works related to the topic. The only weakness is a lack of information on the Moravian congregations outside Bethlehem, as the Moravians did succeed in establishing congregations among the German-speaking peoples in the region. In fact, Moravian activity in present-day Berks and Lancaster Counties attracted considerable attention from German Lutheran and Reformed religious leaders and ultimately contributed to the formation of their respective denominational organizations in the late 1740s. Overall, though, this is a fine book, and it is a worthy contribution to the growing literature on German settlement in colonial Pennsylvania.

KAREN GUENTHER
Mansfield University


“You can hardly imagine how many denominations you will find here,” a German settler in Hereford Township, Berks County, wrote to friends in Europe in 1768, but “we are always at peace with each other.” Indeed, anyone who despised another because of his religion would be considered foolish. “Everybody speaks his mind freely. A Mennonite preacher is my next neighbor and I could not wish for a better one. On the other side I have a big Catholic church” and “the present Jesuit Father . . . confides more in me than in those who come to him for confession . . . Next to them the Lutherans and Reformed have their congregations.” Pluralism was the rule in the experience of Schwenkfelder elder Christoph Schultz. “We are all going to and fro like fish in water.”

Was this the experience of other Pennsylvania communities? Was it confined to rural pockets like Schultz’s neighborhood? Mark Haberlein, professor of early modern history at the University of Bamberg in Germany, chose Lancaster to “demonstrate how religious diversity emerged and how adherents of various faiths interacted with one another in a single town.” He has succeeded in an admirable study illuminating many aspects of Lancaster’s first century. His meticulously-researched local history has broad implications for American religious history, as Haberlein has made a case for seeing...
the long eighteenth century as more significant than earlier or later periods in building religious institutions and shaping American attitudes.

Lancaster, like many Pennsylvania towns and villages, was essentially a German-speaking community and its churches reflected this. Lutherans comprised forty percent of the taxpayers in the borough in 1773, adherents of the German Reformed Church twenty percent and Moravians ten percent. The small Catholic congregation was also German-speaking. The town also had an Anglican church and a Quaker meeting. Laura Becker found much the same religious mix in early Reading. Mennonites and Presbyterians were rooted in rural Lancaster County. The Presbyterian congregation in Lancaster remained “in a rather forming state” until 1770 when they obtained their first minister. His primary call was to rural Leacock Presbyterian Church, where he resided, and Lancaster had only a third of his time.

Haberlein has broken new ground in demonstrating that their churches were important to most Lancastrians and that an increasing percentage participated in church life as the century wore on. In her study of Germantown, for instance, Stephanie Grauman Wolf concluded that churches had a very small role in the community, reflecting the growing secularization of the community. Haberlein found that 63 percent of borough taxpayers in 1751 and 72.5 percent of those on the 1773 tax assessment repeatedly appear in church records. Since the Catholic and Presbyterian congregations have no surviving records for most of the century and Anglican records are spotty, Haberlein found a high percentage of Germans were communicant members of the Lutheran or Reformed congregation and their number increased steadily between 1749 and 1790.

Lancaster churches experienced a common problem in the early decades of the town's history, a dearth of trained clerical leadership. Each congregation was left in turmoil by a series of incompetent clergy and jackleg preachers. The Catholics, served by Jesuit pastors from German universities, were the exception. Moravian efforts to supply Lutheran and Reformed pulpits with awakened preachers added to the confusion and led some members of the older churches to join the new Lancaster Moravian congregation. A tradition of strong lay leadership emerged in each group. Reflecting the composition of the community, they were mainly artisans before mid-century and thereafter drawn from the merchants, shopkeepers, lawyers and medical doctors of the town. In the second half of the century, all the churches had settled pastors with university or pietist academy training. Lay leaders seem to have been reluctant to go along with the emphasis on church discipline.
and tighter pastoral control associated with Lutheran and Reformed pietism. They wanted pastors to devote full time to them and their children, rather than visit other congregations without a pastor. Haberlein noted that spurts of growth, building projects and church organs, happened when there was no resident pastor, rather than correlating with a season of revival.

The Lancaster community was ethically and religiously diverse. How did these groups relate to one another? They met every day over shop counters and in weekly markets, in the court room and the taverns. A Jewish merchant like Joseph Simon formed a business partnership with a Scotch-Irish Presbyterian turned Moravian. The Quaker Isaac Whitelock loaned money to Irish and German Lancasterians. But did they interact as members of their religious bodies? The evidence is harder to find, but Haberlein has marshaled what little is extant to build a convincing argument. With no Presbyterian minister in Lancaster, some Presbyterians rented pews in Saint James Anglican church and a few had pews in both once a Presbyterian church was built. A surprising number of wills made bequests to more than one congregation. Edward Smout, for example, ordered a 400-acre tract to be sold and the proceeds used in equal amounts for repairing and glazing “the Church of England in the Borough” and for building a school house for the Moravian congregation. Cornelius Lane left an equal sum to “the Elders of the Menonite Meeting” and to Trinity Lutheran Church for the poor of each congregation. Church records indicate a certain amount of movement from one denomination to another, although few were as adventurous as William Henry who was successively a Presbyterian, “a decided Deist,” an Anglican, and a Quaker, before finally uniting with the Moravians. Language was a barrier and few marriages took place between members of English- and German-speaking churches. Marriage between members of one German congregation and another was not uncommon, often leading to a Mennonite spouse being confirmed in the Lutheran church or a Lutheran spouse joining the Mennonites. Heinrich and Susanna Steissen Eckenrodt held to their original faiths; she traveled twenty miles to take communion in Trinity Lutheran Church in Lancaster and he was considered the founder of the Catholic congregation which heard Mass in a chapel on his land near Elizabethtown.

When the log chapel built by Catholics in Lancaster burnt to the ground in 1760, it was widely believed to be the work of an incendiary. An interdenominational committee offered a reward for information. Haberlein was unaware that the previous year Benjamin Price Jr. and others were charged with “breaking the fence and windows of the Popish chapple,” but
the jury refused to indict them. The evidence can cut both ways. Haberlein occasionally missed a good story. Christian Sensenig, a Mennonite farmer, came to town to buy a horse and was testing the horse’s responses by galloping up and down Duke Street. Bernhard Hubele, shopkeeper and Lutheran trustee, picked up a stone and hurled it at the rider. Sensenig was fatally injured. Lutheran Pastor Helmuth visited him and Sensenig told the minister that he forgave Hubele and did not want him prosecuted if he should die. The court acquiesced. This was the practice of pluralism.

RICHARD K. MACMASTER
University of Florida


At first glance Caspar Wistar’s early years, in what he called the “small, wretched village” of Waldshilsbach in the German Palatinate, stand in stark contrast to his successful life in America as a brass button maker, merchant, land speculator, and glassmaker. Growing up poor, with little education, and seemingly destined to follow his family’s profession as a forester, Wistar embodies, in many ways, the prototypical American success story. He arrived in Philadelphia, in 1717 at the age of 21, with nine pence in his pocket. Benjamin Franklin-like, he used most of that money to buy a meal of bread. To support himself he labored for sixteen months doing “very hard work”—hauling ashes for a soap maker. Yet, Wistar went on to come enormously influential and wealthy; by the time he died in 1752, his net worth was 60,000 Pennsylvania pounds at a time when elite men were worth on the average only 24,000 pounds.

It would be logical to attribute this meteoric rise to the economic opportunities available in Pennsylvania, known at the time as the “Best Poor Man’s Country.” Beiler, however, demonstrates that Wistar’s story is more complicated than this. She argues that Wistar’s European background provided necessary capital that he used “creatively and effectively” to advance himself in the New World. Thus Wistar’s story adds complexity to the usual understanding of early America as a place of opportunity because of scarce labor and plentiful, cheap land. This was true, of course—Wistar made a fortune.