indensure witnesseth that the said Henry etc. etc. for and in consideration of the sum of L1169 6/5 lawful money of Pennslyvania to them in hand paid (sell all their rights in above properties)

NOTES ON THE WILL AND INDENTURE

In his will Adam does not list his heirs. He says they are all to have equal shares. John is to have an extra pound, possibly because as an executor he will be put to considerable expense owing to his living at a distance. The others who are named are occupying some part of his estate and he gives them the privilege of holding the property by payment of a stated sum to the estate.

In the indenture of 1793 most of the heirs are named but it is not intended as a list of the heirs. It is merely a contract by which some of the heirs agree to sell their interest in their father's estate to Adam Esq. John and Philip are not selling hence, they are not named.

THE SONS AND DAUGHTERS OF ADAM AND EVE-ANN

Adam X Mary Shoemaker	Dauphin Co.
John X Maria Bollinger	Lancaster Co.
Ann X John Etter	Lancaster Co.
Maria Salome X Adam Lombard (Lambert)	Virginia
Eve X Francis Groff	Lancaster Co.
Elizabeth X Anthony Shoemaker	Lancaster Co.
Henry X Mary Tschudy	Mifflin Co. ?
Abraham	Dauphin Co.
Peter (Peter Jr. ?) X Elizabeth Shaefer	Lanc. Co. Berlin, Ont.
Isaac X ?	Dauphin Co.
David X Ann Herr	Lanc. Co. Pa. - Va.
Christian X Ann Ginder	Cumb. Co. Va.
Samuel X Ann Overdear	Franklin Co. Pa.
Philip X Molly	Dauphin Co.

In the court records at Harrisburg there are several brief references to minnor children of Adam Hamaker. The names given are those of Daniel and Susanna and the record refers to the appointment of guardians. No where else have we found any reference to either one of these two or to any others not named in the above list.

ADAM AND MARY

It has been one of the oldest and most persistent traditions of the human race that the first born son should become the head of the family or clan. Some of our Dutch ancestors showed some signs of this though most generally the children were all treated alike. Possibly the practice, not uncommon, of naming the first son after his father is a relic of this tradition. Possibly also tradition was involved in the evident fact that Adam I kept Adam II with him while the other sons wandered away, near or far, in pursuit of their fortunes.

In any case, consciously or unconsciously, Adam II did take the place of his father and that, very effectively. The very fact that he remained on the old home place for another 36 years after his father's death made that place headquarters for all the family. But Adam was by nature not only a leader but also always a ready helper in time of need. We have abundant evidence of this in the records but there is something better that we can read between the lines.

When he was appointed Justice of the Peace, it was not because he was a leader of a clan, but because his neighbors held him in high esteem, whether they were Dutch or English speaking. He represented the community without regard to race or origin. The Dutch were undeniably inclined to be clannish without, however, having any unsocial intent. It was simply easier to consort with ones kind. But we may chalk it up as one of the virtues of the Hamakers, as a common trait, that they took up with the American Ideal of democracy more readily than many others of the Dutch.

Some of the evidence of this lies in the fact that they more quickly acquired a ready use of the English language. They also changed the pronounciation and spelling of the name to conform with the principles of the language which happened to be the language of their adopted country.

In doing so they were not becoming Englishman, they were fitting themselves into the American type of society. Now if Adam II had been the only one of the family to whom these remarks apply there would be no case of a general application. But he was not the only one. In fact the number is all out of proportion to the number represented by the family.

If the Hamakers have produced no national heroes they have, at least, stood well as representative of the people. It was not the heroes who made America but "We the People". When Adam Sr. made his will he named his sons Adam and John as Executors. This most probably indicates that they were the oldest sons, and certainly that he had confidence in their ability and integrity. As to the latter we have further evidence that they were highly respected by their neighbors in that they were both appointed Justice of the Peace by the Governor of the State. It was customary in those days to distinguish a Justice of the Peace by the title Esquire, Esq. or more familiarly, Squire, and it will be convenient here to distinguish Adam II in that way.

Adam Esq. lived on the farm which his father obtained by patent of the H. P. (Honorable Proprietaries - The Penns) in 1766. The farmstead can be easily located. It is today the first on the left after one passes under the railway in going eastward from Hummesltown. The farm building lies back two or three hundred yards from the highway. The farm is now in possession of the Hershey Corporation.

The evidence that this is the ancestral farm is to be found on a tablet let into the gable wall of the barn. It bears the inscription:

BUILT BY
ADAM AND MOLLY
HAMAKER
1820

This was Adam III and his wife Molly Snaveley, and the deed executed in 1810, by which Adam Esq., his father, conveyed this land to him, states, that it is land received by patent in 1766, by Adam, the father of Adam Esq.

Adam, the Squire that was to be, married Mary Shoemaker, the daughter of Philip Shoemaker. She is consistently distinguished from her daughter-in-law, Molly, by the name Mary.

Adam was commissioned Justice of the Peace for the townships of Derry and Swatara in 1791. He died in 1820 leaving two sons and three daughters. His wife Mary, survived him.

Adam has the most definite war record of any of the family. He was present at the battle of Fort Washington where he lost his weapon and other equipment for which he was reimbursed in the sum of L3. 7. 6.

In his will Adam Esq. names two sons, Abraham and Adam, and three daughters, Elizabeth wife of John Douglass, Eve the wife of Henry Grove and Mary, wife of John Werdman. Mary had two sons. To each of the daughters Adam leaves L1000. To

his son Abraham he gives the use of his home farm during the life of Abraham. Ultimately in 1837, this right was levied on and sold for debts.

Adam III, as shown above, had been provided with a farm by the deed of 1810. His wife was Molly (Magdalena) Snaveley, They had a son, Adam IV, who died at the age of 16. As a result of his untimely death the old home place was taken over by a son-in-law, Adam Hocker, who had married a daughter, Eve. Another daughter, Molly married Ulrich Strickler. At least some of the Strickler descendants are still in the vicinity.

ADAM HAMAKER X MARY SHOEMAKER

Adam X Mollie Snaveley	Dauphin Co.
Eve X Adam Hocker	Dauphin Co.
Molly X Ulrich Strickler	Dauphin Co.
Elizabeth X Christian Landis	Dauphin Co.
Philip X Mary Horner	Wayne Co. O.
Adam No issue	
Abraham X Elizabeth Shoemaker	Dauphin Co.
Jacob X Maria Baum	O. - Ill.
Abraham X Elizabeth Longenecker	Lawrence Co. Ill.
John X Mary Ann Shearer	Olney, Ill.
Adam X Susan Printz	O. - Ill.
Elizabeth X John Douglass	Derry
Eve X John Grove (Groff)	Fulton, Mo.
12 children	
Mary X John Werdman	
2 sons	

JOHN AND MARIA

Presumably, when Adam moved to Hanover Township in 1752 he took his son John with him, as the boy, at that time, was only twelve years old. But in 1762 when Adam moved down to Derry Township, he left John in charge of the Hanover mill, for now the boy was a man of 22 and a capable miller. For this we have no direct statement but we have something better. We know that throughout his life John was primarily a miller and, as such, so successful that at the time of his death, more than 40 years later, he owned three mills and one of these was the Hanover Mill. By his will John bequeathed this mill to his own son John, John II.

In 1771 John bought a tract of 188A from Matthew Laird who had received his patent from the Penns. This place lies about a mile south of Hummelstown and is known today as Stoverdale as on it is located the well known campmeeting ground of that name. The name is derived from that of the Stover family which has long owned the land and still does today.

The farm is in a much elongated form and extends from the Swatara eastward up the long slope of the hill. There is a small creek on this land which may at one time have turned a mill but no trace of such a mill remains.

The north-south highway crosses the farm and passes so close to the house that there is no front yard. No definite hold over from the Hamaker days can be recognized unless it is a small building in the back yard. This is constructed of a crumbly sandstone and shows abundant evidence of great age. We are free to imagine it as having been built by our John.

If John did have a mill at the Stoverdale place, he was so near the mill at Fiddler's Elbow as to be in competition with his own brothers. However that may be, he was not content to rest there to the end of his days although as a farm, Stoverdale was vastly better than the rugged hills of Hanover. In any case he made one more move, this time back to the general vicinity of the area where his father had worked 40 years before. In 1781 he sold Stoverdale and bought the farm and mill site in Hempfield Township, on the Chickies (Chiquesalunga) creek where he remained the rest of his days.

When, at a later date, this township was divided, this part became West Hempfield, but in any case the name Hempfield becomes important to us because it serves to distinguish our John from others of the same name who were then living in this part of Lancaster County. There was a John of Columbia who was also a miller and there were other John Hamakers living not far away.

John of Hempfield -our John- came to be widely known. He and his mills are referred to in "County Histories", and the Governor of the State appointed him to the office of Justice of the Peace. Hence, he might also be referred to as John Hamaker J. P. or John Hamaker Esq. (Esquire). Familiarly, that would become Squire Hamaker.

So now we shall proceed with the history of John of Hempfield:

First of all let us try to imagine ourselves in the position of a man who was a miller and had a family of five sons. The mill seldom required the attendance of more than one man. Furthermore, it was the bound duty of a father to bring up his sons in competent command of some trade or occupation by which he

could make an honest living and this, usually the occupation of the father himself. How could such a situation be met without sending the boys away from home? Here was a dilemma. Its solution was not difficult and history clearly indicates the method of solution.

Almost invariably those country mills, if not located on a farm which was in itself a complete economic unity, had a parcel of ground attached which provided the miller with a garden adequate for the needs of his family and also pasturage for at least one cow and one horse. These were the minimum needs of any family. But John had a family of five small boys, at the time we now have in mind, and he was faced with the question of how best to provide for them during the period of adolescence and preparation for a useful life. He could use one after another in the mill and thus train them in a very desirable form of occupation. But even during busy seasons only one or two hands were required at one time and then also, there were slack seasons when even one man was not kept busy. Sometimes the grinding was only intermittent and might even come to a standstill for a day or two.

Such a situation was not a rare one, it was a normal routine in the milling business, and one which any alert miller was prepared to meet. Hence we need not be in doubt of the wisdom which John showed when he bought not only a good mill site but also one of the finest farms in a region which is and was then, notable for fine farms. The outcome of this move becomes apparent twenty years later when John writes his will and leaves the mill in Hanover to one of those sons, another son is provided with a mill in Helm Township, York County, two sons get the Chickies mill with fifty acres of land and the youngest son falls heir to a fine farm.

This farm and mill property is located about half a mile southwest of the present village of Salunga. From the Harrisburg pike, in the village, a road leads off in a southwesterly direction and from this road another branches off to the right. If we follow this road we will have the Hamaker farm on the left with the homestead in view across the fields. Before we cross the creek we will also have the mill property on the right. This consisted, at the time when John made his will, of fifty acres of land, with the mill and of course, at least one residence. There are now two residences in addition to the old mill which was long ago converted into a residence.

If now, we were to follow the road across the creek we would be passing out of West Hempfield Township into Rapho Township, since the creek forms the boundary between the two. This is important to keep in mind since it resolves the apparent contradiction which arises when we find Johns name in a list of tax

payers of Rapho Township and yet distinguish him as John of Hempfield. The point is that when a miller builds a dam across a stream he must own the land at both ends of the dam. And that, at this period, was about the extent of John's interest in the Rapho tax list.

There was a similar situation when Adam bought "a bank of land" at Fiddlers Elbow.

Some items of special interest in the life of John are on record.

During the war of the Revolution, John Hamaker was enrolled in the Militia or Associators as follows:

In 1777 John Hamaker is listed as one of the Non-Associators, which probably drew him a fine though we have no record of such. But again in 1777 he is recorded as a member of 7th Co., 6th Battalion, Lancaster Co. Militia, under Captain William Laird.

In 1781 and again in 1782 he is enrolled in 5th Co., 4th Battalion, Lancaster Co. Militia under Col. Ziegler. This transfer is coincident with the move from Swatara to the Chickies district.

In 1784 John Hamaker, together with other citizens of that vicinity, signs a petition for the betterment of the facilities at a market house in Philadelphia.

In 1795 John Hammacker received a Commission as Justice of the Peace for the Townships of Hempfield, Manheim and Lancaster. This Commission was issued by Governor Thomas Mifflin.

Since there were two or more John Hamakers in this locality at the time we have in mind any record or historical note involving the name was apt to be confusing.

For example: There was a mill on the Shawanese Run, near Columbia which belonged to John Hamaker. In 1797 during the yellow fever epidemic in Philadelphia, the John Hamaker's mill at Mount Joy contributed seven barrels of flour to the relief of the victims. At the same time the John Hamaker mill in Drumore Township contributed \$46.13. In 1770 there was a John Hamaker who was Justice of the Peace in this area and that was before our John had arrived on the scene. For the same reason our John had nothing to do with the two John Hamaker mills lower down on the Chickies which were there before his time.

It is probable that some or all of these references point to John H (ubrecht) Hamaker or his son John C (aspar) or John C's son John (?). The last was born in 1764.

In the same way there is sometimes confusion about members of the next generation when there were two bearing the same name but were of different kinship. Two examples which fall under our survey may be mentioned.

There were two Josephs living not far apart during the early 1800's, one lived near Elizabethtown, the other in the southern part of Rapho township. The latter was the son of our John. Also, there was a Christian in Donegal and Mount Joy while there was also a Christian in Hellam. The latter has already been referred to as one of the sons of John of Hempfield.

John Hamaker
Born 1740, Died Oct. 22, 1804

X

Maria Bollinger
Born 1743, Died Oct. 4, 1821

THE WILL OF JOHN HAMAKER

In the Name of God Amen, I John Hamaker of Hempfield Township in the County of Lancaster and State of Pennsylvania Yeoman, being at present sick and weak of Body but of sound and well disposing Mind Memory and Understanding thanks be to God and knowing the certainty of Death and the Uncertainty of the time thereof, Do therefore hereby make this my last Will and Testament, Principally, I recommend my immortal Soul into the hands of God who gave it me and my Body to the Earth to be Buried in a Christian and decent like Maner at the Discretion of my Executors hereinafter named nothing Doubting of a Joyfull Resurrection through the Merits and Mediations of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ and an happy admition into the Regions of Immortal Bliss and as Touching such Wourldly Estate as it hath Pleased God in his Mercy to bestow me with in this Life I give Devise and bequeath the same in manner and form following to wit - - - Imprimes it is my Will and I do order and direct that all my just Debts and Funeral Expences shall be paid off and Discharged out of my Real and Personal Estate by my Executors hereinafter named

ITEM I give and bequeath unto my Loving Wife Mary the Choice of One of my Cows and as much of my Household and Kitchen Furniture as she shall Please to take at the appraisment, and also a privelege to Dwell in my present Dwelling House on the use of part of the Cellar and Kitchen, and as much of the Garden as she choses to occupy to gather with Pasture in the Summer and Hay and Straw in the Winter and Sufficent Stable Room for her Cows Item as much apples and Fruit off the old Mantion place as she shall Chose an Sufficent Firewood to be delivered to the House Summer and Winter. Item it is my Will that the occupier of the Old Mantion ("Place") shall give my said Wife Mary a Horse to ride any time Required by Her. Item I give and bequeath my Wife Mary the Sum of Thirty Pounds to be paid to her Yearly and every year during her Natural Life or as long as she shall remain to be my Widow by my Executors hereinafter named the

first payment to be made in Twenty Days after my Decease and so yearly and every year as long as she shall remain my Widow. Item it is my Will and I do hereby order and direct that the several Legacies and bequests herein give and bequeathed unto my said Wife Mary shall be Deemed and taken in Lieu and full Sattisfaction of her Dower or thirds of all my Estate both Real and Personal not otherwise.

Item I give devise and bequeath unto my two Sons Abraham Hamaker and Joseph Hamaker Fifty Acres more or less Situate in Hempfield Township and Rapho adjoining Lands of Arthur Patterson John Hays Henry Muser and Surveyed of the old Tract by Samuel Ensminger as by his Draught may appear together with the Dwelling House, Barn Grist Mill and Saw Mill thereon Erected and the appurtenances to hold to them my said Sons Abraham Hamacker and Joseph Hamaker their Heirs and Assigns forever, they paying for the whole of the Said discribed Piec of Land Grist Mill Saw Mill and appurtenances the full Sum of Twenty two hundred and Ten Pounds Cash in Coin of Gold or Silver to be paid by them their Heirs or Assigns.

Item I give devise and bequeath unto my Son John Hamaker all my Land Situate lieing and being in East Hanover Township Dauphin County Together with the Dwelling House Barn Grist Mill and Saw Mill and Appurtenances thereto belonging to hold to his Heirs and Assigns for ever, he his Heirs or Assigns paying for the whole of the said described Piece of Land Grist Mill Saw Mill and Appurtenances the just and full Sum of Eight hundred Pounds Cash in Coin of Gold or Silver affores.

Item I give devise and bequeath unto my Son Christian Hamaker my Land Situate in Helm Township York County Containing about Ten Acres together with the Dwelling House, Barn Grist Mill, Saw Mill and Appurtenances, to hold to him his Heirs and Assigns for ever; Item I give devise and bequeath unto my said Son Christian One other Piece of Land Situate Lieing and being in Helm Township affores. Containing Twenty Seven Acres more or less adjoining Lands of Isaac Flory and others, to hold to him his Heirs and Assigns for he his Heirs or Assigns paying for the whole of the two above described Pieces of Land Grist Mill Saw Mill and appurtenances the just and full Sum of Eleven hundred Pounds Cash in Coin of Gold or Silver Afores.

Item I give devise and bequeath unto my Son Daniel Hamaker my Plantation whereon I now live Containing One hundred Acres more or less together with the Dwelling House Barn and other Buildings thereon Erected with the Appurtenances to hold to him his Heirs and assigns for ever he his Heirs or Assigns paying for the whole of the above described Plantation whereon I now live

the just and full Sum of Sixteen Pounds per Acre for each and every Acre thereof Cash in Coin of Gold or Silver afores ?

Item as to the residue and remainder of my Estate either Real or Personal not herein before given and bequeathed (including the Sums Charged on the several Tracts of Land herein before given unto my Five Sons Abraham, John, Christian, Daniel and Joseph together with the neat proceeds arising from the Sale of my Personal Estate I give devise and bequeath unto my Six Children to wit Elizabeth the Wife of Joseph Evans Abraham Hamaker, John Hamaker, Christian Hamaker Daniel Hamaker and Joseph Hamaker to be equally divided between them Share and Share alike; Item it is my Will and I do order and direct that my Daughter Elizabeth the Wife of Joseph Evans shall be allowed Interest for her Share of my Estate from the day of my decease until she receives her Dower in full.

And Lastly I do hereby nominate and appoint my dearly beloved Son Abraham Hamaker and my beloved Son-in-law Joseph Evens both of Hampfield Township afores and the Survivors of them, Executors and Executor of this my last Will and Testament giving and granting unto my said Executors or the Survivors of them full Power and Authority to make Sign Seal Execute and deliver to my said Sons Abraham, John, Christian, Daniel and Joseph such Lawfull and Sufficient Deed and Deeds Conveyances and Assurances for the said several Tracts of Land herein beforementioned respectively their respective Heirs and assigns in as full and ample manner as I could have done had I sold and Conveyed the same unto them respectively. They an each of them paying or Secureing th be paid the respective Sums of Money which they are or May be Charged with Respectively, and I do hereby revoke and make Null and Void all former and other Wills by me heretofore made declaring this and no other to be my last Will and Testament. In Witness whereof I have hereon-to Set my Hand and Seal the Twentieth Day of October in the Year of our Lord One thousand Eight hundred and four

Signed, Sealed Published

Pronounced and
Declared by the Testator
as and for his last Will and
Testament in the Presence
of us the Subscribers
Christian Newcomer
Henry Musser

His
John X Hamaker
mark

AN INVENTORY of all and singular the Goods and Chattles of John Hamaker late of Hempf. Township Lancaster County deceas.^d taken and apprais^d by us the Subscribers the 10th day of November 1804. to wit.

The Deceasts Wearing Apparel	L	22.	3.	6.
To his Riding Horse Saddle and Bridle		18.	15.	0.
To a Dun Horse		35.	0.	0.
To a Bay Mare		22.	10.	0.
To a Bay Mare		5.	0.	0.
To a Dun Horse		22.	10.	0.
To a Spoted Cow		4.	10.	0.
To a Brindle Cow		4.	12.	0.
To a Brindle Cow		4.	0.	0.
To a Brown Heifer		6.	0.	0.
To a Brown Ditto		5.	0.	0.
To a White do		5.	0.	0.
To 2 " do		6.	0.	0.
To 3 Calves		6.	15.	0.
To a Bull Stag		9.	0.	0.
To a Sow and 3 Pigs		2.	12.	6.
To 3 Hogs		6.	3.	9.
To 5 do		5.	0.	0.
To a Waggon		18.	15.	0.
To an old Waggon		3.	15.	0.
To a p. ^r of Hay Ladders		1.	17.	6.
To 6500 feet of Pine Boards a ^t 8/0 p. ^r Cent		26.	0.	0.
To 5500 feet do. do. a ^t 7/0 p. ^r Cent		19.	5.	0.
To a Wind Mill		2.	10.	0.
To 3 Ploughs		3.	7.	6.
To 3 Harrows		3.	0.	0.
	L	269	1.	9
To Hay first Crop in the Barn	L	27.	0.	0.
To Second Crop in the Barn		6.	0.	0.
To a Stack of Second Crop Hay		17.	10.	0.
To 100 Bushels of Rie more less a ^t 6/6 p. ^r Bus.		32.	10.	0.
To 20 Bush. of Wheat more or less a ^t 11/3 p. ^r Bus.		11.	5.	0.
To 30 Bush. of Oats more or less a ^t 2/6 p. ^r Bu.		3.	15.	0.
To 400 do. of Corn more or less a ^t 4 p. ^r Bus.		80.	0.	0.
To a Cutting Box		0.	12.	0.
To 10 Cow Chains		0.	15.	0.
To 4 Hopples		0.	10.	0.
To 2 Dung forks and Hook		0.	5.	0.

To 3 Iron and 2 Shakeing forks	L	0.	12.	0.
To a Hank Screw and Broad Ax		0.	7.	6.
To a pair of Horse Geers		1.	2.	6.
To 1 do do.		1.	10.	0.
To 1 do do. with Brickbands		1.	17.	6.
To 1 do do. with do		1.	17.	6.
To 1 do do.		0.	7.	6.
To Sundry Chains		1.	2.	6.
To do. do.		0.	1.	6.
To an old Saddle		0.	1.	0.
To 5 Halter Chains		0.	18.	0.
To Raw Hemp		3.	0.	0.
To a Stove		3.	0.	0.
To 1 Ditto		6.	10.	0.
To a Clock and Case		11.	5.	0.
To a Apple Mill and Trough		1.	10.	0.
To 2 Brakes		0.	10.	0.
To 2 large Chains		1.	10.	0.
To a Scalding Trough		0.	5.	0.
To 2 Rickling		0.	7.	6.
To 2 Craidles		0.	5.	0.
	L	18.	2.	0.
To 2 Set of Malling Tools	L	1.	1.	6.
To Rakes and Sundries		0.	8.	6.
To a Gig and Pruning Chisel		0.	2.	0.
To a Grind Stone		1.	10.	0.
To a Wheel Barra		0.	15.	0.
To a Set of Black Smith Tools		14.	0.	0.
To Sundry Pieces of Bar Iron		1.	2.	6.
To 2 Crowbars a Sledge and Pick		1.	10.	0.
To Sundry Shovels Spades and Hoes		0.	15.	0.
To Sundreis of old Iron		0.	2.	0.
To Sundries of . . ditto		0.	11.	3.
To 3 Sythes and Spade		0.	7.	6.
To Sundry Wheatstones and Cump		0.	3.	9.
To Sundry Cherry Boards		1.	2.	6.
To a Copper Kettle		6.	0.	0.
To an Iron do.		0.	10.	0.
To 1/2 Barrel of Pitch		0.	7.	6.
To 1/2 do. of Tar		0.	7.	6.
To a Pickling Tub		0.	2.	0.
To a Fish do.		0.	2.	0.
To 4 Barrels		1.	10.	0.
To a Cagg and Wiskey		1.	6.	3.

To a Big Tub	L	1.	2.	6.
To a Barrel and Tub		0.	3.	9.
To a Cullender and Sundries		0.	10.	0.
To a Watering Pot and Sundries		0.	7.	6.
To a Pepper Box Greater and Sundries		0.	2.	6.
To 15 Crocks		0.	6.	0.
To Sundry Buckets		0.	2.	0.
To an Iron Pot and Gridiron		0.	3.	0.
To a Pail and Jug		0.	2.	6.
To a Kitchen Dresser		2.	10.	0.

L 39. 6. 6.

To a half Bushel Bucke and Kann	L	0.	10.	0.
To Sundry Pewter Dishes and Basons		0.	11.	3.
To Sundry Pewter Plates		0.	5.	0.
To 13 Earthen Plates		0.	3.	0.
To a Candle Stick and Mole		0.	4.	0.
To 14 Spoons		0.	3.	0.
To a Gridle		0.	5.	0.
To 5 Beads and Steads a ^t L 6/o	30.	0.	0.	
To a Crosscut and Mill Saw		2.	5.	0.
To a pair of Saddle Bags		0.	15.	0.
To Sundries of Harnes Leather		0.	7.	6.
To a Doug Trough and Churn		0.	5.	0.
To Sundries of Carpenter Tools		1.	0.	0.
To 13 old Bags a ^t /2/		1.	6.	0.
To 9 do.		3.	0.	0.
To 4 lb. of Yarn a ^t 2/6 pr. lb.		0.	10.	0.
To 15 lb. of Ditto a ^t 1/6		1.	2.	6.
To 38 lb. of do. a ^t 1/6		2.	17.	0.
To a Waggon Cloath		1.	5.	0.
To a Hackle and Cabage knife		0.	7.	6.
To Sundry Bee Baskets		0.	5.	6.
To 2 Barrels a Ridle and See:		0.	5.	0.
To a Big Wheel and Spinning do.		0.	11.	3.
To an old Table Frame		0.	3.	0.
To a Bedstead Barrel and Sundries		0.	2.	6.
To Sundry Bearskins		1.	2.	6.
To a Big Chest		0.	7.	6.
To Sundry Baskets with Lumber		0.	7.	6.
To 226 lb. Hemp a ^t 6/o		5.	13.	0.

These three pages are about half of the original Inventory.

COMMENTS ON THE WILL AND THE INVENTORY

1. The first section of the will has to do with the future welfare of Mary. There is a similar section in Adam's will but John's goes into greater detail. Indeed in this matter of itemizing possible future needs of the individual we today might think it better to use more general terms and let those concerned decide the details. But such was the practice of the times. It was not a quirk of the Hamaker family but the general custom.

Moreover we are not to think that all those terms were supposed to be carried out. They might better be regarded as a combined life insurance policy and lien on the estate. She could not lose it, it could not be taken from her.

2. The list of items selected by Mary as her own, as given in the inventory, throws a flood of light on the mode of life in the household of that day. We might take any one of them as the subject of a chapter in the life of the Dutch family. For one, take the cow-chain! An inane item recorded in the court house of Lancaster? Not at all! Those cow-chains were an institution which has never been improved upon. But that is not the point here. That particular cow-chain stood for one of the most fundamental chores in the daily round of living. Whatever else may be going on in the home the cow could not be neglected-milk, butter, cheese! A good half toward the needs of the day.

A similar consideration of the other items which Mary thought necessary for comfortable living will give us a very fair idea of life in the home of the Pennsylvania Dutch country folk.

3. But now let us take a look at life on that farm, and the many others like it, as shown to us, as in a picture, by the list of John's personal property as listed in that Inventory. We might first note that the mere length of the list of items would indicate a very complete equipment for a farm of moderate size and the probability that at that time there was still some acreage occupied by standing timber. Also to be remembered is the fact that John had been occupying this farm for less than 25 years and that therefore there would not be a large accumulation of outworn equipment. The list begins with 22 pounds for wearing apparel, which, considering that it was second hand seems adequate to give Squire Hamaker the necessary dignity in appearance. But looked at from our viewpoint in time, it is somewhat difficult to judge. Next comes, appropriately, the necessary riding horse, saddle and bridle, but no car! In fact, here we come at once to the one great difference between life in 1800 and in 1950. The absence of machinery of all sorts is the all important difference between that farm and its counterpart of today. There was a "windmill" so called, a

device for cleaning grain, which was probably an adaptation of a new invention, recently introduced in the flour mills, but this one operated by hand.

The list includes eight sickles, three scythes and two cradles but no harvesting or threshing machines of any kind.

The "apple mill" or cider mill was an important item because of the extensive use made of cider in household economy--both as a component in many table delicacies and as a preservative. Hence, the mention of two vinegar troughs as well as vats, tubs or troughs for other pickling processes for preserving foods.

This farm and this farmer are not to be judged in the light of modern standards. John began like the traditional pioneer whose home was a one room log cabin and whose equipment was mainly his rifle and his axe. It was in the best American tradition.

Finally we may note that the man was not indulging in an orgy of buying and collecting many articles which he did not need. That he was conservative and at the same time progressive is shown by his cash balance, his credit account against his brother Adam, his bonds, notes and book accounts, and the stock of 55 barrels of flour at Newport.

MARY AND ELIZABETH AND DANIEL

We have only one more record in reference to Mary (Maria.) This is to the effect that she died in East Hempfield in October of 1821 just eighteen years after the passing of John. But that is not all that can be said about her. Her young son, Daniel, now in possession of the farm, was still unmarried and in need of her help and council and can there be any question as to whether he got it?

But very soon more momentous problems came up which Mary was naturally called on to solve and, again there can be no question that she was equal to the occasion and that it occupied her for the rest of her life.

Elizabeth was Mary's only daughter and apparently one of the oldest children in the family. She had married a man by name Joseph Evans, who must have been held in high regard by John since John named him one of the executors of his will. This couple, Elizabeth and Joseph, both died suddenly not long after the death of John. They left two small children to the mercies of the world. Need we ask who in the world saw and accepted his/her duty?

Again the records tell us that Daniel, a young unmarried man, was appointed guardian of these children. Later records

show that Daniel had accepted the honor and was carrying on in that function. But, leaving the matter of honor aside, may we assume that it was Mary who was doing the work?

In 1806 Daniel married Anna Musser, the daughter of Henry Musser, whose farm lay nearby on the east. They had four children: Anna, Daniel Jr., Mary and Barbara. We presume that these four children and the two Evans children grew up together on the Hamaker farm. But when Henry Musser died part of his farm was inherited by his daughter Anna, and Daniel took over the management of the Musser farm.

About this time Daniel Sr. moved to a new site on a farm and mill property east of Petersburg, on the Conestoga Creek. It was here that Mary died and in this vicinity the Evans children with their descendants were established for several generations.

Daniel Sr. prospered and in 1829-30 he was elected a Representative in the State Legislature.

Anna Musser Hamaker died in 1847, Daniel Sr. died in 1826. By his will he directed that Mary and Barbara should have all his property except \$1000 which was to be paid to Anna, the wife of David K. Stauffer. He also states that Daniel Jr. had had his share.

Now, this Hamaker line would be continued only through Daniel Hamaker Jr. and his wife Frances Forry.

Anna x John Rohrer

Eliza x Elias B. Bomberger

Fanny x Menno Wenger

Maria x x Elias B. Bomberger

John

Barbara x Philip Brehm

Daniel x Elizabeth Brandt

Amos

David x Frances Leopold

Many of these along with some of the decendants of Anna Hamaker and David K. Stauffer are still living in the vicinity.

Abraham Hamaker was born on the fifth of December, 1770 as recorded on his memorial in the Mount Tunnel Cemetery at Elizabethtown. His wife, Elizabeth, was born in 1783. We do not know when they were married but their first and only child, John, was born in 1804, the year of the death of his grandfather John.

In 1805 Gov. Thomas McKean, appointed Abraham as Justice of the Peace, presumably to take the place of his father and for the same district. However, as late as 1838, John, the younger, refers to his father as Abraham Hamaker, Esq. at a time when Abraham was living in Donegal, 25 years after he had moved from Hempfield. It is likely that at this time the title was purely honorary.

After the death of Joseph Evans, Abraham continued to act as the only executor of his fathers will and accordingly made his reports at intervals until 1815 when the heirs signed his release.

Apparently Abraham with his little family continued to live in West Hempfield until 1812 when they moved to Mount Joy.

Peter Heistand (later, in English, Hiestand) had been living on a farm located on the Manheim road just beyond the town limits of Mount Joy and adjoining the Little Chickies Creek. Here he had a mill and a little way out, another farm.

This Peter Heistand died in 1812 and by his will he gave the farm on which he was living to his daughter Elizabeth--the wife of Abraham Hamaker. The mill he gave to a son Peter, Jr. and the other farm to his other son, Jacob.

Abraham and Elizabeth lived on this Mount Joy farm until 1818, when they sold it to Geo. Fisher for \$14,500.00. In the terms of sale they reserved two rooms in the house for themselves until 1820. The farm was one of the finest, consisting of 146 acres of the best land, all of it arable, and the location was most desirable. It may be that Abraham wanted a mill and sold on the offer of a good price. In any event there was a lapse of four (6) years before he bought the Donegal farm where he at once proceeded to build a mill.

From the point where the Elizabethtown-Bainbridge road crosses the Conoy Creek, westward-downstream, there was a considerable tract of land which belonged to Samuel Bossler. On the lower part of this tract Bossler had a mill. The upper part, of 87 acres Bossler and his wife Barbara sold to Abraham and it was here that Abraham built another mill. These were two of the seven mills on that short stretch of the Conoy Creek, between Elizabethtown and the Susquehanna River. The farm itself was decidedly one of secondary rate.

Abraham had also made other purchases of land which were clearly a matter of investment or speculation. We have several of the original documents relating to such transactions. One is an original patent bearing the seal of the State and signed by the Governor Thomas McKean and refers to a parcel of land which was part of a tract of 164,291A in Jefferson, McKean and Warren Cos. which was transferred by the Commonwealth to a group of Dutchmen of Amsterdam. One of these documents is a deed executed in 1814, giving Abraham title to 165A of the above tract. For this he paid \$360.00. By another deed, executed in 1820 for 990A he paid \$990.00. Since these deeds were retained by the family it may be that the lands in question were never sold, that they were worthless.

Whatever the causes may have been it finally becomes clear that the fortunes of the family had reached a low ebb. In 1838

Abraham and Elizabeth signed a deed conveying the Conoy homestead to their son John, and with this we come to the end of Abraham's record, excepting the notice of his death in 1843. Elizabeth outlived Abraham by 16 years but they were laid to rest side by side.

JOHN HAMAKER SON OF ABRAHAM

Since John was the only son and heir of his father the administration of the estate was a matter of little importance. John had already taken over the farm and mill. There was no occasion for dividing personal property. So the passing of Abraham caused barely a ripple in the flow of daily life of the Hamaker family. John naturally became the head of the family and his wife the mistress. This mistress was another Elizabeth and also, again, a miller's daughter. She was the daughter of Samuel Bossler, the one who owned the other mill. She was born in 1810 as is shown by her birth certificate which is pasted in the inside of the lid of her "hope chest". Her oldest son, Abraham was born in 1830 and eventually there were eight children. All of them honored their mother by using the initial letter B as a middle letter in their names.

John has left us little by which to form an estimate of his stewardship as head of the family or as master of the homestead. Whatever he may have been doing about home he also found time to serve his community. We have his pocket note book which is dated from 1835 to 1839. It bears his name, with the title Supervisor. The area to which it applies is West Donegal. The book is primarily a list of the taxables of the township and also contains items of debits and credits relating to various citizens of the township in regard to repair of roads and bridges. He credits himself for example, with one days work \$1.00, and ten cents per mile for 36 miles, for carrying election returns to Lancaster.

The book is of interest to us primarily because it gives us many names of neighbors and kinsmen of the time. It is also notable for the excellent penmanship and that may be listed as one of the traits common to John's ancestors back to the time when Adam signed his name that momentous day in Philadelphia.

In this connection it may be recalled that quite generally in the earlier days, when the ladies were called on to sign their names they simply made a mark, although their husbands did write their names. And then again at a later date, when the husbands signed in good American style their ladies signed in German script.

John has left us not one line of record about the mill. But all his boys somehow learned the art of milling and Abraham, at the age of 22 was installed as master miller of "Conoy Mills". He kept a daybook in which he recorded every item of business and sometimes, when there was nothing doing he resorted to doodling to beguile the time. On one of these times, apparently, he wrote at the top of the page "Hamaker and Bossler Co." which may indicate that his grandfather Bossler had an interest in the mill. Otherwise every page was headed in imposing lettering, done with the quill, "Conoy Mills."

At the beginning, by the variety of the items entered we learn that the mill was equipped for all kinds of grain milling and would have been ranked, in the phraseology of the time, as a "grain and merchant mill". Also in the number of patrons and the value of their "grists" the mill was doing very well.

John himself, was one of the principal patrons and one of his orders called for 87 barrels of flour.

This day book covered the period 1852-1856 and it shows that for sometime the mill was doing all that could reasonably be expected of it. But from about the first of April 1855 there was a radical change both in the character of the work done and the value of it. All the work done was "chopping", i. e., a coarse grinding of corn on the cob for feed of horses and cattle. And the orders were all small, many of one bushel for which the charge was 10-12 1/2 cents, and few going to as much as a dollar. By actual count there were only 6 grists out of 235 that came to one dollar or more. Naturally that came to the end of the record as far as Abraham was concerned. But the mill did not yet shut down.

John died in 1863 and that brought matters to a head. Something had to be done but none of the sons would undertake the responsibility. Finally John and Jacob agreed to take over together. They tried it for two years and failed. But by chance it was during these two years that the Conoy Mills got public recognition. On a map published in 1864 this point is marked "Jn. and Jb. Hamaker's Chopping Mill".

John and Jacob tried it once more at Round Top with two more years ending in failure, and that for them was the end of milling. John moved to Middletown where he opened a store and his name is perpetuated in the name of a street, Jacob turned to carpentry and house building. Later he moved to Abilene, Kansas. Henry also was a carpenter and lived in Elizabethtown. Abraham continued milling as a journeyman in various places and finally retired to Manheim.

Christian never married but devoted himself to his mother. When the farm was sold they lived for a time nearby. Christian

worked as a carpenter when that was convenient, otherwise he did all sorts of odd jobs for the neighbors. Finally he and his mother moved to Elizabethtown where Elizabeth died in 1882. Her memorial may be found there with that of her husband and three sons.

Abraham Hamaker x Elizabeth Heistand	W. Donegal
John Hamaker x Elizabeth Bossler	W. Donegal
Abraham Hamaker x Catharine Spickler	Manheim
Samuel Hamaker x Lydia Young	
John S. Hamaker x Anna May Barnhart	Mount Joy
Mary Ellen Hamaker x Benjamin Donovan	Manheim
Abraham Lincoln Hamaker x Emma S. Arnold	Manheim
Emma Frances Hamaker x Warren D. Miller	Landisville
Franklin Hamaker x Ellen B. Stauffer	New Orleans, La.
Amos, William Seward, Catharine, No issue	
John Hamaker x Mary Brenneman	Middletown
Emlin Hamaker x Annie Rehder xx	Indiana
Elizabeth Hamaker x George Hand	Middletown
Ella Hamaker x Millard McNeal	Waynesboro
John Milton Hamaker x Nettie Boyd	
Henry Hamaker x Elizabeth Jane Thomas xx Daisy Irene Dreha	
Jacob B. Hamaker x Martha M. Gish	W. Donegal
John Irvin Hamaker x Ray L. Parker	Lynchburg, Va.
Jacob G. Hamaker x Lillian Rugh	Richmond, Va.
Henry Hamaker x Sarah Grove	Elizabethtown
Clarence Hamaker Died in infency	
Hiram F. Hamaker No issue.	
Barbara Hamaker x David Nissley xx Christian Oberholtzer No issue	
Elizabeth Hamaker x Jacob Horst	Oberlin
Minnie Horst x John Brown	
Elizabeth Horst x John Reed	
Frances Horst x Charles Strickler	Harrisburg
John, Enos, Mamie, Christian, Annie Adeline, Charles, All no issue	
Mary Hamaker x John Wormley	Lancaster
Annie Wormley x Gary Waltz	
George Wormley x	
Edwin, Oliver, Frank, No issue	
Samuel. Died in infancy	
Christian No issue	

Of John's (John I) six children only two have left us a clear trail in the records. All we know of the others may be told in a few words.

JOHN

John II, of Hanover, died in 1807, October 12. Apparently he left no will as the Court appointed as administrators, Christain Hamaker and Moses Wilson. His estate consisted of a grist and sawmill with a small tract of land. His widow's name was Margaret (Brenneman) and there were four children: Ann, John, Eliza and Joseph. All were under the age of 14. Joseph, about 10 years old was "not fully compos mentis" and John Jr. was about 18 months old.

It is further stated that Margaret very soon married Thomas Dunn.

Another record, dated 1827, regarding the estate of John Hamaker states that his wife Margaret, now deceased, left two daughters, the only heirs. These were: Elizabeth, who was married to John Brenneman of Londonderry Township, and Anny married to David Kissinger of Swatara.

CHRISTIAN

Christian, son of John, might well be called Christian of Helm since there were several Christians within a small area and it is often difficult or impossible to tell to which one a certain record may refer. This township also has been more or less disguised under several names. Sometimes it is written Hellam and later the name was changed to Spring Garden. Although he continued in the milling business his name frequently occurs in connection with real estate transactions and other matters of record.

In 1822 he was appointed Justice of the Peace for the 12th District of York Co. which included Helm Twp.

In April 1824 Christian and his wife Ann make an assignment to Abraham Heistand as Trustee.

Ann died in October of that year, her age given as 51. Her maiden name was Landis. We have no information of any children but in the Strickler graveyard, nearby, there is a grave bearing the name of Ann Hamaker with the age 30.

JOSEPH

Joseph Hamaker, son of John, made his will in 1854. At this time he was living in Rapho township on a farm. He names his wife, Artilla, and three children, as son Joseph, and two daughters, Attilla and Ann both, at that time, unmarried. The only special bequest made is that Joseph Jr. is to have a small property of five

acres adjoining the "Mansion Farm" on which he, Joseph Sr., was then living. For executor he names John C. Clair.

He locates the farm by naming the neighbors of the adjoining farms, these were John and Jacob Strickler and David Brandt.

The word mansion as used here was frequently used in those times in reference to the main house and was usually used with the word house, as mansion house. As used it implied that there was also another, or minor house. Such minor houses were designed primarily for the use of a "hired man" who had a family, or for a married son who was working the farm before the owner retired, or for the deceased owner's widow, etc. Hence, "the mansion farm" implied that it was a farm large enough to give employment to more than one man to carry on in full scale the varied operations of a fully developed farm of 100-150 acres.

On a map of Mount Joy and West Donegal townships published in 1864 there were indicated three houses belonging to Joseph Hamaker. One is located on the Harrisburg pike about half a mile north of Elizabethtown, the other two are in the village of Newville, about one and a quarter mile southwest of the first. The house on the pike is in Mount Joy township, the other two are in West Donegal. Whether this Joseph is the son of the aforementioned Joseph has not been determined.

THE MILL

Traditionally, the Hamakers were a race of millers. They showed a marked preference for the mechanic arts rather than trade or farming. And of the mechanic arts, milling took the lead and this from the beginning. A county history tells us that John H. had a mill on the outskirts of Columbia and it was also probably this John who at the time of the cholera epidemic in Philadelphia had a mill on the eastern side of the county, from which a contribution was made to the relief of the sufferers.

Adam in his will disposes of three mills which he leaves, each one, to those of his sons who were then in charge of them. At a later date John, son of Adam, also leaves three mills to his sons. This is not an intimation that the tribe made it a point of dealing in mills wholesale. What is more significant is that from this point on to the present, subsequent generations continued in the milling business as they moved out to new and more distant areas as to Missouri, Idaho and elsewhere, and so wherever they were they came to be well known to everyone in their community.

Every family required flour for the table and grist for their live stock and the place to get it was at the nearest grist or flour

mill. Also, whenever lumber was needed, and that was one of the earliest possible demands of a new community, it was to the same mill they had to go. Hence, the mill became a community center and the miller was a friend to all.

Moreover, milling of that kind was not the simplest of occupations. When and if all was in order and a boy appears at the door with a bushel of wheat slung across the bare back of his horse our Adam journeyman miller, meets him at the door, takes in the wheat, dumps it into a hopper and pulls a lever. Now, while the wheels go round and the grain is slowly trickling down upon the great revolving stone the man and the boy are making friends. Somewhere in the operation the miller takes his one-eighths "toll" and at last the boy, back on his horse, with his bag of meal, departs for home a wiser boy. His eyes had also taken a toll not limited by law. That was all just in the day's work.

But now look at this. We propose to build a mill. Immediately a number of vital questions arise. Is there need for a mill in the given location? Would there be a supporting patronage? Is the proposed location easily accessible? The best spots on the stream are always most difficult of approach.

But wholly apart from these most practical problems are the very technical ones of water supply and the building of the dam and the mill itself. Neither common sense nor any of the other faculties with which man is ordinarily endowed will be sufficient to give him best results. An authority on this subject says that up to the year 1795 no adequate combination of theoretical knowledge and practical experience had ever been made to give the best result to the many problems involved. He, therefore, proposed to publish a book on the subject and called on the public for subscriptions. The response he got was most surprising and justified his assumption that there was a pressing need for just that sort of thing. The author in question was Oliver Evans of Philadelphia and the title of the book:

The
Young
Mill-wright and Miller's
Guide

In five parts Embellished with Twenty Five Plates
Contents (in part)

- I Hydraulics and Mechanics etc.
- II Rules for applying the Theories to Practice
- III Directions for construction, using improvements, etc.
- IV The Art of manufacturing meal and flour etc.
- V Instructions for building mills etc.

The list of subscribers begins with George Washington, President of the United States. Then follows Thomas Jefferson, late Secretary of State. Edmund Randolph, Secretary of State. Eight Senators from New Hampshire to Georgia. Fifty four representatives some asking for two copies. Fifty five State Senators and Representatives of Pennsylvania.

Then follows a list of about 575 plain American citizens, many asking for more than one copy, up to 12. One subscriber in Bucks Co., Pa. asked for 144 copies and Evan Evans of Virginia needed 150 copies.

One copy of this popular book came to me from the estate of my Grandmother Hamaker whose father, Samuel Bossler, also owned a mill. Grandmother married a miller and three of her sons were millers, probably all. One of these sons stuck to milling as a journeyman throughout his active life. The other two continued for a short time with their father's mill, soon failed with that, tried another with the same result. They had had enough and would have told you that it was the mills that failed rather than the millers. For on looking back on that period, about 1870, it later became clear that the era of the country water mill had passed a crisis and was rapidly passing out. Steam power was taking the place of water power, the milling business was passing to the mills in town where they stood by the side of the railroads, burned coal for power and were much more accessible than that old mill site down in the rocky gorge by the millstream. And that old millstream! Even it was going, slowly drying up as the forested lands were all being cleared off. So that though the Evans mill book may have helped it could not save the country mill.

With the passing of the mill there came of course, a crisis in the affairs of a family whose fortunes had been so dependent on the mill. But even if they were not anticipating such a change in fortune they were not wholly unprepared to meet the situation. It had been customary to have more or less farming land connected with the mill property. This made it possible to shift work from the mill to the farm or back again as the changing seasons made more pressing demands on one or the other. Also, the farm was very elastic in regard to the amount of work it could provide for those vigorous boys.

But here again that Evans Mill Book served a useful purpose. Anyone who reads this book will find his wits well occupied and with fair ability and a reasonable term of experience he should be able to serve creditably not only as miller but also as millwright. So that with skill in the use of tools it was a simple matter to leave the forsaken mill and turn his hand to carpentry and house building. And this is just what many of them did.

Blacksmithing was also one of skills adopted by many. In any case "Back to the Farm" was always a pretty safe motto and there were always some who adopted it. So here would be an appropriate time to cite a good example. When John of Hempfield, noted above, devised three mills to certain of his sons he, himself, was living on a farm to which there was no mill attached. This he left to his youngest son Daniel who, presumably had been the farmer. Later Daniel disposed of that farm, instead bought another in East Hempfield which did have a mill property attached. It was this Daniel who in time became the most distinguished of all the tribe as he was elected Representative to the State Legislature.

THE FOUR DAUGHTERS OF ADAM AND EVE ANNA MARIA HAMAKER

Anna Maria Hamaker was born in 1743. The records of the Moravian Church of Lancaster Co. show that Adam and Eve Hamaker presented the infant Anna for baptism on the 19th of December of that year. By these same records we find that in the year 1746 a sister of Anna, Maria Eve, and in 1748 another sister Elizabeth were also baptized under Moravian auspices. In the meantime, however, there was a fourth sister, who was baptized in the first Reformed Church of Lancaster in 1745. Such apparent shifting of church affiliation would seem surprising today but when seen in the light of the times there is a very natural explanation. Churches were few and far apart, travel was difficult and most important of all was the fact that the supply of ministers was far short of the needs of the churches.

Moreover, at home in the Rhineland, it was customary to have every infant baptized, that without any reference to ones theological principles.

One thing is clear, and that is significant, that is that at this time Adam and Eve were not opposed to The Church. Later on they joined the "Brethren" which were not a church but a sect, which was opposed to The Church. Also, the Brethren were opposed to infant baptism which had as a result the total absence of any records of baptism of any of the eight children born to Adam in later years.

Anna Hamaker married John Etter who was of a family well represented in Lancaster County. They still lived there in 1793. By now Anna was 50 years old and her family would have been complete. But her children have not been distinguished from others bearing the same name.

MARIA SALOME HAMAKER

Maria Salome Hamaker was baptized on the 24th day of March 1745. She married Adam Lambert whose surname seldom occurs in the records of Lancaster County until after 1800. In 1793 the Hamaker family indenture refers to them as of Virginia. They had evidently gone with the flood of Pennsylvania Germans which moved down the Valley of Virginia during the period 1780 - 1800. They settled in the vicinity of Howell's Creek and many Lamberts are to be found there to this day.

Adam's will, recorded at Staunton, gives the following list of his children, to this we append also their marriages as recorded by the Rev. Wm. King:

Christian x Magadelena Hafner,	Dec. 26, 1785	
Abraham x Barbara Hamaker,	Dec. 26, 1795	
Mary x Philip Nevergal,	March 25, 1802	King
Adam x Elizabeth Waggy,	Oct. 18, 1803	"
Francis x Elizabeth Van Fossen,	Oct 26, 1800	King
John x Ann Cary,	March 24, 1808	"
David x Peggy Phillips,	Feb. 9, 1802	"
Sarah x Jacob Van Fossen (Fa fuss)	Apr. 3, 1806	"
Samuel,	minor.	
Peter,	minor.	
Esther x George Hisey		
Elizabeth x John Retinan		

Further references to some of these families may be found in the "Burned" Deed Book at Harrisonburg.

MARIE EVE HAMAKER

Marie Eve was baptized on November 7, 1746, she married Frantz Groff. Even in the original German this family name was spelled variously and when the English became paramount the name quite generally becomes Grove. Our Frantz, however, still held to the old form. His will is recorded in Will Book 2X which indicates that it was written in German and later recorded in translated form. The will was first signed in 1815 but later two codicils were added and the last one was dated 1819.

Frantz gives his residence as Rapho Township and gives the names of various neighbors, witnesses and executors as follows: Abraham Frantz, Frantz Groff, John Lehman, Henry Ober, Daniel Fretz, Christian Gibble. Later Henry Ober declined the honor of serving as executor and Abraham Brubaker's name was substituted.

Frantz gives the names of his children as follows: John Abraham Frantz, Christian Isaac Anna Elizabeth Marie Magdalena Barbara and Eva with only one comma, as shown, so that one is in doubt about how many there were. From the context however, it seems fairly certain that there were at least 10 but leaving still some question about the Maria Magdalena whether that was one or two.

Two of the sons-in-law were in such low esteem with Frantz that he took great care that they should never be able to lay their hands on the inheritance of their wives. These were Abraham Frantz, the husband of Elizabeth, and Daniel Hollinger, the husband of Barbara.

This will is an interesting document and might well be quoted in full but it is very long and in general way follows the same plan as those of John and Adam.

Frantz goes into great detail regarding the provisions made for the welfare of "My beloved wife Eve". Here are some of them: "She shall have as her place of residence the little room wherein I now reside and the chamber and kitchen and cellar and garret and in the washhouse and smokehouse she shall have place for her use. She shall have all the furnishings of these rooms too numerous to mention. " There was the matter of money provided in a certain way.

"Further she shall have yearly twelve bushels of wheat and five bushels of rye and five bushels of oats and three bushels of buckwheat and one hundred pounds of beef with the fat and one fat hog which shall weigh not less than one hundred and twenty-five pounds with the fat and ten pounds of hackled flax and 4 pounds of wool and three bushels of potatoes and one barrel of good cider and one barrel of water cider the above named articles are to be delivered to her. The grain is to be taken to the mill and the grist brought back to her. And she shall have every week six hen eggs. "

"Further she shall have the right to fetch apples when and where she chooses, if there are any. She shall have wood as much as she needs of one third part hickory and two third oak brought to her house cut short. Further she shall have the garden at the washhouse, which shall be every two years well dunged. "

Of course, a cow and a horse are provided together with everything necessary for their keep.

Maria Eve Hamaker x Frantz Groff

Abraham

John

Frantz

Christian
Isaac
Anna
Elizabeth x Abraham Frantz
Maria Magdalena
Barbara & David Hollinger
Eva

ELIZABETH HAMAKER

The records of the Moravian Church show that Elizabeth, the daughter of Adam and Eva Hammacher was baptized in 1748.

This Elizabeth was the youngest of the four daughters of Adam and Eve. She married Anthony Shoemaker, son of Philip and Mary Shoemaker and brother of Mary, the wife of Adam Jr., Elizabeth's brother. The indenture of 1793 refers to Elizabeth and Anthony as residents of Lancaster Co.

The U. S. Census of 1790 lists an Anthony Shoemaker in Franklin Co., Pa. and well informed Shoemaker kinsmen hold that this was the Anthony whose wife was Elizabeth Hamaker. A list of their children is given as follows:

David

Adam b. 1777, X Nancy Zonirers 1796.

Philip, twin brother of Adam.

John, Dunkard preacher.

Elizabeth X Adam Shullenberger

Mary X Christian Hensel

Catharine X Samuel Shoemaker

This Anthony of Franklin Co. died in 1804 in Lurgan Twp. Franklin Co.

By the records in Lancaster there was an Elizabeth Shoemaker who died in 1823 in Elizabeth Twp. She left no will. It is quite possible that this was another Elizabeth but it also would have been most natural if, after her husband's death, she had returned to the scenes and friends of her youth.

THE YOUNGER SONS OF ADAM AND EVE

Since we have no means of determining the relative ages of these eight sons, we shall take them up in the order in which they are named in the indenture of 1793.

HENRY HAMAKER AND MARY TSCHUDY

Although it is stated that Henry was living in Mifflin Co. in 1793, a search through the records there revealed no Hamaker names. On the other hand, on a brief visit to the eastern end of Perry Co. we found many Hamakers who have been there so long that they have lost all knowledge of how they came to be there. This puzzling situation clears up somewhat when we review the changes which have taken place in the political organization of that part of the State.

Mifflin Co. was organized in 1789 while Perry Co. did not exist until 1820; hence the Perry Co. Hamakers may have been there since before the present boundaries were established.

There has been a tendency to confuse the offspring of Henry and those of Christian who was living to the southward in Cumberland Co. But there was a rather effective barrier between them. The two counties are separated by the Blue Mountain. On the north side, the Hamakers are found mainly in the three townships of Watts, Buffalo and Rye, all fronting along the Susquehanna - Watts and Buffalo on the north side of the Juniata and Rye on the south.

We have no list of Henry's children but the history of one has been fairly well established by his descendants of today. It begins with a record in the Court House at Carlisle, for the district involved belonged at an early date to Cumberland County. Here, it is stated in effect that Jacob Hamaker of N. Buffalo, through his wife Janet Rogers, falls heir to a part of the estate of William Rogers of Rye. This was in the year 1813. They were married about 1806 and lived in this vicinity until about 1822-24 when they moved to Morgan Co., Ohio. At this time, they had five children and another was born in Ohio. Later the whole family moved to Marion Co., Iowa.

From this point, by the end of the fifth generation in America, the family had spread all over the western part of the United States in true pioneer American fashion.

The land records at Carlisle refer to two other Hamakers, David and Samuel of Rye, who buy 155 acres land. These are evidently of the same generation as Jacob and may have been sons of Henry.

1788-1855

1788-1870

JACOB HAMAKER (~~1772-1856~~) AND JANET RODGERS (~~1785-1870~~)

John Haymaker x Elizabeth Johnson Amador Co., Col. or Calif.
Martha Jane Haymaker x Daniel Newman

Sarah Ann Haymaker x Jerome Rhoades	
Elizabeth Haymaker x John C. Lyman	
John D. Haymaker x Josephine Samples	
Isaac Newton Haymaker x Alice Montgomery	
Henry Haymaker x Eleanor Harkless	Harrison Co., Mo.
Charles Hamaker x	Iowa Utah
John Hamaker x Sarah Rockefeller	Iowa
George Hamaker x Nancy Ann McDowell	Iowa Nebraska
Jacob Hamaker x Almeda Jane Maginnis	Ia, Oregon, Utah, Neb., Mo.
Martha Jane Hamaker x W. H. Taft	Iowa
Eliza Jane Hamaker x --- Vogler	Ia, Mo.
William Hamaker x Nancy Henderson	O., Ia., Mo.
George Hamaker - Killed at Gettysburg	
William Hamaker x Margaret Thomburg	Sal.
Mrs. Belle McClary	Salem, Mo.
Hamlin P. Hamaker	Mont.
Leonard N. Hamaker	Wyo.
Jasper N. Hamaker	Mo.
Alva S. Hamaker	Mo.
Mrs. Kate Hamaker Dalrymple	Mo.
Mrs. Margaret Hamaker Duncan	Mo.
Stetta Janetta Hamaker x W. A. Mendenhall	Mo.
Mary Ann Hamaker x Ransom Council	
Lucetta Council x J. W. Stephens	
John Jacob Council x Sarah Ella Devo (Sp.)	
Isaac Council and Lorin Walters	
Elizabeth Council x Jerome Rhoades	
Isabel Council x Andrew H. Stone	
David Hamaker x Rebecca Rodgers	
John Wesley Hamaker x	
Joel D. Hamaker x	
Sarah Elizabeth Hamaker x	
Joseph Oliver Hamaker x Annie M. Horton	Oregon
Seneca Clark Hamaker x	

ABRAHAM HAMAKER

Concerning Abraham, the son of Adam; Sr., we have almost no word. He was named as one of the heirs in 1793 and his residence was given as Dauphin Co. No wife is mentioned. He was enrolled in the militia in 1794 during the time of the insurrection in western Pennsylvania, but after that we have nothing more about him. He may have given his life in the service of his country, or, until we know otherwise, we may

think of him as one of the many young men who, in those times set out for the magic West and never returned. Perhaps he was forgotten because he had left no one to preserve his memory.

PETER HAMAKER

After the war of the Revolution a goodly number of Lancaster County Germans made preparation to move to Canada. When they landed at Philadelphia they had been required to swear (affirm) and sign allegiance to the crown and now they were under a moral obligation to conform. They bought 60000 A land in Waterloo Co., Ontario, and as, and when, they disposed of their holdings in Lancaster Co. they set out on the long trek to Ontario.

So, in 1805, Peter Hamaker sold his farm in Mount Joy Twp. and followed. Though not among the first, he arrived in time that his name is included among others on a memorial tablet which was set up to perpetuate the memory of the first settlers.

Peter's family grew rapidly and in the course of generations accumulated a set of traditions which, especially in regard to the earlier period, has little basis on fact or records.³ This was doubtless due to their isolation from their kin in Pennsylvania.

The following points which they make and which we may accept as substantially correct may be noted

1. There were two Peters. Father and Son. The father died about 1795.

2. The son was born in 1773, married Elizabeth Schaefer about 1796 and died in 1840.

Brumbaugh in his history of the German Baptists states that Peter united with the Brethren in 1770. And again he is listed as a member in 1791. This would have been Peter Sr.

In the 1793 list of heirs of Adam the name of Peter appears without reference to his wife. So we are led to the conclusion that at that time Peter was a widower with one son, the only child, since no others have come to light.

The man who sold the farm in Mt. Joy Twp. was Peter Jr. And the location of the farm should be made note of. It adjoined the lands of John Herr of whom we shall hear again.

Peter had 9 children and more than 40 grandchildren.

1. Rebecca Hamaker born about 1797
2. John Hamaker 1799 x Sarah Wildfong
3. Susannah Hamaker x Geo. Kleinknecht Perth Co.
4. Polly Hamaker x Benjamin Wildfong Perth Co.
5. Elizabeth Hamaker x Elias Wildfong

6. Benjamin Hamaker 1809-. x Susannah Campbell
7. Samuel Hamaker x Elizabeth Goebel
x Mary Ann Burns
8. Hannah Hamaker x Jeremiah Cole
9. Peter Hamaker 1818-, x Mary Bock

ISAAC HAMAKER

The name of Isaac Hamaker is brought to our attention for the first time as one of the heirs of Adam Sr. Nothing is said of a wife but in his will, recorded at Harrisburg in 1813, he names four children, but again without mention of his wife. Presumably in the interval of 20 years between 1793 and 1813 he had married and then lost his wife. The four children are named in order, "Leseey", the older daughter, two sons, John and Adam, another daughter, Anne.

Isaac's name does not appear on the rolls of the Associators, nor is it mentioned in Adam's will.

They were living in East Hanover Township and Isaac is stated to have been a blacksmith. He owned a considerable acreage of land. This consisted of 42A on Swatara creek, a home tract of 229A plus 9A of meadow land.

DAVID HAMAKER

The name of David Hamaker occurs on the rolls of the Associations from 1777 to 1785. At first, he served in the Company of Captain William Laird, then in that of Capt. Abraham Scott and in 1784-85, with Capt. John Bishop.

During this time, David had moved from Derry to the vicinity of Mount Joy. Possibly he was then serving a term as journeyman miller but in 1779 he was taxed for one cow and one horse and he owned 130 acres of land in Mount Joy Township.

In 1786 he bought 109A land on Powell's Creek in Paxton Township.

In 1783 David offers a caveat against the probate of the will of his father, but in January of the next year he withdrew it and confessed he had no good ground for his objections.

In 1788 David and his wife Ann sign a quit claim on the estate of his father in consideration of the sum of 117, 9 sh., 11p. paid by Adam, Jr., his brother. This receipt is signed by David Hamacker, Ann makes her mark and, as witness, Abraham Hammacher signs in copy book German script.

This Ann, David's wife, was the daughter of John Herr and grand-daughter of Abraham Herr, the pioneer. John Herr's farm lay adjacent to that of Peter Hamaker, as noted previously and David's farm was not far away. Witnesses to John's will were Philip Shomacher, the father of Anthony and Mary, and Frantz Groff - evidently quite a center of Hamaker influence.

In 1792, David bought 200 acres of land on Stony Brook in Augusta Co., Virginia, and the deed bears his name in German Script - David Hamacker. The list of heirs of the 1793 indenture refers to David Hamaker and Ann his wife as of --- Co., Virginia.

In the Augusta Co. records of 1795, we find the item on the marriage of Barbara, daughter of David Hammaker, to Abraham Lambard, presumably her cousin. David is here located in "Shenandoah".

Samuel, a son of David and Ann, was reared in the family of Frederick Croan, and married Elizabeth, one of the daughters of the Croans. The later history of Samuel and Elizabeth may be found in great detail in the published genealogy of the Croan family.

There is a tradition that there was another son, Adam, born to David but no details are available.

In 1805 David married Margaret, the widow of Daniel Stout.

Of the 200 acres which David had bought, he sold 152 in 1795 and in 1805 David and Margaret sold the other 48 acres.

DAVID HAMACHER X ANN HERR, XX MARGARET STOUT. Va. -0.

Barbara Hamacher X Abraham Lamberd	Shenandoah, Va.
see Lambert Family	
Samuel Hamacher X Elizabeth Croan	Ind.
John Hamacher X Nancy Noakes	
David Hamacher X Rebecca Boles	
Frederick Hamacher X Lucia Rawlings	
Elizabeth Hamacher X Samuel Boles	
Mary Hamacher X David Clark	
Anna Hamacher X George Shearer	
Adam Hamacher ?	

CHRISTIAN HAMAKER x ANN GINDER

When his name first appears in the annals of the family Christian is living in Dauphin Co. He is married and the name of his wife was Ann Ginder. When we next hear of him he is living just

across the Susquehanna in Cumberland Co., East Penn. Twp. But it is 27 years later and he has written his will. This was in April of 1820 but the will was not recorded until June of 1826. However, he died in January of 1826 as attested by his daughter Barbara. Ann, his wife is still living and the will first of all, provides for her a "living". Then his daughter Pevey Stephenson is similarly provided for. His sons John, Jacob and Christian get a token of 25 cents each. The daughters Nancy Reset, Susanna Hummel, Mary Shanke and Fanny Gish also each get a quarter. All the residue of the estate goes to sons Isaac and David.

Isaac Hamaker of Silver Springs Twp. Cumb. Co. dies intestate in September of 1833, leaving his widow Sarah and two children under 14 years of age. Their names Ann and Mary. Isaac's land adjoined that of John Bossler.

Fanny Hamaker had married Mathias Gish. They moved to Ohio.

Susanna, 1783-1855 x Frederick Hummel, 1782-1813 of Hummelstown.

Jacob bought 53A in Lower Paxton Twp. Dauphin Co. in 1806 at a Sheriff sale. In 1811 part of his property is sold for debts. He is listed as innkeeper of Swatara. In 1803 he had sold all his distillery equipment late the property of Chr. Saylor. In 1814 Jacob Hamaker and wife Elizabeth convey part of their property to Peter Pancake, Jr. 6A. In 1818, Jacob of Londonderry (Elizabeth his wife) is listed as a millwright. Also in this year he sells his chattels to Christian of Mount Joy.

CHRISTIAN HAMAKER X ANN GINDER Cumb. Co.

Barbara X David Stephenson

David

Christian X Elizabeth

Mount Joy

John

Jacob X Catherine

Elis Washington X Atilla

Frances

Elizabeth

Mary Ann X David Engle

Ann Barbara

John

Jacob X Elizabeth

Frances X Mathias Gish

O.

Mary X Shank

Susanna X Frederick Hummel
Nancy X Reset
Isaac X Sarah
 Mary
 Ann
David

Hummelstown

SAMUEL HAMAKER & ANN OVERDEAR

Samuel Hamaker served in the Pennsylvania State Militia in 1781, under Capt. William Laird.

By his will of 1783, Adam Hamaker leaves the mill property at Fiddler's Elbow to his sons Philip and Samuel jointly but Samuel sold his interest to Adam Jr. and by 1793 he was reported living in Franklin County, Pa.

Samuel's wife was Ann Overdear, according to the word of their great grandson Dr. Winters G. Hamaker.

In 1823 Samuel died in Washington Co. Maryland, which is just across the state line from their former home. As administrators of the estate the Court appointed Samuel's son Peter along with Christopher Flory and Benjamin Oswald.

In the same year the will of Peter Krause is recorded. In it Krause names his sons Jacob and Peter and their sister Elizabeth, the wife of Peter Hammacher.

The will of Peter Hamacher is recorded in 1840 and in it he names his sons, Ephraim, Solomon and Daniel and two daughters Mary Ann and Sophia, Descendants of these families are still living in Washington County.

Another son of Samuel and Ann was Adam. His wife was Mary LeCron, daughter of Simon Le Cron and his wife Elizabeth Flory, Adam built a mill near Cavetown, Maryland, but died at the early age of 31, leaving three small children; Simon Le Cron, Elizabeth and "A. P." (Adam Peter ?)

SAMUEL HAMAKER X ANN OVERDEAR

Peter Hamaker x Elizabeth Krause (x1817)

 Ephraim Hamaker x Susanna Shank

 Solomon Hamaker x Catherine Newcomer

 Daniel Hamaker x Isabella Colleflower

 Mary Ann Hamaker

 Sophia Hamaker

Adam Hamaker (1799 - 1831) x Mary Le Cron

Simon Le Cron Hamaker x
Elizabeth Hamaker x
Adam Peter Hamaker x Sarah McVickers
Elizabeth Hamaker x 1823 Peter Renner
Samuel Hamaker x 1824 Elizabeth Robinson
Susan Hamaker x 1825 Henry Gallagher
Maria Hamaker x 1827 John Gonder
Daniel Hamaker x 1830 Susan Bender
Stewart Hamaker (-1836) x Susan

PHILIP HAMAKER X MOLLY

The name Philip Hamaker, appears repeatedly in the rolls of the Associators of Lancaster Co., during the period of the Revolution. Otherwise, we find his name associated with that of Adam's family first time in Adam's will of 1783. By this will Philip and Samuel, jointly fall heir to the mill property at Fiddler's Elbow. At a later date Samuel sells his interest in this estate to Adam, Esq. From then on, we lose sight of Philip for a time. His name does not appear in the indenture of 1793 for the reason, of course, that he was not selling his interest in his father's estate.

In 1802, it is recorded that Philip Hamaker, late of Derry but now of Paxton, and Molly, his wife relinquish to Adam, Esq. the property left to them by Adam Sr.

At this point all trace of Philip and Molly is lost and there is no list of their children. But the census of 1791 tells that beside himself and wife there were three boys and one girl under the age of 16, residing with them. That does not say that any or all of those children were theirs, but it is a fairly safe assumption that at least some of them were.

In 1798 a certain Philip Hamaker appears in Botetourt Co., Va. and buys a lot in Fincastle, the county seat. In this year also Philip marries Elizabeth Fizer.

In 1805 another marriage record states that Peter Hamaker (Haymaker) was married to Barbara Hip.

We have no record of the parents of the two but circumstantial evidence points to Philip and Molly.

Philip and Elizabeth soon removed to Montgomery Co., Va. where many of their decendants still live today. Peter and Barbara remain in Botetourt and there also many of that family are still living.

PHILIP HAMAKER X MOLLY

Philip Hamaker x 1805 Elizabeth Fizer

Michael Hamaker x Mary Douthat

Nancy Hamaker

John Hamaker

Samuel Hamaker

Harry Hamaker

Philip Hamaker

Peter Hamaker x Barbara Hip (x1805)

Jacob Hamaker x Christine Minnick

John Hamaker x Hester Rodgers

Catherine Hamaker x William Grim Jr.

Adam Hamaker x Nancy Blunt, xx Martha Campbell

Michael Hamaker x Irene Minnich

George Hamaker x Phila Bolton