

Instead the Delawares took the lead in urging the Senecas to return their English captives. In so doing, Delawares linked their female status with the authority to 'strongly recommend' actions and to shape policy. 'We expect that Men will not refuse what we earnestly desire ...' (123). It is, of course, well-documented that among the northeastern Indians women played a more active role in the political realm than in European society. Among the Iroquois, especially, women were very influential in the treatment of captives. However, the use of the term "women" in this context serves to place the tribe in a gendered position relating to warfare—a realm where women rarely participated on the field of battle. Thus, the level of even marginal equity that Schutt suggests existed between the Iroquois and Delawares is not particularly convincing.

A very welcome Epilogue explains the current locations of descendents of the Delaware populations by summarizing the movements from the Ohio Country to Wisconsin, Canada, Texas, Oklahoma, and New York State. Less clear, however, is the nature of modern Delawares' political status in terms of tribal recognition and other issues. Of course, the later history is not the declared focus of her study and the odyssey that she describes thoroughly really ends with the American Revolution. The rest of the odyssey of the Lenape people, continuing through the present, is left for other scholars to unpack.

THOMAS J. LAPPAS  
Nazareth College of Rochester

Aaron Spencer Fogleman. *Jesus is Female: Moravians and Radical Religion in Early America*. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007. Pp. x, 330, illustrations, tables, maps, appendices, notes, bibliography, index. Cloth, \$49.95.)

Count Nicolaus Ludwig von Zinzendorf, leader of the Unitas Fratrum (Moravian Church), came to Pennsylvania in December 1741. A firm believer in the unity of all Christian churches in a shared faith, who saw no contradiction in his own dual role as Lutheran minister and Moravian bishop, Zinzendorf presided over the first of seven ecumenical synods on New Year's Day 1742. His stated aim was to form an association of autonomous churches, united on the essential doctrines and free to follow their own traditions in worship and work, but others saw an attempt to proselytize for the

Moravian Church. Mennonites and Dunkers were the first to withdraw, and by springtime only Moravians were participating.

After the failure of this effort, Zinzendorf returned to Europe in January 1743, determined to try another approach. Lutheran, Reformed, and Moravian churches were three distinct ways (or tropes, as Zinzendorf put it) of being Christian, but all could work together, he argued. Moravians could thus sponsor Lutheran and Reformed congregations and supply them with ministers.

During his year in Pennsylvania, Zinzendorf had observed that Lutheran and Reformed congregations in "the Pennsylvania field," which included New York, New Jersey, Maryland, and Virginia, lacked pastoral leadership and depended on irregularly ordained ministers or dedicated laymen. With some twenty-eight organized Lutheran congregations in 1742, there was only one trained Lutheran minister and eight others with varying qualifications; the thirty-five Reformed congregations were served by thirteen pastors, mostly unordained and untrained. It was only in 1746 that a Reformed synod in Europe, the Classis of Amsterdam, sent a German-speaking minister to Pennsylvania.

In Zinzendorf's new plan, Moravian men and women, including some men ordained as Lutheran or Reformed ministers, would fan out across the countryside from the Moravian centers at Bethlehem and Nazareth to nurture existing congregations and gather new ones by evangelistic preaching. At first they were remarkably successful. Isolated Swiss and German communities welcomed itinerants of their own Lutheran or Reformed tradition who preached enthusiastically about the saving blood and wounds of Jesus. Two-thirds of the clergy working in these congregations through the 1740s were Moravian-related. "By 1745 the Moravians conducted a full-fledged revival in the classic sense in and around Pennsylvania, with traveling preachers, emotional sermons, [and] singing in churches, barns and open fields." They drew "big crowds of mixed ethnic and religious groups, sometimes including Indians and slaves" (118–119).

Success bred conflict. It did not take long for quarrels to divide nearly every congregation, with denunciations of the Moravians as wolves who had disguised themselves to creep into the sheepfold. Lutherans in Lancaster, for instance, had been happy with their pastor until he arranged for a Moravian synod to meet in the Lancaster County Court House in 1746. The congregation then split into two increasingly violent groups, each faction claiming to represent the true Lutheran faith, each determined to keep

the other out of the church building (208–211). Similar confrontations, occasionally violent, occurred across Pennsylvania and New Jersey. In time the pro-Moravian factions were isolated. “While Moravian preachers had served in at least 102 German-speaking congregations from 1740 to 1748, they served in only 48 during the period 1749 to 1755, and many of these visits were either brief or to small congregations that would ultimately become separate Moravian communities instead of Lutheran or Reformed” (212).

Aaron Fogleman has drawn on prodigious research in European and American archives in retelling this story. While other historians have generally seen these conflicts as quarrels over property or as part of a broader “layman’s progress” in gaining control of church affairs, Fogleman’s analysis pointed to deeper issues.

In these same years some Moravians went beyond the common evangelical emphasis on the blood and wounds of Jesus that brought salvation to sinners, itself comparable to the devotion to the sacred heart of Jesus promoted by the German Jesuits working in Pennsylvania from 1741 who gave their church at Conewago that name. The new Moravian emphasis was on the side wound as a birth canal for the new Christian as well as a secure hiding place. Some began to introduce sensual, even erotic, language into their hymns and prayers and to depict the side wound in a vagina-shape in their art.

Combined with Moravian freedom to allow women to teach and preach, although only in devotional meetings with other women, and the separation of married couples, parents and children, in the Moravian choir structure at Bethlehem and elsewhere, Fogleman contends, this new, more feminine piety presented a challenge to the accepted gender order in Europe and America. By emphasizing these issues, Fogleman is able to situate seeming parochial disputes in Tulpehocken and Coventry within the context of transatlantic opposition to Moravians. His exploration of their place in anti-Moravian polemics in Europe sheds new light on the controversies within pietism that were reflected in Pennsylvania.

As Fogleman is quick to acknowledge, there is little evidence to indicate that gender issues played a major role in the Pennsylvania field. In each of his detailed case studies of violent opposition to Moravians, Fogleman admits “the importance of confessionalism is clear,” but “the role of gender must be inferred” (199, 211). A dearth of documentary evidence does not

disprove his case, but it does make it difficult to establish its comparative importance alongside other factors.

Moravians welcomed slaves and Indians to their meetings and as full members of their church, which “engendered tense opposition to the group” (159). Fogleman might have expanded on this seeming offhand remark. How important was this factor? While Fogleman is undoubtedly right in looking beyond mere property disputes for an explanation, property, or better, who controlled property was significant.

Philadelphia Lutheran and Reformed congregations may have shared a rented hall, but their bitter quarrel with the Moravians was over who would be the gatekeepers, literally locking out their opponents. This was equally true in Lancaster, although the Moravian faction had a better claim on the church building. Elsewhere Moravians seemed to be claiming church property that arguably belonged to others. In Donegal in Lancaster County several Swiss Reformed families organized a congregation and at their own expense erected a meeting house for a “Calvinist Church” as the 1745 warrant recorded; it was deeded to the Moravian Society in 1750. There was no injustice here, since most of the congregants joined the Moravians, but the minority may well have felt hoodwinked.

Moravians undercut their own mission by their initial secrecy, presenting themselves as Lutheran or Reformed pastors and hiding their Moravian associations. When this came to light, it naturally created suspicion. Zinzendorf’s authoritarian manner contributed to the collapse of his Pennsylvania synods and also of his trope approach. He took it on himself to ordain Lutheran and Reformed pastors for the Pennsylvania field and offered his own catechism to replace the Reformed Heidelberg Catechism. Moravian itinerants like Lischy and Rauch, whose diaries were published a century ago, routinely listed “the awakened souls in the various Reformed congregations” and wrote of individuals as “converted” and “thoroughly awakened.” Did they unintentionally divide their congregations and provide ammunition for their critics?

Aaron Fogleman has given us fresh insight into the creative ferment of eighteenth-century Pennsylvania with a book that is a valuable contribution to religious studies.

RICHARD K. McMASTER  
*University of Florida*