Brown’s pre-novel-writing career. These shortcomings should not, however, detract from the numerous virtues of this new study. The issues Kamrath raises will almost certainly spur scholars of both literature and history to rethink their assumptions about Brown and his era.

Western Michigan University  
SCOTT SLAWINSKI


The trial of Frederick Eberle involved over fifty men, all of whom were indicted and ultimately convicted for conspiracy and rioting in Philadelphia in 1816. They were constituents of the German Lutheran Church St. Michael’s and Zion and had fought with other members of the church over whether they should include English-language services and education in their ministry. Almost a decade earlier, a group of pro-English-language Lutherans had left the church over a similar controversy, and as Baer explains in this excellent micro-history of the church community, these fights over church governance and religious practice were significant in early republican Philadelphia.

The trial of Eberle and others became a debate over the place of ethnicity and language in the American republic. As such, it reflected crucial themes, such as the problem of citizenship in a new country. It also touched upon the cultural problems of heterogeneity, as well as individual rights and privileges in the face of majority rule and state power.

Although the conflict between these various church factions was complicated, Baer’s close analysis reveals certain trends. The pro-English group tended to be more politically engaged and more involved with the larger English-speaking community, both in Philadelphia and the state. The pro-German group was comprised of more recent immigrants, many of whom were small artisans and petty retailers who served the German-speaking populations of Philadelphia; they lived in the Northern Liberties and Southwark, the city’s suburbs.

In some ways the book reflects the ambivalent open-endedness of the theme itself. Conflicts over immigrants’ language, nationality, ethnicity, and citizenship have been ongoing in different local communities throughout the United States, and the debates within the German community would continue, change shape, and shift in the decades after this crisis. Although the court chastised these particular pro-German-language Lutherans and penalized them with substantial fines and court costs, they would actually pay little and would win their battle
within St. Michael's and Zion. After failing to secure English services within the church and its governing institutions, the pro-English men resigned and pursued their case with the Pennsylvania Assembly. Despite initial favorable action by the assembly, the state had no authority to force the German community to abandon its language and “rights” (177). Ultimately, the pro-English group split from the main body of the church just as another substantial component of pro-English supporters had done in the early nineteenth century. So, Baer wisely shrinks from making an easy conclusion about this fight between two factions in one community, both of which had a good cause for concern about their place and future in the new nation. In doing so, Baer has shed light on the dynamic processes by which immigrants—of all ethnicities—have fought to live together in the United States.

Binghamton University, State University of New York

DOUGLAS BRADBURN


Wartime opposition, both North and South, played a major role not only in Federal and Confederate state policies but also in daily social interactions between soldiers and civilians on both sides of the conflict. Although there is little to suggest that ideological opposition physically inhibited either government from carrying out military policy, numerous historians have identified the psychological stress and anxiety that accompanied disloyalty. This is especially true in the North, where the widespread opposition by Peace Democrats, or “Copperheads,” was seen as a Confederate conspiracy rather than a democratic, constitutional protest against the federal government’s infringement upon individual rights. Robert Sandow’s book, *Deserter Country: Civil War Opposition in the Pennsylvania Appalachians*, is a case study of wartime opposition in the rural North, and it illuminates the regional variances that influenced dissent and the broader social and political reactions that pitted local citizens against the federal government.

Copperheadism, as an extension of the Democratic Party, has traditionally been linked to urban areas where high-profile incidents, such as the draft riots in New York City in July 1863, occurred. Historians tend to view Northern antiwar sentiment as a product of the growing class and ethnic tensions that accompanied industrialization (8, 101). Studies of Southern Unionism have also focused on issues of class, as historians have noted the economic disparity that existed between men and women of the Southern “hill country” and those who occupied the more fertile agricultural land. Sandow, however, rightfully suggests that past