



1-1998

God's Designs: The Literature of the Colonial Revival of Religion, 1735-1760

Allen C. Guelzo
Gettysburg College

Follow this and additional works at: <https://cupola.gettysburg.edu/cwfac>

 Part of the [Christianity Commons](#), [History of Christianity Commons](#), [History of Religion Commons](#), and the [United States History Commons](#)

Share feedback about the accessibility of this item.

Guelzo, Allen C. "God's Designs: The Literature of the Colonial Revival of Religion, 1735-1760." In *New Directions in American Religious History* eds. Harry S. Stout and D. G. Hart (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 141-172.

This is the publisher's version of the work. This publication appears in Gettysburg College's institutional repository by permission of the copyright owner for personal use, not for redistribution. Cupola permanent link: <https://cupola.gettysburg.edu/cwfac/42>

This open access book chapter is brought to you by The Cupola: Scholarship at Gettysburg College. It has been accepted for inclusion by an authorized administrator of The Cupola. For more information, please contact cupola@gettysburg.edu.

God's Designs: The Literature of the Colonial Revival of Religion, 1735-1760

Abstract

In December of 1990, after the completion of a section on Jonathan Edwards at the annual meeting of the American Historical Association in New York City, a dozen or so of mostly younger scholars of Jonathan Edwards swept around the corner from the convention hotel and settled themselves down to a staggering repast at a posh north Italian restaurant. In the midst of some very un-Edwardsean consumption, I offered a question to everyone around the table: What is the most important book which you've ever read on the Great Awakening? With only one exception, the Young Edwardseans gave the palm to an obscure nineteenth-century Congregationalist, Joseph Tracy; the one dissenter held out for a book from the 1960s, but it was the book that most Young Edwardseans are ritually required to despise, Alan Heimert's *Religion and the American Mind: From the Great Awakening to the American Revolution*. These unexpected choices could illustrate, alternately, how disillusioned historians are with virtually all current writing on the Great Awakening, or an entirely lopsided adoption by younger historians of one half of a long-term argument about the Great Awakening, or even what David Hall tactfully called the difficulty early modern historians have in recapturing the meaning of religion to the peoples of early America. The strangest aspect of these responses, however, was the appearance of consensus they suggested, for hardly ever in American history has a single event raised more questions about what an *event* might actually be, or proven so alluring and so elusive of interpretation. [*excerpt*]

Keywords

Jonathan Edwards, Great Awakening, religion, religious revival, Protestantism

Disciplines

Christianity | History | History of Christianity | History of Religion | Religion | United States History

GOD'S DESIGNS

*The Literature of the Colonial
Revivals of Religion, 1735-1760*



Allen C. Guelzo

IN DECEMBER OF 1990, after the completion of a section on Jonathan Edwards at the annual meeting of the American Historical Association in New York City, a dozen or so of mostly younger scholars of Jonathan Edwards swept around the corner from the convention hotel and settled themselves down to a staggering repast at a posh north Italian restaurant. In the midst of some very un-Edwardsean consumption, I offered a question to everyone around the table: What is the most important book which you've ever read on the Great Awakening? With only one exception, the Young Edwardseans gave the palm to an obscure nineteenth-century Congregationalist, Joseph Tracy; the one dissenter held out for a book from the 1960s, but it was the book that most Young Edwardseans are ritually required to despise, Alan Heimert's *Religion and the American Mind: From the Great Awakening to the American Revolution*. These unexpected choices could illustrate, alternately, how disillusioned historians are with virtually all current writing on the Great Awakening, or an entirely lopsided adoption by younger historians of one half of a long-term argument about the Great Awakening, or even what David Hall tactfully called the difficulty early modern historians have in recap-

turing the meaning of religion to the peoples of early America.¹ The strangest aspect of these responses, however, was the appearance of consensus they suggested, for hardly ever in American history has a single event raised more questions about what an *event* might actually be, or proven so alluring and so elusive of interpretation.

Both of those qualities can be illustrated by considering the enormous interpretive extremes which bracket the Great Awakening. Alan Heimert and Perry Miller, who may be said to have touched off the modern debate over the definition and significance of the Awakening, were confident that the various subevents of the Awakening all fit together as a clear and forceful story of renewal in the face of spiritual declension in America and the creation of a uniquely American set of meanings for American culture. "The Great Awakening was the religious revival that swept through the American colonies between 1739 and 1742," announced Heimert and Miller in the opening of their introduction to the first major anthology in this century of voices from the Awakening—as though there was no question that a single plot governed all the actors of the Awakening. Nor were they in much doubt about its meaning: "The Awakening, in brief, marked America's final break with the Middle Ages and her entry into a new intellectual age in the church and in society." But only fifteen years after the publication of the Heimert-Miller anthology, another major interpreter of early American religion rose to question whether there actually was such a single plot to the Awakening and, if there was, whether it was a story about the imposition of Europeanized establishment religion on the chaos of early American religious experience. The Great Awakening, wrote Jon Butler in 1982, may well be an "interpretive fiction," created by historians to describe a series of isolated, regional subevents whose accomplishments were actually quite modest and whose chief historical use ought to be little more than the polishing of "nearly perfect mirrors of a regionalized, provincial society."²

Nor do the alternatives lie only in the extremes. Between Heimert and Butler stretches a considerable amount of interpretive territory, much of which was first explored by the Awakeners themselves, and their critics. Both the friends and the enemies of the Great Awakening were conscious from the beginning that they had been part of an event charged with bitterly contested meanings on numerous levels: on the levels of Christian soteriology (in what ways people are made right with God), ecclesiology (how Christians are to be organized into congregations and who should have the power to rule them), and religious politics (how a Christian society should function and who it should include). But we do not have anything on offer as a historical *interpretation* of the Awakening until 1842, and the publication of Joseph Tracy's *The Great Awakening*. It was Tracy who selected the term *great awakening* from the plethora of descriptions of the revivals used in the eighteenth century and fixed it into place as the modern term of choice, and it was Tracy who for the

first time collected and published a broad sampling of documents from the Awakening that he worked into a coherent and accomplished narrative. But the religious questions of the previous century still managed to emerge from Tracy's history as the principal matters of interest. An 1814 graduate of Dartmouth College, Tracy had been trained for the Congregational ministry under the austere eye of Asa Burton of Thetford, Vermont, one of the last major Edwardsean voices in New England; and under that influence, Tracy's book may be read as a major polemic in defense of Edwardseanism as true Christianity, and the Awakening as God's design. "The revival was," Tracy concluded, "in all its valuable features, a manifest example of the power of those doctrines" that Edwards preached. In its train there flowed spiritual enlightenment, the "restoration of the true doctrine concerning church membership."³

The reluctance that Tracy's historical narrative exhibited in escaping (or rather, failing to escape) the orbit of the Awakening's religious questions persisted through much of the nineteenth century. Like Tracy, most of those who turned their hand to any historical consideration of the Awakening were usually evangelical Protestant clergy, prompted by the need to reach for historical armor in dealing with later forms of revivalism or later versions of the questions that had so inflamed Jonathan Edwards, Charles Chauncy, Jonathan Dickinson, and the Tennents. As Joseph Conforti has shown, the renewed outbreak of Awakening-like revivals in New England and the trans-Appalachia in the 1820s touched off a major effort to reify the Awakening into a "great, general and formative event" that would justify and rationalize the newer outbursts of revival enthusiasm.⁴ The articles on various aspects of the Awakening that splashed up on the pages of theological quarterlies like Edwards Amasa Park's *Bibliotheca Sacra* or Charles Hodge's *Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review*, and the successive editions of the works of Jonathan Edwards and his disciples (principally Hopkins, Bellamy, and Emons) that were published between 1808 and 1851, were (like the original participants) less consumed with establishing what happened in the Awakening than with establishing whether or not the Awakening was theologically explicable.⁵

Not until the beginning of this century, as an American historical profession was beginning to emerge out of the fledgling nests of late-nineteenth-century university graduate programs and as revivalism was pushed to the margins of public religious concern, did narratives about the Awakening, or that included the Awakening, began to reconfigure themselves around a new set of more strictly historical questions. The first of these questions was a cultural one: To what extent was the Great Awakening a distinctively American event, or an event formative of a uniquely American culture? Long before Alan Heimert, Herbert Levi Osgood asked that question in *The American Colonies in the Eighteenth Century*, and long before Perry Miller, Osgood answered it in the affirmative. The Awakening was "the first great and spontaneous movement

in the history of the American people, deeper and more pervading than the wars," Osgood wrote, and he promised that "Curious inquirers, whose purpose it may be to interpret the mind of the American people, will rank this high among the early phenomena which furnish a clue to the elusive thing of which they are in pursuit."⁶ A second question was more nearly related to the old religious questions, except that it was now recast as inquiry into the history of ideas: To what extent did the Great Awakening change religious discourse in America? Vernon Louis Parrington addressed that question in *Main Currents in American Thought* in 1926, and concluded that the Awakening was an ironic attempt by hateful Calvinist fanatics to retain their dominance of the public sphere, an attempt that blew up in their own hands and ended up permanently discrediting Puritan (which in Parrington's case meant *fundamentalist*) theology and "thus hastening the decay of Calvinism."⁷ The third question was posed by Charles Hartshorne Maxson and Wesley M. Gewehr, who suggested the transposition of the Great Awakening into a metaphor for eighteenth-century political conflict. Gewehr was struck by the parallels between the demands of the New Light Baptists in the 1750s and 60s for religious liberty and the demands of the Virginia patriots in the 1770s for political liberty, and he concluded that "the evangélical doctrine, when brought to bear upon the great mass of the population, produced a democratic feeling, developed a degree of self-respect, and inculcated ideas of self-government . . . and thus accustomed people to self-government." Maxson, likewise, was convinced that "the Great Awakening prepared the way for the Revolutionary War" by creating a "community of feeling," primed for political resistance.⁸ Of course, the religious questions did not disappear; in fact, the finest single-volume local study of the Awakening, Edwin S. Gaustad's *The Great Awakening in New England* (1957), was written almost entirely around the same religious controversies that haunted the original actors in the Awakening. But the tone and sense of distance in this writing was much more aloof and historicized, even from historians like Gaustad who had genuine religious interests and commitments as part of the motivations for their work.

Thus, the publication of Alan Heimert's *Religion and the American Mind* (1966) did not so much set out new questions as reinforce a secularization of the Awakening that had been under way for some time. Nevertheless, Heimert's reinforcement was so dramatic and so vividly stated that the sheer critical din that arose around the book forced early American historians to take long new looks at the Great Awakening. In varying degrees, Heimert addressed all three of the modern questions about the Awakening. Like his mentor, Perry Miller, Heimert treated the discourse of Edwards and the Awakeners as an elaborate intellectual code that embodied "a vital competition for the intellectual allegiance of the American people." At the same time, Heimert also discerned an unambiguous political message in the Awakening that placed Charles Chauncy as the forerunner of American liberalism and individualism—although,

unlike Vernon Parrington, Heimert meant nothing complimentary about it. For Heimert, liberalism represented a "profoundly elitist and conservative ideology, while evangelical religion embodies a radical and even democratic challenge to the standing order" that stood in judgment against "the increasingly acquisitive and indulgent spirit of the America of the 1730s." That, in turn, led Heimert to see in the Awakening the shape of a new and distinctively American culture, pervaded by longings for evangelical union and the millennium. The Awakening thus became "almost by definition, a quest for the great community," a community that eventually took concrete political shape in a new public citizen who sought "the perfection of a people in righteousness." At each point, Jonathan Edwards was the major player among the Awakeners, and Edwards's magisterial treatise on the will positioned him as an American Rousseau, calling Americans to discover their unity as a people against British tyranny and leading them to the Jeffersonian apotheosis of 1800.⁹

Of course, some early American historians, like Edmund S. Morgan, were less than captivated by Heimert's arguments. Heimert's book "partakes more of fantasy than of history," Morgan snorted, as he catalogued one contradiction after another across Heimert's pages.¹⁰ But *Religion and the American Mind*, and the theses that could be spun off from it, remained too tantalizing and too productive of exploration and exegesis not to attract a host of younger early Americanists to its side. Harry S. Stout, who declared in 1977 that his "point of departure . . . is Alan Heimert's study of *Religion and the American Mind*," found evangelical itinerant preachers fashioning a new "egalitarian rhetoric" full of messages about free will, self-determination, and liberty that were available a generation later to galvanize resistance to Great Britain.¹¹ Similarly, Heimert's determination to intertwine religious and political rhetoric paved the way for Gaty Nash to identify the urban evangelicals with popular movements that fragmented and democratized hierarchical colonial politics. Just as Heimert had defined the Awakening as a crisis of cultural formation, Nash defined the Awakening as "a profound cultural crisis involving the convergence of political, social, and economic forces," and Nash saw it quickly turn into a "class-specific movement" that promoted "levelling" in the form of lay preaching and a general "expansion of political consciousness and a new feeling of self-importance." Like Heimert, Nash saw the Old Lights as the friends of an emerging liberal capitalist ethic while the Awakeners "heaped scorn" on "the acquisitiveness of the urban elite," and like Heimert again, Nash saw the Awakening as a major formative element in the creation of an "antiauthoritarianism" that shattered the "habit of obedience" among Americans and paved the way to resistance in 1775.¹²

But the great weakness of Heimert's argument and the arguments piled more-or-less haphazardly around his was the ease with which large patches of exceptions could be found in the eighteenth-century record. As Nathan O. Hatch discovered, large numbers of Old Lights cheerfully

joined with the New Lights in supporting the Revolution, almost as though the distinctions Heimert had drawn did not exist, and Hatch even found New England Old Lights as firmly fixated on millennialism as the New Lights. Nor was it at all apparent that the Old Lights were the apostles of liberal individualism; in fact, the commonest complaint of the Old Lights and Old Calvinists, during the Awakening and long after it, was precisely that the Awakeners disrupted and subverted organic notions of community, as symbolized by the Half-Way Covenant and the conventional New England baptismal rites.¹³ Bruce Tucker has pointed out that the Great Awakening may actually have increased American reliance on British culture, through the transatlantic cooperation of American Awakeners with English Evangelicals, rather than created anything tending toward an American culture. "By the Revolutionary era, ministers rarely, if ever, invoked the Great Awakening as a crusade upon which the new political movement could be built," observed Tucker; "More central was the theme of a religious partnership which had been betrayed by former friends."¹⁴ And in a later work, *The Democratization of American Christianity* (1989), Hatch suggested that the real story of democratization in religion and American culture was the breakup of established religious institutions under the influence of Jeffersonian political radicalism. Hatch, in essence, turned Heimert upside down by proposing democratization as a process that the Revolution forced on evangelical awakeners in the *second* "great awakening" in the early republic, and not one that the evangelicals of the first Awakening forced on the Revolution.

Recognition of these weaknesses in the Heimert thesis led to the administration of a tremendous shock in the form of Jon Butler's 1982 article in the *Journal of American History*, "Enthusiasm Described and Decried: The Great Awakening as Interpretive Fiction." Butler aggressively assaulted the Heimert thesis on nearly every ground on which it stood and dragged down a number of Heimert's admirers at the same time. Butler questioned exactly what was meant by Joseph Tracy's term, *great awakening*, and pointed out that the revivals of the 1740s and 1750s were often isolated and incongruent events, and certainly not nation-shaping cultural upheavals; he questioned the supposed democratic or communitarian valences between revivalism and revolution and pointed out that the Awakening started and finished securely in the hands of clerical elites; and he attacked the notion that any common rhetorical or ideological ground existed between the revivalists and the revolutionaries. The Awakening was no longer "great"; it was, to the contrary, an unconnected string of regional revivals of various forms of pietist Calvinism, which had little impact on the long-duration growth of either American denominations or American nationalism.

Rarely in the space of one essay has so much damage been done to so many historical reputations. If Tracy and the nineteenth-century chroniclers offered the spiritual interpretation of the Awakening, and the

twentieth-century historians (climaxing in Heimert) developed a secularized political/cultural interpretation of the Awakening, Butler created the anti-interpretation, both in the 1982 essay and more recently in his larger study, *Awash In A Sea of Faith: Christianizing the American People* (1990). Far more serious even than Charles Chauncy, who conceded the importance of the Awakening even while he argued that it was a fraud, Butler argued for the irrelevance of the Awakening, and the fraudulence of its interpretation.

I

With the earth thus leveled by Butler's iconoclasm, it has become possible over the last decade to back off from the macrocultural or political-cum-intellectual paradigms created by Osgood, Parrington, Gewehr, Maxson, and Heimert, and begin reviewing and reconstructing the sociological, religious, ethnohistorical and even non-American shape of the Awakening. Without the need to justify one's interest in the Awakening by hitching it to the Revolution, the time has been particularly ripe for bringing the religious meanings of the Awakening back to the fore, especially as cultural anthropologists have impressed historians with the need to fold religion back into their reconstructions of cultures. Even though Gary Nash was largely concerned with political and economic problems in *The Urban Crucible*, he was fully aware that "the Great Awakening in New England was not caused by economic dislocation, spreading poverty, or currency problems," and that any adequate understanding of the Awakening had to be rooted, not in anticipations of the Revolution or republican culture, but "deeper into the subsoil of Calvinist Puritan culture."¹⁵

The most basic of those religious questions concerns the actual meaning of revivals or awakenings; few historians have been, as Nash observed, overly willing to define these terms, being happier simply to describe the event and debate its details. But one can no more ignore a definition of the Awakening as a religious event than historians of eighteenth-century imperial tensions can avoid a definition of mercantilism or capitalism. What that has required, however, is more interpretive empathy than modern historians usually have in store, for religious events that center on revival and conversion necessarily function, especially in early modern cultures like the American colonial eighteenth-century, on levels of meaning that (as anthropologist James Clifford has warned) are not entirely congenial to historians trained up to a "bias toward wholeness, continuity and growth" rather than "contradictions, mutations, and emergencies." As a result, the general predilection is to read religion as what Martin Marty called a *nothing but* phenomenon—*nothing but* the protest of the poor or the oppressive, *nothing but* the refuge of the timid, *nothing but* this or that—and to read awakenings as events of either resistance or accommodation (to modernism or plural-

ism, in the fashion of Peter Berger), or as moments along a line of development from dominance to decline or back again (as in Anthony F. C. Wallace's "revitalization" thesis).¹⁶ But a religious awakening can simultaneously be intellectual, mystical, experimental, affectional, and coercive; it can influence and be influenced by many relations, signs, and situations, and it is more likely to speak with a vocabulary of resonance, affinity, and motive than with social causatives.¹⁷ And what is equally important, it is precisely the affectional, the personal, and the mystical that are the components of a revival most compelling to its participants. Even the logically and temporally comprehensible New England doctrinal controversies over baptism, the terms of communion, and the nature of conversion that loom so large as the background to the Great Awakening were charged with devotional, spiritual, and familial meanings which we ignore only at the price of misunderstanding the entire enterprise.¹⁸ Thus, any new history of the Awakening has to begin by readdressing religion in early America as a creative and interactive variable, capable of originating, mediating, and integrating an extraordinary spectrum of experiences.¹⁹

But such a history cannot stop there: in fact, historians have been calling, somewhat disingenuously, for such interpretive empathy for a generation without ever coming to terms with the terrific ontological and narrative consequences of such empathy. We must go on from mere empathy to ask, in the case of the Great Awakening, whether the current genres of historical narrative are actually capable of conveying anything like the sense of the spiritual or devotional, or whether writing on such subjects would not simply become denatured by the conventional processes of description. The Awakeners were not conscious of being historical; as far as they understood matters, they were participants in an aesthetic and transcendent event that has no respect for the modern metaphysics of history. For the Awakeners, the stories of conversion and supernatural light were not attempts, as ours are, to capture an event in our own hands, but to bring spiritual healing. If this history is to go forward, a new kind of historical language is needed to speak about the Great Awakening—not the sterile and alienated language of modernism, nor the ironic language of the discreetly empathetic, nor yet the self-absorbed and power-hungry language of the postmodern, but a language of awe and terror, and if possible, of reconciliation.

This is not to suggest, however, that the consideration of revivals as historical events—as cultural assimilation or resistance or the like—has yielded no worthwhile fruit. Henry F. May's survey of *The Enlightenment in America* (1976) is helpful for the care with which he integrates the Awakening and the concerns of pietist Evangelicals into the vast mental geography of the Enlightenment, and he treats the Awakening less as a prototype for the American cultural future and more as an angry and self-conscious protest against "the whole social and emotional tendency" of what May called the "Moderate Enlightenment" of eighteenth-century

natural religion. Not surprisingly, May had little use for Heimert: "No society could have based its existence" on Jonathan Edwards's treatises on the will or the religious affections, and for May "the marvel is that he affected American culture as deeply as he did." Equally germane to the international context of the Awakening is the even vaster spiritual geography mapped out by W. R. Ward, whose *The Protestant Evangelical Awakening* also situates the Awakeners in a broader eighteenth-century context, only this time the context of Continental pietism and the Counter-Enlightenment. Ward is particularly adept at stressing how the European spiritual revivals rested upon the creation of vast networks of letter writing, travel, the growth of a common popular press, and large amounts of translation and republication, which made printed texts a major vehicle for the spread of religious ideas across national and linguistic boundaries. Ward is also highly effective at making millennialism more than simply a vehicle for the covert expression of American politics.²⁰ In the end, both of these table-setting studies come to roughly the same conclusion: like May, Ward's general perspective on Protestant Awakenings in the eighteenth century is to see them as movements of resistance to assimilation, which means in the American case that the Great Awakening could be seen less as a movement to establish a new identity and more as an effort to recover or protect old ones.²¹

But the process of assimilation/resistance can cut in various directions, and sometimes simultaneously: Jonathan Edwards lauded small-town, up-river resistance to the "great Noise" of Arminianism that invaded the Connecticut River Valley in the 1730s, but he also wrote and published for large-scale transatlantic audiences. Where Ward has found resistance in the international context, Susan O'Brien, Michael Crawford, Robert Rutter, Harold Simonson, and John Raimo have found an equal measure of enclosure within an Anglo-American system of religious discourse.²² The question of assimilation/resistance is further complicated in early America as soon as we recognize that the Great Awakening was more than simply an Anglo-American, or Anglophone, event with the dividing lines in communities drawn on the basis of whether people were *for* it or *against* it. As demonstrated by Joyce Goodfriend, Richard W. Pointer, Randall Balmer, Marilyn Westerkamp, A. G. Roeber, Ned Landsman, and Leigh Eric Schmidt in their studies of German, Scottish, Dutch, and Scots-Irish communities in New York and New Jersey, the picture of a single Great Awakening becomes blurred by the mixture of ethnic and religious identities in British North America, to the point where questions of *for* and *against* become almost useless. Balmer, Pointer, and Goodfriend are more-or-less agreed that the Great Awakening (contrary to Ward) was an assimilationist event that helped the Dutch community of New York City find accommodations with the surrounding English colonial culture. However, among the Scots described by Schmidt and Landsman and the German Lutherans described by Roeber in New York and New Jersey, the Awakening becomes much more of what Ward described

as a tool for resisting assimilation (in the form of Scottish "communion fairs" that eventually become transmuted into "camp meetings") or even for gobbling up and Scot-ifying colonial Presbyterianism.²³ Concerning Pennsylvania, Dietmar Rothermund, John Frantz, and Stephanie Grauman Wolf all open windows into the German-speaking Protestant communities in and around Philadelphia, although in Wolf's case the principal result is to show how negligible the impact of the Awakening was on German Lutheran and German Reformed churchgoers, while Frantz argues that it had a significant antiassimilationist effect by making the Germans more ethnically and linguistically apart.²⁴ But even here, generalizations based upon "German" or "Scottish" ethnicity can be treacherous: not only did "German" conceal a variety of distinct and competing regional origins, but non-English colonists showed themselves quite adept at picking and choosing cultural elements from their English neighbors for incorporation without following a particularly coherent plan. Some "Germans," then, might promote English-style Awakenings, but for very different reasons than the English would have employed; and some would have opposed them while being quite loyal to "pietist" constructions of their religion.

If the Middle Colonies have been the major resource for understanding the Awakening as a cultural contest, New England has been home to the sociology of the Awakening, and probably because the general perception of New England as ethnically homogeneous in the eighteenth-century has preempted any expectation of seeing the Great Awakening there as a struggle over assimilation. Some of this attention has been little more than the by-product of the usual New England antiquarian or institutional historical interests.²⁵ Yale College, which became a center of controversy in the Awakening on more than one occasion, has turned in a rather large share of material on the Awakening through Richard Warch's *School of the Prophets: Yale College, 1701-1740* (1973); Louis L. Tucker's biography of Yale President Thomas Clap, *Puritan Protagonist: President Thomas Clap of Yale College* (1962); and a well-crafted but sadly neglected anthology by Stephen Nissenbaum, *The Great Awakening at Yale College* (1972). But a more important stimulus to the social history of the Awakening in New England was generated by the publication in 1970 of three landmark histories of New England towns by Kenneth Lockridge, Michael Zuckerman, and Philip Greven. With those historians as models, a flurry of essays and monographs by James Walsh, Gerald Moran, John Jeffries, J. M. Bumsted, William Willingham, and Christopher Jedrey seized on the Great Awakening as a means for further understanding or illustrating the demographic and structural dilemmas of eighteenth-century New England.²⁶ Jedrey's biography of John Cleaveland, for instance, owed a great deal in conceptual terms to Greven's work on inheritance patterns in seventeenth-century Andover, and the central chapter of the book was in fact devoted to showing how Cleaveland, a radical New Light, was situated in a parish that was

wholly devoted to perpetuating traditional patterns of power, landholding, and inheritance, and to resisting the reorganization of village life along liberal entrepreneurial lines. The story of the Great Awakening in Cleaveland's parish was thus the story of how older parents and their dependent (and unwilling) sons stayed loyal to Old Light practices while the independent and middle-aged were drawn to the New Light.²⁷ Like so much else in the literature of the Great Awakening, these studies have been far from uniform in their conclusions. Stephen Grossbart, for example, analyzed the conversion and membership patterns of five Connecticut parishes between 1711 and 1832, and his results disputed both Gerald Moran's desire to link New Light conversion with maturation and the life cycle, and Bumsted's penchant for hooking the Awakening to economic crisis, since the ages of conversion Grossbart computed varied widely from cohort to cohort irrespective of the age of marriage or settlement, and even went up (rather than down) after 1750.²⁸ On the other hand, Rosalind Remer, for example, drew a series of striking connections between the Land Bank party in Boston in 1739-40 and the New Lights, and the Silver Bankers and the Old Light churches, and demonstrated important correlations between church membership, occupation, bank subscription, and office-holding, so that "clearly, diverging religious beliefs about salvation and piety were closely linked with concerns about the social order."²⁹

By contrast with New England, the sociology of the Awakening in the Middle Colonies has been almost entirely absorbed by the assimilation problem. The urtext in the field was, for over fifty years, Charles Hartshorne Maxson's *The Great Awakening in the Middle Colonies*, with Martin Lodge's 1964 dissertation, "The Great Awakening in the Middle Colonies" (University of California, Berkeley), as almost the only useful complement. This peculiar cloud of inattention began to lift with Jon Butler's study of the ecclesiastical politics of the Delaware Valley, and the insistence of Patricia Bonomi and Gary Nash on shifting the focus of early American religious history out of New England.³⁰ But for the most part, the sociology of revivalism in the Middle Colonies has been easily dwarfed by the attention captured by the theological problems posed by the Great Awakening to the Presbyterians in Pennsylvania and New Jersey, as well as by one of the finest denominational histories ever written, Leonard J. Trinterud's *The Forming of an American Tradition: A Re-examination of Colonial Presbyterianism* (1949). Trinterud's book is not a study of the Great Awakening per se, but he necessarily devotes an outsize amount of attention to the Awakening among the mid-Atlantic Presbyterians in an effort to stand twentieth-century Presbyterian conservatives on their heads by tracing the lineage of Presbyterian liberalism to the eighteenth-century Awakeners. Beyond Trinterud, Presbyterian biographies like Keith Hardman's dissertation, "Jonathan Dickinson and the Course of American Presbyterianism, 1717-1740" (University of Pennsylvania, 1971), and Milton J. Coalter's *Gilbert Tennent, Son of Thun-*

der: A Case Study of Continental Pietism's Impact on the First Great Awakening in the Middle Colonies (1986) take over as the principal narratives of the Presbyterian Awakening in the Middle Colonies. For the non-Protestant or non-Calvinist groups who actually constituted the numerical majority in the Middle Colonies, the available literature is ludicrously thin (except, again, as a study of assimilation), which suggests rather strongly that the impact of the Awakening needs in the future to be assessed not only in terms of those who received it but those who resisted it or who were indifferent to it. Pennsylvania German Lutherans, for instance, were resistant to "pietism" even when it came in the form of German Lutheran missionaries like Henry Melchoir Muhlenberg who had no assimilationist agendas, and in fact American Lutheranism managed to develop a theological and institutional identity quite apart from the evangelicalism of the Awakening.³¹ Ironically, no single person in the Middle Colonies has come in for greater attention in connection with the Awakening than one whose principal interest in it was to make money from it, and that was Benjamin Franklin.³²

The bibliographical terrain for the social history of the Awakening in the southern colonies was almost as flat until very recently. Much of this neglect, as Jack P. Greene has complained, was surely due to the overall propensity of early American historians to treat Massachusetts rather than the Chesapeake as the normative early American society. Greene has argued relentlessly that early modern societies like colonial British North America underwent a developmental evolution involving *simplification*, *elaboration*, and then finally *replication* (the copying and appropriation of imperial British cultural norms), which fits the Chesapeake and not Massachusetts. Greene and his model have undergone severe criticism at times, especially for Greene's inability to fit the Chesapeake's overwhelming reliance on slave labor into anything that seems to "replicate" Georgian English society. But the involvement of prominent English figures like Whitefield in the American revivals (and over a prolonged period of time, until Whitefield's death in Massachusetts in 1770) and the thick network of intellectual exchange between American and British Awakeners, implies that the Awakening could act as an important demonstration of "replication," provided that more evidence of its operation could be demonstrated in the South. It is not so much Greene who takes up that note as it is Jon Butler, who interprets the Awakening (such as it was) not as an assertion of American cultural identity but as the continuation of a steady process of imposing formal institutional religious authority on populations who had heretofore escaped it. "Europeans in America did not flee their past; they embraced it," Butler wrote in 1990, "They moved toward the exercise of authority, not away from it, and they understood that individual religious observance prospered best in the New World environment through the discipline of coercive institutional authority." In so saying, Butler has produced what amounts to yet another argument about assimilation, with the Awakenings as examples of "reli-

gious, social, and economic maturation" in the colonies that often aimed at homogenizing various "ethnic dimensions in religious observance, both Scottish and German," into a single imperial evangelical form.³³

Greene, unfortunately, preferred to by-pass the Awakening as he had by-passed slavery, and studies of Virginia community like Darrett and Anita Rutman's *A Place in Time: Middlesex County, Virginia, 1650-1750* (1984) usually come to conclusion in midcentury, before any form of the Great Awakening arrived in Virginia. Consequently, our understanding of the Awakening in the South, and especially Virginia, relies very largely on Richard Beeman's and Rhys Isaac's work on the Virginia New Light Baptists, which clearly hooked evangelical Awakeners, in Heimert-like style, to the Revolution and a new American political ideology and away from assimilation.³⁴ The attractiveness of Isaac's story turns on the variety of sources he used to illustrate it—not the elite texts used by Heimert, but passers-by on roads and highways, the patriarchal organization of buildings, the hierarchical message of Anglican church architecture. Although Isaac's overall message is about the transformation of Virginia culture from a provincial hierarchy to a fragmented, contentious republican society, the New Light Baptists and the Awakening in Virginia play the catalytic role in this transformation, in that the New Light Baptists created a counterculture of austerity, ecstatic and extempore preaching, and social fellowship to which Virginia elites were eventually forced by the Revolution to concede, and then surrender, power. Given the fact that the Awakening in Virginia continues into the 1760s, Isaac represents a formidable bid to reestablish the political and revolutionary significance of the Awakening as its central plot; unfortunately, it is precisely the fact that Isaac's Awakening occurs so conveniently in the 1760s that raises legitimate questions about whether his New Light Baptists have any meaningful connection with the New England and Pennsylvania events of 1739-1742. Without that connection, Isaac's New Light Baptists become merely an isolated and local phenomenon, whose relationship to the Revolution is a freak of the Virginia environment, not Heimert's Awakening political ideology.

Of course, even if Isaac is right about Virginia, that does little to dislodge the justice of Jon Butler's complaints about Heimertizing the rest of the Awakening. And indeed, if one looks at evangelicals in the 1760s in places like Philadelphia, the papers and records of the "second-generation" evangelicals like William Bradford reveal a behavior of assimilation to imperial culture and "replication" almost inverse to that of Isaac's Baptists. Isaac is also on unsteady ground when dealing with Virginia's slave population in the Awakening, especially since Isaac claims that African Americans were moved only marginally by his New Light Baptists and created an evangelical ethos with none of Isaac's critical interest in republican self-control. Recent articles by Leigh Eric Schmidt, Stephen J. Stein, Alan Galloway, and Frank Lambert have pointed out that white Awakeners in the South were indeed culpably timid in confronting

the racial status quo, but Lambert and Albert Raboteau have taken particular pain to show that African Americans appropriated the Awakening for their own purposes and equipped it with their own meanings quite apart from the intentions of Whitefield or the other white Awakeners.³⁵ Indeed, it is seriously worth wondering how much the affectional style of the Awakeners found a major pool of support in the response of African Americans, for whom traditional religion had always contained strong affectional elements. Historians have paid unaccountably little attention to the repeated observations of the Awakeners about the large numbers of African American hearers and converts whom they encountered, and it may well turn out to be no accident that New England towns with the most serious outbreaks of radical separatism were those like Groton and New London, which had unusually large concentrations of free and enslaved African Americans in the eighteenth century.³⁶

Another problem with giving Isaac too long an interpretive leash is the short shrift he gives the Presbyterians in Virginia. George W. Pilcher has given us at least one study of a major New Side Presbyterian in Virginia in *Samuel Davies: Apostle of Dissent in Colonial Virginia* (1971), and the late Lefferts Loetscher provided another biography of a Scots-Irish Virginia Presbyterian who was greatly affected by New Side revivalism in the Shenandoah in his *Facing the Enlightenment and Pietism: Archibald Alexander and the Founding of Princeton Theological Seminary* (1983). But beyond that, the Virginia Presbyterians are still in need of the kind of description that Isaac provided for the Baptists.³⁷ If Heimert is right, then such a study should demonstrate a substantial set of interconnections between the various ethnic and regional revivals that dotted the British American seaboard. For the Virginia Presbyterians, far more so than Isaac's Baptists, were much better placed, in terms of the ethnic geography of the mid-Atlantic, to sustain such interconnections. After all, Samuel Davies was originally a Pennsylvanian, moved to northern Virginia with the tide of Scots-Irish immigration there in 1749, attempted to lure both Edwards and Joseph Bellamy to Virginia, and ended up moving to New Jersey to take up what became the central post of New Light leadership in the 1760s at Princeton. If the Great Awakening was a single event that possesses a coherence beyond the New England and Pennsylvania events of 1739-1742, the evidence of it will lie, not with Isaac's Baptists, but with people like Davies and his migratory evangelical Scots.

2

The mention of biographies highlights the odd way in which the Awakening, however else it may want for sociological, ethnocultural, or demographic analysis, has never lacked for biographers, and sometimes hagiographers.³⁸ The most potent subject for biography in the Awakening has always been George Whitefield, and the Great Itinerant's most useful

biographer has always been himself, since Whitefield unhesitatingly parlayed his own *Journals* and ostensibly private correspondence into public propaganda and publicity for his revivals.³⁹ Hardly a year passed after his death, however, before a crowd of biographers began jostling together to recreate his image. Luke Tyerman's 1200-page *The Life of the Rev. George Whitefield (1876-1877)* was the standard biography of Whitefield for almost a century. But Tyerman was tipped off that pedestal by the Canadian Baptist Arnold Dallimore in his two-volume *George Whitefield: The Life and Times of the Great Evangelist of the Eighteenth-Century Revival (1970, 1980)*, for although Dallimore's biography was plainly written that ye may believe, it represents a major effort to move Whitefield out of the shadow of Wesley, to redeem him from the picture of public buffoon that the enemies of the Awakening retailed, and to establish in painstaking detail Whitefield's transatlantic goings and comings over three decades.

Whitefield has subsequently become the centerpiece of two of the most innovative interpretations of the Awakening, by Harry Stout and Frank Lambert, where the questions shift from assimilation to modernization. Stout's biography of Whitefield is closely connected to both his earlier studies of New Light preaching rhetoric and his long-term sympathies with Heimert. Accordingly, Stout's Whitefield is primarily a preacher; in fact, more than a preacher, Whitefield is an actor, a "divine dramatist," who skillfully links evangelical religion with the new public culture of "theatricality" in the eighteenth century. But true to Heimert, Stout's Whitefield is also a harbinger of the Revolution, bravely standing up for the interests of Americans in the 1760s and warning his English brethren not to press the colonies unrighteously. For Lambert, who stands in the shadow of Timothy Breen (his dissertation advisor) rather than Heimert, Whitefield is primarily an entrepreneur who manipulates the eighteenth-century "consumer revolution" and commodifies evangelical religion through his published journals and sermons.⁴⁰ Lambert's Whitefield, unlike Stout's, has virtually no message about politics or revolution, but he does have tremendous significance as a cultural shaper of a new Habermas-like "religious public sphere" in which abstract public debate is substituted for class-based authoritarian pronouncements. Lambert's Whitefield seized control of "the expanding network of colonial newspapers" through a deliberate "print and preach" strategy; "crafted a new religion out-of-doors, beyond parish boundaries"; and "employed the language of reason," rather than ecclesiastical authority, which appealed to the newly rationalized audience in an age of expanding commerce.⁴¹ From both Lambert and Stout, there emerges a picture of the Awakening as a swiftly moving, sophisticated, coordinated, and dynamic communicative event that in some measure belies the localized and New England-dominated image of Butler's critique, as well as leaving earlier images of the Awakening as a desperate (or valiant) reaction against modernity seriously wanting.

Oddly, it is not individual clergymen as much as the clergy considered as a whole who have come under some of the most sophisticated scrutiny in the literature of the Great Awakening. The social state of the ministers has fascinated a number of historians, since the role of the clergy as public intellectuals in the eighteenth century has eerie valences for modern academics. James W. Schmotter, George Harper, J. W. T. Youngs, David Harlan, and Donald Scott all address in varying ways the decay of religious and social authority in the clergy both before and after the Awakening, while the first three chapters of E. Brooks Holifield's *A History of Pastoral Care in America: From Salvation to Self-Realization* (1983) lay out the changes in pastoral theory and practice that the Awakening induced.⁴² Once again, however, the conclusions that emerge from such specialized professional studies have been strangely contradictory. Schmotter, for instance, insisted that "New Englanders aroused by the spirit of revivalism" deserted their respectable parsons to "turn to Baptist or Separatist meetings," while the "ties of professionalism" that had bound the clergy together as a professional caste disintegrated during their "internecine squabbling" over the Awakening. Holifield and Youngs saw the relationships of clergy and people change, too, but less in terms of a decrease of political authority and more in terms of an adjustment of clerical style to accommodate the increasing demands of the people that the clergy make "concern for the people the *essence* of clerical leadership."⁴³

If the preachers of the Awakening can call forth such a conflicting body of analysis, then it has to be said that their rivals and critics have summoned forth almost as much. That the Old Lights have survived with any shred of attraction left is largely due to Conrad Wright's deeply sympathetic account of their response to the Awakening and to Edmund S. Morgan's beautiful biography of Ezra Stiles.⁴⁴ On the other side of the spectrum, New Light radicalism, whether in the form of the Separate Congregationalists, Free Will Baptists, or Universalists, became the focus of the late Clarence C. Goen, in his benchmark study of the Separates, *Revivalism and Separatism in New England, 1740-1800: Strict Congregationalists and Separate Baptists in the Great Awakening* (1962); David Lovejoy, in his broad survey of *Religious Enthusiasm in the New World: Heresy to Revolution* (1985); and Stephen Marini, in his colorful and provocative monograph on *Radical Sects of Revolutionary New England* (1982). The uproar over James Davenport and the Separates in New London has garnered the most significant scholarly attention, especially in articles by Richard Warch, Peter Onuf, and Harry Stout, but Leigh Eric Schmidt has also focused attention on the Boston Separate Andrew Crosswell, whose publications in defense of New Light radicalism gave more theological heft to the Separates than the social "shock tactics" used by Davenport and Timothy Allen. Those "shock tactics," as Onuf and Stout have shown, were not without their own rhyme and reason, since Davenport's theatrical defiance of the Standing Order in New Lon-

don was carefully calculated to encourage an "assertive role" for audiences and congregations. As Stout and Onuf conclude, "By successfully calling into question the integrity of the religious establishment and enjoining these people to act for themselves, Davenport demonstrated how tenuous were the bonds of social order and how fragile traditional controls could be in a rapidly changing society. . . . This awakening—which released so much anger and discord—offered a glimpse into things as they were and were becoming in a world at war with itself."⁴⁵

This brings us at last to Jonathan Edwards. No survey of the literature of the Awakening can honestly avoid Edwards, just as none can safely try to do him bibliographical justice. He is, as Martin Marty remarked in the midst of an even more ambitious bibliographical survey, "the single one-purpose industry among American historians."⁴⁶ As with Whitefield, the most important sources on Edwards are by Edwards himself, and the twelve current volumes of the Yale University Press *Works of Jonathan Edwards*, each with an introduction that could stand alone as a work of scholarship, offer the best introduction to the man whom George Bancroft advised students to give their days and nights to if they wished to understand America. Approaching the secondary literature on Edwards is more daunting, since Edwards's theological students fashioned a formidable school of Calvinistic theology around his writings known as the New Divinity, and the flourishing of the New Divinity between 1760 and 1840 left a lengthy trail of commentary and controversy on Edwards through the major theological quarterlies of the new republic. With the passing of the New England Theology, Edwards's general popularity declined, and by the 1920s, studies of Edwards by Progressives like Parrington and Henry Bamford Parkes had fixed him as a reactionary but tragically talented figure that Americans had safely left behind them. Even Ola Elizabeth Winslow's lengthy and largely sympathetic biography of Edwards in 1940 could not escape a measure of regret that Edwards had chained himself to a backwards and anti-intellectual religious mentality.⁴⁷ Largely in response to this, Perry Miller's 1949 biography of Edwards, riding high on the neo-orthodox critique of liberalism popularized by Reinhold Niebuhr, restructured Edwards as a Niebuhr-like critic of modern acquisitiveness whose admiration for Lockean sensationalism clearly fixed him as a thoroughly American thinker and whose Calvinism was a weapon a "tamed cynic" could feel comfortable with.⁴⁸

It is to Miller, whose dramatic style and fierce championship of Edwards are written large across every page of *Jonathan Edwards*, more than anyone else that we owe the modern revival of interest in Edwards, and it may be worth wondering if the entire historiography of the Great Awakening since 1949 is simply an indirect beneficiary. But, as if to confirm Marty's comment about the industriousness of Edwards scholars, Miller has been rendered increasingly out-of-date by the tide of Edwards studies published in the 1980s and the early 1990s. Clearly, the most

important of these publications are the ones that have attempted to call a halt to the wave of biographical modernizations: Norman Fiering's *Jonathan Edwards's Moral Thought and Its British Context* (1981), which corrects many of the more egregious interpretive errors in Miller's reading of Edwards (principally, Fiering weans Edwards off Locke and puts him back within the context of Continental theocentric rationalism) without sacrificing any of the intellectual excitement Miller imparted to him, and William S. Morris's *The Young Jonathan Edwards: A Reconstruction* (1991), a book that developed a legendary—almost cult—following among Edwardseans but that had to wait almost thirty years to make the transition from a University of Chicago dissertation to publication. Morris, like Fiering, sets Edwards against the background of Edwards's own reading in Continental rationalism and Protestant scholasticism as a student at Yale, and opened up a view of the Edwards who went up to Yale and met, not Locke, but de Maastricht.

Fiering helped to ignite a flurry of reexaminations of Edwards's philosophical writings and pushed intellectual historians into a radical reconsideration of Edwards's long-term place in American philosophy.⁴⁹ One of the best samplings of the various forms that the intellectual history of Edwards has taken is the volume of essays collected from the papers given by Henry May, Norman Fiering, Wilson Kimnach, and others at a major conference on Edwards at Wheaton College in 1984, and published by Nathan Hatch and Harry Stout as *Jonathan Edwards and the American Experience* (1988). Ironically, as Edwards's philosophical reputation ascended, his preeminence as a theologian seemed to dim. I remember thinking, as a graduate student attending the 1984 Wheaton conference, how peculiar it was that a meeting dedicated to Jonathan Edwards, and held in the Billy Graham Center at Wheaton College, could get through three days of papers on Edwards and never once mention "Sinners in the Hands of An Angry God." Perhaps this is because the theologians have turned out, ironically, to be the ones most concerned with making Edwards "modern," and most of them are unaccountably chary of talking about Edwards's role in the Great Awakening. Two recent and lengthy theological surveys of Edwards's thought by Sang Hyun Lee and Robert W. Jenson, both theological seminary professors, quixotically pleaded for Edwards's "modernity" and invoked as their pole-star the name, not of Fiering, but Perry Miller (in Lee's case, in the first sentence of his book).⁵⁰

This has meant, oddly, that the most successful work on Edwards and the Great Awakening has been that which grounds Edwards in the mentality and context of western Massachusetts in the mid-eighteenth century. Gregory H. Nobles, Patricia J. Tracy, and Kenneth P. Minkema (in his unpublished dissertation on the Edwards family) have presented surveys of the social and familial world of the upper Connecticut River Valley, and Tracy in particular draws close connections between the pressures exerted on Northampton's youth and the theological and spiritual

message Edwards was presenting to them.⁵¹ The picture of Edwards that emerges from Tracy's book is not particularly happy: as a student of Stephen Nissenbaum, Tracy had picked up on a suggestion Nissenbaum embedded at the close of the book he and Paul Boyer coauthored on the Salem witch trials, a suggestion that asked for some consideration of the Great Awakening and the 1692 witch frenzy as being two sides of the same response to social and economic pressure in New England.⁵² In that light, Edwards becomes a desperate figure, struggling to preserve clerical authority in an atmosphere of economic stress and instability, and turning to the most vulnerable part of the Northampton community, the young and landless (just as the young and landless turned out to be the chief accusers at Salem), to build a power base. The Great Awakening thus becomes Edwards's bid to succeed Solomon Stoddard, turning the children against the parents, and then ultimately the children against himself in 1750 when he failed to deliver on the promises of redemption and security that the Awakening had offered to them. The question that lingers in the mind after these works, however, is still the question of awe and terror: would Jonathan Edwards have recognized himself on these pages? Or do these studies, useful as they are, only underscore that Edwards may be the first place where the new language of the Awakening must be written?

3

There are several ways to measure the impact of an event or a movement. Alan Heimert made his measurements almost entirely on the basis of elite texts, an approach with weaknesses that have only become more glaring the more we have understood the dynamic relationship that exists between texts and readers. Part of the ease with which Butler made his critique of Heimert rested on his understanding of how closely confined the influence of those texts could be in the eighteenth century's public sphere, and it was Butler's knowledge of both the geographical and perceptual constraints of elite religious texts that undergirded the punishing assertions he made in 1982 about the Awakening's regional limitations and the few real challenges to elite religious leadership offered by the revivals. What we have learned about the economic and social constraints on the eighteenth-century Protestant clergy, and their dependence for marginal livelihoods on the good will of their congregations, makes it even more problematic that they could have assumed the directing role Heimert imputed to them. Even if the clergy were in some way important to the Revolution, it probably had little to do with whether they were New Lights or not.

And yet, most of the work that has been published on the Awakening since 1982 has demonstrated that there were limitations in Butler's critique, too. Butler's Gramscian portrayal of eighteenth-century Americans being herded by a clerical hegemony toward "Christianization" ignored

the work of European popular culturalists, which stressed the shared spiritual and intellectual interactions of clergy and laity.⁵³ Similarly, new research on the radicalism of New Light laypeople in the Revolutionary era has given a subtle and unexpected restorative to Heimert's demand to see the Awakening and the Revolution as a single chain of ideological events. Add to this the recovery of the transatlantic evangelical networks performed by Ward, O'Brien, Crawford, and others, and the extraordinarily sophisticated manipulation of rhetoric and print for lay audiences and readers that Stout and Lambert have shown in Whitefield, and the various regional pieces of the Awakening begin to take on far more coherent and interwoven shape than we had supposed (although caution will interrupt to suggest that *transatlantic* is not the same as *intercolonial*, that New Light radicals shared their radicalism with numbers of Old Lights, deists, Anglicans, Catholics, and Jews, and that bits of connection do not guarantee coherence).

That caution is what leads me to deflect discussion of the importance of the Awakening away from the preoccupation with the creation of a *political* mentality that prepared Americans for the Revolution, and to urge pursuit of the very substantial role that the Awakening played in shaping the American *evangelical* mentality. The Awakening crystallized a particular religious ideology, shaped around the experience of direct conversion, disinterested benevolence, and a peculiar connection between individualistic assent to religious experience and the possibility for a new, heightened shape of communal order. When one surveys the religious establishments of Virginia and New England, and the sectarian chaos of the middle colonies in the eighteenth century, there is comparatively little in the religious history of those communities that foreshadows what we have come to recognize as modern evangelicalism; even among the most direct offspring of the Radical Reformation, one finds pietism and quietism but not evangelicalism. That in large measure was the offspring of the Awakening, and the Awakening remains the formative event of the American evangelical mentality—it gave methods, psychology, and (in the form of Edwards, Brainerd, and Whitefield) role-models and heroes.⁵⁴ It may be true that Edwards's influence in the 1740s extended little beyond the Connecticut River Valley, but that influence had grown gigantic by the end of the century, and personalities as volatile as Charles Grandison Finney and John Brown all have connections to the ideas Edwards and the New Divinity developed to define the Awakening. Alongside the question of a persistent evangelical ideology formed by the Awakening, there must also be the question of how that ideology institutionalized itself. One real but remarkably unappreciated accomplishment of the Awakening in New England was the dominance it gave to Yale College in western New England. Riding the same tide of institutionalization into the nineteenth century were the explicitly New Light colleges like Dartmouth, Brown, and Princeton (all more-or-less offspring of Yale) and their nineteenth-century spin-offs, Oberlin, Knox, the Oneida Insti-

tute, Mount Holyoke, Wheaton—all of whom transmitted and transformed the New Light and the New Divinity in radical ways.

Still, the influence of elite texts, if not the clergy elites themselves, on the political ideology of the Revolution cannot be waved entirely aside. Even if we concede the criticism that an American Revolution led by Thomas Jefferson and Tom Paine seems to wear little of the impress of Jonathan Edwards or George Whitefield, that concession may be in danger of ignoring the long-duration meaning of the texts of the Awakening for American political culture. *Freedom of the Will* and *The Religious Affections* might have had little formative power over the Enlightened minds of the Continental Congress, but they staged a dramatic comeback in the early nineteenth century when the deism of the Founding Fathers had mostly gone to seed. As John Murrin observed, "If we are determined to attribute a major political and military upheaval to revival fervor, we would do far better to choose the Civil War, not the Revolution." Perhaps not in 1775, but far more certainly in 1861, the children of the Awakening "imposed their social vision upon their fellow citizens until their reformist ardor drove an angry South to secession." And it is in that long-term influence, rather than the short-term connections to the Revolution, that we may have to find the long-sought political meanings of the Awakening. "Without the Great Awakening and its successors, there would have been a revolution in 1775," Murrin concedes, "but in all probability, no Civil War in 1861."⁵⁵ There are several other such connections that have gone curiously undrawn between the Awakening and the nineteenth century, not the least of which concerns the relationship of religion and capitalism. After all, the Awakening took place simultaneously with the development of international commercial capitalism over the century between 1730 and 1830; and yet, apart from Mark Valeri's essay on Edwards, no serious effort has been made to situate the correspondence of the Awakening and the capitalist transformation of the Anglo-American economy.⁵⁶ This does not mean that we should be looking simply for a bigger and better version of the Osgood–Miller–Heimert paradigm. Recent historians of early American radicalism have found a striking connection between the Awakeners and revolutionary radicalism among agrarian Regulators, artisans, and urban mechanics and slaves. In surveying the work of Alan Taylor on the Maine land rioters of the 1780s and 90s, and Michael Merrill and Sean Wilentz on the New Divinity laborer William Manning, Alfred Young has concluded that the political resistance of early republican radicals was "as their language alone suggests . . . often rooted in religion, especially in the evangelical dissenting faiths. Evangelical religion surfaces in protest throughout these essays."⁵⁷ Thus, Heimert may have been right after all, but not for the reasons he thought.

The possible connections of the evangelical ideology of the Awakening, Revolutionary radicalism, and the evangelicalized political culture of nineteenth-century politics have only been tentatively explored as yet. But

within the orbit of that interest, the most important story about radicalism and the Awakening is that of gender more than class. We have known for a long time about the predominance of women as members of colonial churches, but we have not known how to translate that demographic fact into a statement of gender, and so, oddly, we know very little about the formative influence of gender in the Awakening. What makes this odder still in the context of the Awakening is that we do know that the spiritual experience of women plays a significant role in the accounts of Edwards, the Tennents, and Whitefield. We are also becoming more dimly aware that the evangelical communications networks were highly gendered: women wrote to women even as men wrote to men, although curiously (in generational terms) daughters seem to have imbibed their evangelicalism from their fathers to transmit to their children. Beyond that, however, whatever else we know of women in the Awakening underscores a paradoxical combination of submission and assertiveness, and assertiveness clearly did not win the day. Susan Juster has pointed out how New Light Baptists, in the crux of the Awakening, were willing to let down the walls of patriarchy —only to build them up again after the passage of a generation and the fervor of revival. Similarly, we do not know much about womens' participation in the revivals themselves.⁵⁸ Mary Beth Norton and Charles Hambrick-Stowe have succeeded in recovering the experiences of Sarah Osborn, a disciple of Samuel Hopkins's in Newport, Rhode Island, and Osborn's career as an organizer and promoter of revival interest in the 1750s and 1760s may offer a pattern for understanding still further the opportunities and limits imposed on gender by the Awakeners. But even as sparse as these explorations may be at present, they already decisively question Ann Douglas's "feminization" thesis, for contrary to Douglas's assertion that women "feminized" and debased the masculine Calvinism of post-Awakening New England into a thin gruel of sentimentalism, Edwardsean women from Sarah Pierpont Edwards to Mary Lyon of Mt. Holyoke not only embraced the most ultra forms of New Light Calvinism but were remarkably successful in promoting them.⁵⁹ That, in turn, may help to open up a larger question of ambiguity in American evangelicalism, which concerns its persistent capacity to involve itself in both radical individualism and self-absorbed communalism, in both radical antielitism and complacent bourgeois conservatism.

Much as there is new ground to turn over, there is also some old ground that is far from exhausted. Donald Weber's *Rhetoric and History in Revolutionary New England* (1988), as well as the Stout and Lambert biographies of Whitefield, have demonstrated that the rhetorical meanings of the Awakening are far from well understood. Tied to further consideration of rhetoric and speech must be a consideration of public ritual (along the lines hinted at by Rhys Isaac). Evangelical religion has always been a religion of signs, but the perception of those signs has usually been occluded by the prominence of evangelical speech, as though evan-

gical Protestantism in the eighteenth century (and the Great Awakening with it) was an exercise in gnosticism rather than pietism. That the Awakening invented participatory rituals other than Davenport's breeches-burning has only been faintly touched on, and then usually in the context of ethnic exceptionalism. What is yet to be done is the identification and elaboration of the larger patterns of evangelical performance that were established in the Awakening (the concert of prayer, the emergence of a folk hymnody in the singing schools and shaped-note hymnody of Daniel Read and Jeremiah Ingalls) and preserved in nineteenth-century evangelicalism. And not only in evangelicalism: Charles Grandison Finney is frequently described as a revivalist who appropriated the style of lawyers to win his "retainer for the Lord Jesus Christ," but Richard D. Brown is right to question whether the shoe may really be on the other foot, and whether the rhetorical culture of early American lawyers (like Tapping Reeve, in the heart of New Divinity country in Connecticut's Litchfield County) may have instead imitated New Light preaching.⁶⁰ Above all, we are desperately impoverished in our understanding of the spirituality of the Awakening, despite the fact that a sizeable proportion of the Awakening's texts were devotional rather than polemic, and despite the fact that Edwards and Prince consciously hoped to prove the unrevolutionary nature of the Awakening by deploying reprintings of seventeenth-century devotional texts. However, persuading historians, not to mention the editors of scholarly periodicals, to take spirituality with any seriousness may be a far more difficult task than the actual work of research and analysis.⁶¹

The Great Awakening was not as revolutionary or culturally unique an event as some of its admirers have claimed, but neither was it as unsophisticated, provincial, and resultless as its decriers have asserted. Its immediate effects tended to be localized, but the strength of transatlantic connections and intercolonial communications guaranteed that those effects would be described, read, internalized, and exemplified across a broad mental and physical geography in British North America. It was in many respects a backwards-looking and by no means American event, in that it borrowed freely from Scottish and Continental precedents—from communion fairs to childrens' conversions—and gave a renewed lease to what David Hall called "the mentality of wonders," and yet it also galvanized separation, conflict, and new forms of communal action, and dissipated the elite solidarities upon which deference, force, and persuasion rested. If the interpretive wind still blows from any direction, it is still from Heimert's and not Butler's, although it blows in ways that Heimert paid little attention to. The Great Awakening occupies a peculiar borderland between intellectual history and religious history, between the history of influential elites and large social movements. Much of the difficulty we have experienced in discussing the Awakening lies precisely in how it straddles these boundaries in its odd ungainly way, and much of the standoff we have witnessed about the Awakening's long-duration

significance in American history has arisen from seeing it only on one side of those boundaries. There is much that we do not know about the Awakening, much more in fact than we realize (estimates of the actual numbers of converts, for instance, still rest on Benjamin Trumbull's and Joseph Tracy's educated guesses in the early nineteenth century), while at the same time, the moment is long past for a large-scale synthetic history of the Awakening.⁶² More than a narrative of surprising conversions, I fully expect that it will be a narrative of surprising convergences.

NOTES

I wish to thank Rose Beiler, Donna Rilling, Cathy McDonnell, Jane Merritt, James Pearson, Liam Riordan, Marianne Wokeck, Michael Zuckerman, and the friends and Fellows of the Philadelphia Center for Early American Studies for their helpful commentary on a preliminary draft of this chapter.

1. Hall, "Religion and Society: Problems and Considerations," in *Colonial British America: Essays in the New History of the Early Modern Era* (Baltimore, 1984), 317.

2. Heimert and Miller, "Introduction," *The Great Awakening* (Indianapolis, 1967), xiii-xv; Butler, "Enthusiasm Described and Decried: The Great Awakening as Interpretive Fiction," in *Journal of American History* 69 (September 1982): 324.

3. Tracy, *The Great Awakening: A History of the Revival of Religion in the time of Edwards & Whitefield* (Boston, 1842), 402, 406, 414.

4. Conforti, "The Invention of the Great Awakening, 1795-1842," in *Early American Literature* 26 (September 1991): 99-118, and "Edwardseans, Unitarians, and the Memory of the Great Awakening, 1800-1840," in *American Unitarianism, 1805-1865*, ed. Conrad E. Wright (Boston, 1989), 31-50.

5. See Noah Porter, "President Edwards on Revivals," in *Quarterly Christian Spectator* 1 (1827): 295-308; Daniel T. Fiske, "New England Theology," in *Bibliotheca Sacra* 22 (July-October, 1865): 467-512, 568-87; Edwards Amasa Park, "New England Theology," in *Bibliotheca Sacra* 9 (January 1852): 170-219; Edwards Amasa Park, "Introductory Essay," in *The Atonement: Discourses and Treatises by Edwards, Smalley, Maxcy, Emmons, Griffin, Burge, and Weeks* (Boston, 1859), pp. ix-xlvii; Charles Hodge, *The Constitutional History of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America* (Philadelphia, 1851), part 2, 11-101; Archibald Alexander, *The Log College: Biographical Sketches of William Tennent and his students, together with an account of the revivals under their ministries* (1851; London, 1968), 7-13; Benjamin Trumbull, *A Complete History of Connecticut, Civil and Ecclesiastical* (1818; New London, 1848), volume 2, 103-219; for a modern survey of this literature see, Mark Noll, "Jonathan Edwards and Nineteenth-Century Theology," in *Jonathan Edwards and the American Experience*, Nathan O. Hatch and Harry S. Stout, eds. (New York, 1988), 260-87.

6. Osgood, *The American Colonies in the Eighteenth Century* (New York, 1924), volume 3, 409; it also has to be noted that one other secular response to the Awakening was to ignore it entirely—Lawrence Henry Gipson's great multi-

volume history of the Anglo-American empire in the eighteenth century hardly notices the Awakening from either British or American perspectives, and only *The British Isles and the American Colonies: The Southern Plantations, 1748-1754* (New York, 1960) and *The British Isles and the American Colonies: The Northern Plantations, 1748-1754* (New York, 1965) actually managed to give the Awakening a total of five pages of notice; similarly, Carl Bridenbaugh's urban histories, *Cities in the Wilderness: The First Century of Urban Life in America, 1625-1742* (New York, 1938), gave only two of its 481 pages to the Awakening, while his sequel, *Cities in Revolt: Urban Life in America, 1743-1776* (New York, 1955), only managed to mention the Awakening on four of its 425 pages, and Bridenbaugh's history of Philadelphia, *Rebels and Gentlemen: Philadelphia in the Age of Franklin* (New York, 1942), devoted all of two paragraphs to it; even Stephanie Graumann Wolf's recent *As Various As Their Land: The Everyday Lives of Eighteenth-Century Americans* (New York, 1993) only has space on four of its 279 pages for the Great Awakening.

7. Parrington, *Main Currents in American Thought: An Interpretation of American Literature from the Beginnings to 1920* (New York, 1926), volume 1, 160-61.

8. Gewehr, *The Great Awakening in Virginia* (Durham, N.C., 1930), 187; Maxson, *The Great Awakening in the Middle Colonies* (Chicago, 1920), 150.

9. Heimert, *Religion and the American Mind from the Great Awakening to the Revolution* (Cambridge, Mass., 1966), 9-10, 12, 100, 300, 532.

10. Morgan's review of Heimert appeared in the *William and Mary Quarterly* 24 (July 1967): 454-59.

11. Stout, "Religion, Communications, and the Ideological Origins of the American Revolution," in *William and Mary Quarterly* 34 (October 1977): 521, 533; Stout, *The New England Soul: Preaching and Religious Culture in Colonial New England* (New York, 1986), 193, 218-19, 286.

12. Nash, *The Urban Crucible: Social Change, Political Consciousness, and the Origins of the American Revolution* (Cambridge, Mass., 1979), 204, 208, 218, 223, 384. Even when historians were not modeling themselves directly on Heimert's thesis, it was still clear that his book had exerted a tremendous pull on their interpretations of the Awakening. Richard Bushman's *From Puritan to Yankee: Character and Social Order in Connecticut, 1690-1765* (New York, 1967), was critical of Heimert's overemphasis of "the political significance of the New Divinity" at the expense of "religious issues," but Bushman still lauded the "valuable insights" of Heimert's book (302) and developed an argument structurally similar to Heimert's which saw the Awakening as the catalyst for transforming Connecticut from a provincial and hierarchical society to an individualistic "Yankee" democracy.

13. Mark A. Noll, "Ebenezer Devotion: Religion and Society in Revolutionary Connecticut," in *Church History* 45 (September 1976): 293-307, and "Moses Mather (Old Calvinist) and the Evolution of Edwardseanism," in *Church History* 49 (September 1980): 273-85.

14. Hatch, *The Sacred Cause of Liberty: Republican Thought and the Millennium in Revolutionary New England* (New Haven, 1977), 25-26; William K. Breitenbach has also shown that Edwards's disciples, the New Divinity, were deeply ambivalent about commitments to individualism and community, in "Unregenerate Doings: Selflessness and Selfishness in New Divinity Theology," in *American Quarterly* 34 (Winter 1985): 479-502; Tucker, "The Reinvention of

New England, 1691-1770," in *New England Quarterly* 59 (September 1986): 315-40.

15. Nash, *The Urban Crucible*, 204, 219.

16. Wallace, "Revitalization Movements," in *American Anthropologist* 58 (April 1956): 265, and "Paradigmatic Processes in Culture Change," in *Rockdale: The Growth of an American Village in the Early Industrial Revolution* (New York, 1978), 477-485; see also William G. McLoughlin, *Revivals, Awakenings, and Reform: An Essay on Religion and Social Change in America, 1607-1977* (Chicago, 1978), 12-23.

17. James Clifford, *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art* (Cambridge, Mass.: 1988), 337-38; Martin Marty, "Explaining the Rise of Fundamentalism," in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (October 28, 1992), A56; Lewis R. Rambo, *Understanding Religious Conversion* (New Haven, 1993), 32-35, 41-42, 87; Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York, 1973), 25-310; see also Andrew Smout's "Born Again at Cambuslang: New Evidence on Popular Religion and Literacy in 18th Century Scotland," in *Past and Present* 97 (November 1982): 114-27, and Steven Bruce's "Social Change and Collective Behaviour: The Revival in 18th-Century Ross-shire," in *British Journal of Sociology* 34 (December 1983): 554-72, which are both critical of material reductionism, and which use literacy, reading patterns, and "affinity" of world views to describe religious decisionmaking as an independent variable in social formation.

18. See James P. Walsh, "The Pure Church in Eighteenth-Century Connecticut" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1970) and "Solomon Stoddard's Open Communion: A Re-examination," in *New England Quarterly* 43 (March 1970): 97-114; Gerald F. Moran, "The Puritan Saint: Religious Experience, Church Membership, and Piety in Connecticut, 1636-1776" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Rutgers University, 1973); Robert G. Pope, *The Half-Way Covenant: Church Membership in Puritan New England* (Princeton, 1969), 251-75; Paul Lucas, *Valley of Discord: Church and Society along the Connecticut River, 1636-1725* (Hanover, N.H., 1976), 169-202; Ralph Coffman, *Solomon Stoddard* (Boston, 1978), 48-102; and James W. Jones, *The Shattered Synthesis: New England Puritanism Before the Great Awakening* (New Haven, 1978), 104-28.

19. Lovelace, *Dynamics of Spiritual Life: An Evangelical Theology of Renewal* (Downers Grove, Ill., 1979), 21-22, 61-200, esp. 75; Michael Crawford offers a summary of the distinctions and materials used by the eighteenth-century revivalists in observing the Awakening in "The Morphology of Religious Revivals" in *Seasons of Grace: Colonial New England's Revival Tradition in its British Context* (New York, 1991), 180-95.

20. For the politicization of millennialism and its connections with the Awakening, see Ruth Bloch, "The Social and Political Base of Millennial Literature in Late 18th-Century America," in *American Quarterly* 40 (September 1988): 378-96; and *The Visionary Republic: Millennial Themes in American Thought, 1756-1800* (Cambridge, 1985), 10-21, and James West Davidson, *The Logic of Millennial Thought: Eighteenth Century New England* (New Haven, 1977), 213-54; and Sacvan Bercovitch, "The Typology of America's Mission," in *American Quarterly* 30 (Summer 1978): 135-55. For an approach to eighteenth-century millennialism that pushes the millennialism of the Awakeners into an international context instead, see Gerald R. McDermott, *One Holy and Happy Society:*

The Public Theology of Jonathan Edwards (University Park, Pa., 1992), 50-92.

21. May, *The Enlightenment in America* (New York, 1976), 49-50; Ward, *The Protestant Evangelical Awakening* (Cambridge, 1992), 2-10, 16-49, 353-55; see also, W. R. Ward, "Power and Piety: The Origins of Religious Revival in the Early Eighteenth Century," in *The Bulletin of the John Ryland University Library of Manchester* 63 (Autumn 1980): 231-52, "The Protestant Frame of Mind," in *History Today* 40 (September 1990): 18-24, and "The Relations of the Enlightenment and Religious Revival in Central Europe and in the English-Speaking World," in *Reform and Reformation: England and the Continent, 1500-1700*, ed. Derek Baker (Oxford, 1979), 281-305.

22. Susan O'Brien, "A Transatlantic Community of Saints: The Great Awakening and the First Evangelical Network, 1735-1755," in *American Historical Review* 91 (October 1986): 811-32; Rutter, "The New Birth: Evangelicalism in the Transatlantic Community During the Great Awakening, 1739-1745" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Rutgers University, 1982); Raimo, "Spiritual Harvest: The Anglo-American Revival in Boston, Massachusetts, and Bristol, England, 1739-1742" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1974); Simonson, "Jonathan Edwards and His Scottish Connections," in *Journal of American Studies* 21 (December 1987): 353-76; Crawford, *Seasons of Grace*, 19-28, 37-42, 53-65, 82-104, 141-79, 192-239.

23. Goodfriend, "The Social Dimensions of Congregational Life in Colonial New York City," in *William and Mary Quarterly* 46 (April 1989): 252-278, and *Before the Melting Pot: Society and Culture in Colonial New York City, 1664-1730* (Princeton, 1992), 81-94, 108-10, 121-32; Pointer, *Protestant Pluralism and the New York Experience: A Study of Eighteenth-Century Religious Diversity* (Bloomington, In., 1987), 29-52; Balmer, *A Perfect Babel of Confusion: Dutch Religion and English Culture in the Middle Colonies* (New York, 1989), 99-140; Westerkamp, *The Triumph of the Laity: Scots-Irish Piety and the Great Awakening, 1625-1760* (New York, 1989); Roeber, *Palatines, Liberty and Property: German Lutherans in Colonial British America* (Baltimore, 1993), 328; Schmidt, *Holy Fairs: Scottish Communion and American Revivals in the Early Modern Period* (Princeton, 1989); Landsman, *Scotland and Its First Colony, 1683-1765* (Princeton, 1985), 183-91, 227-55; see also Elizabeth Nybakken, "New Light on the Old Side: Irish Influences on Colonial Presbyterianism," in *Journal of American History* 68 (March 1982): 813-32.

24. Rothermund, *The Layman's Progress: Religious and Political Experience in Colonial Pennsylvania, 1740-1770* (Philadelphia, 1961), and "Political Factions and the Great Awakening," in *Pennsylvania History* 27 (October 1959): 317-31; Frantz, "The Awakening of Religion among the German Settlers of the Middle Colonies," *William and Mary Quarterly* 33 (April 1976): 266-88; Wolf, *Urban Village: Population, Community, and Family Structure in Germantown, Pennsylvania, 1683-1800* (Princeton, 1976), 203-42, 333-34.

25. See, for instance, Thomas Henry Billings, "The Great Awakening," in *Essex Institute Historical Collections* 65 (January 1929): 89-104, or Mary H. Mitchell, *The Great Awakening and Other Revivals in the Religious Life of Connecticut* (New Haven, 1934).

26. Bumsted, "Religion, Finance and Democracy in Massachusetts: The Town of Norton as a Case Study," *Journal of American History* 57 (March 1971): 817-31; Walsh, "The Great Awakening in the First Congregational Church of Woodbury, Connecticut," *William and Mary Quarterly* 28 (October 1971): 543-

62; Moran, "Conditions of Religious Conversion in the First Society of Norwich, Connecticut, 1718-1744," *Journal of Social History* 5 (Spring 1972): 331-43; Willingham, "Religious Conversion in the Second Society of Windham, Connecticut, 1723-1743: A Case Study," *Societas* 6 (1976): 109-19; Jeffries, "The Separation in the Canterbury Congregational Church: Religion, Family and Politics in a Connecticut Town," *New England Quarterly* 53 (December 1979): 522-49.

27. Jedrey, *The World of John Cleaveland: Family and Community in Eighteenth-Century New England* (New York, 1979), 52, 58-94; Robert Gross also links division and agitation over the Awakening in Concord, Massachusetts, to larger contentions over inheritance patterns and landholding, in *The Minutemen and Their World* (New York, 1976), 18-29.

28. Grossbart, "Seeking the Divine Favor: Conversion and Church Admission in Eastern Connecticut," *William and Mary Quarterly* 46 (October 1989): 696-740; for similar questions, see also Edward M. Cook, Jr., *The Fathers of the Towns: Leadership and Community Structure in Eighteenth Century New England* (Baltimore, 1976), 128-29.

29. Remer, "Old Lights and New Money: A Note on Religion, Economics and the Social Order," *William and Mary Quarterly* 47 (October 1990): 566-73.

30. Butler, *Power, Authority, and the Origins of American Denominational Order: The English Churches in the Delaware Valley, 1680-1730* (Philadelphia, 1978), 75-78, where Butler presents an early version of his attack on the Heimert thesis; Bonomi, *Under the Cope of Heaven: Religion, Society, and Politics in Colonial America* (New York, 1986), 72-92, 168-81; Nash, *The Urban Crucible*, 219-21, 227-32; see also Lodge's "The Crisis of the Churches in the Middle Colonies, 1720-1750," in *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 95 (April 1971): 195-220.

31. See Frederick Tolles, "Quietism and Enthusiasm: The Philadelphia Quakers and the Great Awakening," in *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 69 (January 1945): 26-49, where the Awakeners are interpreted as an immature version of the same enthusiasm that gave rise to Quakerism and that consequently embarrassed Quakers eager to disassociate themselves from their century-old roots in religious radicalism; see also E. G. Alderfer's history of the Ephrata community, *The Ephrata Commune: An Early American Counterculture* (Pittsburgh, 1985), where Whitefield is mentioned only once (101) and the Great Awakening not at all. The essays on *Continental Pietism and Early American Christianity* edited by F. Ernest Stoeffler (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1976) make almost no connection at all between the Awakening and the various forms and communities of German Reformed, Lutheran, Brethren, and Mennonite pietism in the American colonies, while Marianne Wokeck effectively demonstrates how German-speaking Lutheranism insulated itself from the concerns of the Awakeners in two as-yet unpublished papers, "The Desert Is Vast and the Sheep Are Dispersed: Henry Melchoir Muhlenberg's Views of the Immigrant Church" and "German Settlements in the North American Colonies: A Patchwork of Cultural Assimilation and Persistence."

32. John R. Williams, "The Strange Case of Dr. Franklin and Mr. Whitefield," in *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 102 (October 1978): 399-421; David T. Morgan, "A Most Unlikely Friendship—Benjamin Franklin and George Whitefield," in *The Historian* 47 (February 1985): 208-18; Lambert, "Subscribing for Profits and Piety: The Friendship of Benjamin Franklin and George Whitefield," in *William and Mary Quarterly* 50 (July 1993): 529-

48; see also chap. Four, "The Spirit and the Press," in Melvin Buxbaum, *Benjamin Franklin and the Zealous Presbyterians* (University Park, Pa., 1975), 116-52.

33. Butler, *Awash in a Sea of Faith: Christianizing the American People* (Cambridge, Mass., 1990), 128, 179.

34. Beeman, "Social Change and Cultural Conflict in Virginia: Lunenburg County, 1746 to 1774," in *William and Mary Quarterly* 35 (July 1978): 455-76, and *The Evolution of the Southern Backcountry: A Case Study of Lunenburg County, Virginia, 1746-1832* (Philadelphia, 1984); and Isaac, *The Transformation of Virginia, 1740-1790* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1982), 165-73, 278-95, 315, 322, and "Religion and Authority: Problems of the Anglican Establishment in Virginia in the Era of the Great Awakening and the Parsons' Cause," in *William and Mary Quarterly* 30 (January 1973): 3-36, and "Evangelical Revolt: The Nature of the Baptists' Challenge to the Traditional Order in Virginia, 1765-1775," in *William and Mary Quarterly* 31 (July 1974): 345-68; see also Jack Stephen Kroll-Smith, "In Search of Status Power: The Baptist Revival in Colonial Virginia, 1760-1776" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1982), 157-78, 185-218. Outside of Virginia, see Daniel T. Morgan, "The Great Awakening in North Carolina, 1740-1775: The Baptist Phase," in *North Carolina Historical Review* 45 (1968): 264-83.

35. Isaac, *Transformation*, 307; Schmidt, "The 'Grand Prophet' Hugh Bryan: Early Evangelicalism's Challenge to the Establishment and Slavery in the Colonial South," in *South Carolina Historical Magazine* 87 (October 1986): 238-50; Galley, "The Origins of Slaveholders' Paternalism: George Whitefield, the Bryan Family, and the Great Awakening in the South," in *Journal of Southern History* 53 (August 1987): 369-94; Stein, "George Whitefield on Slavery: Some New Evidence," in *Church History* 42 (June 1973): 243-56; Lambert, "I Saw the Book Talk: Slave Readings of the First Great Awakening," in *Journal of Negro History* 77 (Fall 1992): 185-98; Albert Raboteau, *Slave Religion: The Invisible Institution in the Antebellum South* (New York, 1978), 95-128.

36. Noel Ignatiev, "The Revolution as an African-American Exuberance," in *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 27 (Summer 1994): 605-13.

37. See Ernest T. Thompson, *Presbyterians in the South, Volume 1: 1607-1861* (Richmond, Va. 1963), 41-66; Robert F. Scott, "Colonial Presbyterianism in the Valley of Virginia," in *Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society* 35 (June 1957): 71-92, and 35 (September 1957), 171-92.

38. There are four major sources of short but highly useful biographical material in W. B. Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit; or Commemorative Notices of Distinguished American Clergymen of Various Denominations* (New York, 1859), volume 1; Clifford K. Shipton, *Sibley's Harvard Graduates: Biographical Sketches of Those Who Attended Harvard College* (Boston, 1937-1960), volumes 5-11, covering the classes of 1701 through 1745; F. B. Dexter, *Biographical Sketches of the Graduates of Yale College, October 1701-May 1745* (New York, 1885); and James McLachlan, *Princetonians, 1748-1768: A Biographical Dictionary* (Princeton, 1976). For individual Great Awakening-related biographies, see Joseph Conforti, *Samuel Hopkins and the New Divinity Movement: Calvinism, the Congregational Ministry, and Reform in New England Between the Great Awakenings* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1981), 23-40; Stanley Grenz, *Isaac Backus—Puritan and Baptist* (Macon, Ga., 1983), 55-91; Edward M. Griffin, *Charles Chauncy of Boston, 1705-1787* (Minneapolis, 1980), 46-108; and Charles Lippy, *Seasonable Revolutionary: The Mind of Charles*

Chauncy (Chicago, 1981), 20–77. The single major prorevival voice among the Church of England clergy in Virginia was Devereaux Jarratt, whose memoirs were edited and published by Douglass Adair as “The Autobiography of the Rev. Devereaux Jarratt,” in *William and Mary Quarterly* 9 (July 1952): 346–93; New Light Baptists also turn up frequently on the pages of Charles Woodmason’s famous *Journal*, which was edited and published by Richard J. Hooker as *The Carolina Backcountry on the Eve of the Revolution: The Journal and Other Writings of Charles Woodmason, Anglican Itinerant* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1953), and somewhat less frequently in Henry Melchoir Muhlenberg’s *The Journals of Henry Melchoir Muhlenberg*, eds. T. G. Tappert and J. W. Doberstein (Philadelphia, 1942–1958), 3 volumes.

39. Whitfield’s autobiographical *A Short Account of God’s Dealings with the Reverend Mr. George Whitefield*, A.B. (Philadelphia, 1740) and *A Further Account of God’s Dealings with the Reverend Mr. George Whitefield* (London, 1747), along with his eight *Journals*, were first published together by Whitefield himself in 1756, and then republished by William Wale in 1905 and again by Iain Murray as *George Whitefield’s Journals* (Edinburgh, 1960); Whitefield’s letters were published in the first three volumes of his six-volume *Works* (London, 1771), the first volume of which was reprinted with an introduction and the addition of thirty-four additional letters by S. M. Houghton as *Letters of George Whitefield* (Edinburgh, 1976).

40. Stout, *The Divine Dramatist: George Whitefield and the Rise of Modern Evangelicalism* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1991), xvi, xxii, 262–67, 287; in the end, Stout cannot resist connecting Whitefield with the Revolution by pointing to Whitefield’s condemnation of the Stamp Act and the American episcopate proposal before his death in 1770: “He died a Pauline evangelist and an American patriot” (287).

41. Lambert, “The Great Awakening as Artifact: George Whitefield and the Construction of Intercolonial Revival, 1739–1745,” in *Church History* 60 (June 1991): 223–46; Lambert, “Pedlar in Divinity: George Whitefield and the Great Awakening, 1737–1745,” in *Journal of American History* 77 (1990): 812–37; and Lambert’s full-scale biography, “Pedlar in Divinity”: *George Whitefield and the Transatlantic Revivals* (Princeton, 1993). On the construction of the “public sphere,” see William J. Gilmore, *Reading Becomes a Necessity of Life: Material and Cultural Life in Rural New England, 1780–1835* (Knoxville, 1989), and Michael Warner, *The Letters of the Republic: Publication and the Public Sphere in Eighteenth-Century America* (Cambridge, Mass., 1990), xiii.

42. Schmotter, “Ministerial Careers in Eighteenth-Century New England: The Social Context, 1700–1760,” in *Journal of Social History* 9 (Winter 1975): 249–67; Harper, “Clericalism and Revival: The Great Awakening in Boston as a Pastoral Phenomenon,” in *New England Quarterly* 57 (December 1984): 554–66; Harlan, *The Clergy and the Great Awakening in New England* (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1980), esp. 49–69.

43. Schmotter, “Clerical Professionalism in the Great Awakening,” in *American Quarterly* 31 (Summer 1979): 148–68; Youngs, *God’s Messengers: Religious Leadership in Colonial New England, 1700–1750* (Baltimore, 1976), 139–40.

44. Wright, *The Beginnings of Unitarianism in America* (Boston, 1955), 28–58; Morgan, *The Gentle Puritan: A Life of Ezra Stiles, 1727–1795* (New Haven, 1962), 20–77.

45. Richard Warch, "The Shepherd's Tent: Education and Enthusiasm in the Great Awakening," in *American Quarterly* 30 (Summer 1978): 177-98; Onuf, "New Lights in New London: A Group Portrait of the Separatists," in *William and Mary Quarterly* 37 (October 1980): 627-43; Stout and Onuf, "James Davenport and the Great Awakening in New London," in *Journal of American History* 71 (December 1983): 556-78; Schmidt, "A Second and More Glorious Reformation: The New Light Extremism of Andrew Crosswell," in *William and Mary Quarterly* 43 (April 1986): 214-44.

46. Marty, "American Religious History in the Eighties: A Decade of Achievement," in *Church History* 62 (September 1993): 367.

47. Parkes, *Jonathan Edwards: The Fiery Puritan* (New York, 1929), 249-55; Winslow, *Jonathan Edwards, 1703-1758* (New York, 1940), 325-30.

48. Miller, *Jonathan Edwards* (New York, 1949), 119-26, 270-72, 324-26.

49. Donald Weber, "The Figure of Jonathan Edwards," in *American Quarterly* 35 (Summer 1983): 556-64; James Hoopes, "Jonathan Edwards's Religious Psychology," in *Journal of American History* 69 (March 1983): 849-65; Allen C. Guelzo, *Edwards on the Will: A Century of American Theological Debate* (Middletown, Conn., 1989); Bruce Kuklick, *Churchmen and Philosophers: From Jonathan Edwards to John Dewey* (New Haven, Conn., 1985), 15-32.

50. Lee, *The Philosophical Theology of Jonathan Edwards* (Princeton, 1988), 3, and Jenson, *America's Theologian: A Recommendation of Jonathan Edwards* (New York, 1988), viii, 194-96; a far better example of a theologically oriented study of Edwards, rooted in Edwards's unpublished sermons and far more attentive to questions of historical context, is McDermott's *One Holy and Happy Society*, 43-92.

51. Nobles, *Divisions Throughout the Whole: Politics and Society in Hampshire County, Massachusetts, 1740-1775* (New York, 1983), 12-106; Tracy, *Jonathan Edwards, Pastor: Religion and Society in Eighteenth-Century Northampton* (New York, 1979), esp. 188-94; Minkema, "The Edwardses: A Ministerial Family in 18th-Century New England," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Connecticut, 1988), volume 1, 206-70.

52. Boyer and Nissenbaum, *Salem Possessed: The Social Origins of Witchcraft* (Cambridge, Mass., 1974), 215-16.

53. See A. G. Roeber, "The Problem of the Butler Transatlantic *Problematic* and American Religious History," unpublished paper read at the German Historical Institute Conference on Cultural Transfer, October 29-31, 1992.

54. Joseph Conforti, "Jonathan Edwards's Most Popular Work: 'The Life of David Brainerd' and Nineteenth-Century Evangelical Culture," in *Church History* 54 (June 1985): 188-201.

55. Murrin, "No Awakening, No Revolution? More Counterfactual Speculations," in *Reviews in American History* 11 (June 1983): 169.

56. Valeri, "The Economic Thought of Jonathan Edwards," in *Church History* 60 (March 1991): 37-54; see also McDermott, *One Holy and Happy Society*, 138-42.

57. Rhys Isaac, "Preachers and Patriots: Popular Culture and the Revolution in Virginia," in *The American Revolution: Explorations in the History of American Radicalism* (DeKalb, Ill., 1976), 125-56; Alfred F. Young, "How Radical was the American Revolution?" in *Beyond the American Revolution: Explorations in the History of American Radicalism* (DeKalb, Ill., 1993), 322; see also Richard D.

Birdsall, "The Reverend Thomas Allen, Jeffersonian Calvinist," in *New England Quarterly* 30 (June 1957): 147-65; and Lovejoy, *Religious Enthusiasm in the New World*, 202-06.

58. Juster, "Sexual Politics: Gender and Authority in the Evangelical Church" (paper delivered at the American Historical Association, December 28, 1991); see also Jay Fliegelman, *Prodigals and Pilgrims: The American Revolution Against Patriarchal Authority, 1750-1800* (New York, 1982), 155-94.

59. Norton, "My Resting Reaping Times: Sarah Osborn's Defense of Her 'Unfeminine' Activities," in *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 2 (1976): 515-29; Hambrick-Stowe, "The Spiritual Pilgrimage of Sarah Osborn (1714-1796)" in *Church History* 61 (December 1992): 408-21; see also Joseph Conforti, "Mary Lyon, the Founding of Mount Holyoke College, and the Cultural Revival of Jonathan Edwards," in *Religion and American Culture* 3 (Winter 1993): 69-89; and Barbara E. Lacey, "Women and the Great Awakening in Connecticut," unpublished paper, Princeton Theological Seminary, 1982.

60. Brown, *Knowledge is Power: The Diffusion of Information in Early America, 1700-1865* (New York, 1989), 101.

61. Charles E. Hambrick-Stowe, "The Spirit of the Old Writers: The Great Awakening and the Persistence of Puritan Piety" in *Puritanism: Transatlantic Perspectives*, ed. Francis J. Bremer (Boston, 1993); and Allen C. Guelzo, "The Spiritual Structures of Jonathan Edwards," in *The Bulletin of the Congregational Library* 62. 44 (Fall 1993): 4-15.

62. On numbers of converts, see Trumbull, *History of Connecticut*, volume 2, 218; Tracy, *The Great Awakening*, 389. Two general surveys of the Awakening were published in the 1970s, the first of which was Cedric Cowing, *The Great Awakening and the American Revolution: Colonial Thought in the 18th Century* (Chicago, 1971), followed by J. M. Bumsted and John E. Van de Wetering, *What Must I Do to Be Saved? The Great Awakening in Colonial America* (Hindale, IL, 1976). Both, however, are very short (the Bumsted-Wetering volume is only 165 pages, while Cowing is only 225 pages and actually devotes less than half its length to the Awakening) and heavily dependent on Tracy and Heimert.