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ABSTRACT

THE EVANGELICAL NEW LIGHT CLERGY OF NORTHERN NEW ENGLAND, 1741-1755: A TYPOLOGY

by

Laura Broderick Ricard
University of New Hampshire, December, 1985

Based on the prosopographical analysis of twenty-five Maine and New Hampshire clergymen, this dissertation corrects the prevailing treatment of New Lights, who emerged during the Great Awakening, as if they were of a monolithic "mind." It counters the oversimplified labeling of mid eighteenth-century evangelicals with a typology that establishes subtle gradations of New Light piety according to appreciable differences in theology and religious practice. It examines the mysticism of the most extreme New Lights, and suggests that the strong pneumatic impulse that manifested itself in their violent yearnings for an emotionally satisfying relationship with God was a thread that continued unbroken from 1636, when Antinomianism was first suppressed in Massachusetts. It demonstrates that Jonathan Edwards's theological understanding of alienating radical behavior accounts for their conduct in a way that psychological theories have not, and illustrates that the radicals fell into precisely the behavioral pitfalls that Edwards warned were inevitable when Christians suffered
various exclusively spiritual ills and deficiencies. It examines the New Light understanding of conversion and sanctification and argues that treatment of the New Light as "revolutionary" fails to account for moderate loyalty to Calvinist orthodoxy, blurs considerable differences within New Light ranks, and perpetuates ideas about pro-revivalists that are little more than caricatures. On the basis of a paradigm J. William T. Youngs developed to describe the nature of the Puritan encounter with God, it analyzes the inner spiritual experiences of New Light moderates; it also examines evidence that suggests that as a professional class, in various ways ministers on the eastern frontier do not fit the picture scholars have drawn of a problem-ridden clergy. Finally, on the basis of New Light responses to issues within their particular churches, it concludes with a portrayal of five distinct New Light temperaments.
INTRODUCTION

This is undoubtedly either a very great work of God, or a great work of the devil.

Jonathan Edwards

The decades prior to the Great Awakening were marked by a moralistic formalism. A vacuous religiosity prevailed, brought on to some degree by the forces of the Enlightenment, and the vital experimental piety of New England's spiritual fathers was conspicuously absent. Men floundered in matters of religion and were decidedly more Yankee than Puritan.

Writing from Portsmouth, New Hampshire, the Rev. William Shurtleff recalled the period before the Great Awakening as a time when "not only Pelagianism, but Arianism, Socinianism, and even Deism itself" prevailed. It was fashionable "to throw off all manner of Regard to strict and serious Godliness," and most were content to keep up only the "Form." Only "a small Handful" attended the monthly lecture--if there was one--and the sabbath was a social occasion; "that is there would be a Number of Persons of both Sexes, especially in some congregations, richly and curiously dress'd, and making as fine and glittering a Shew as if this was the Thing they chiefly aim'd at." For the word of God, congregations manifested "a horrid Contempt" and in His house "how little did they behave as those that
came to converse with an infinitely holy and glorious GOD." People slept. Their minds wandered. Eternal salvation did not concern them.¹

Even the ministry was "sluggish." Although "there were doubtless Exceptions to the contrary," Shurtleff complained that the bulk of his colleagues were "dull," "careless," and "negligent." Most disturbing was the way in which ministers corrupted the scriptures. It was bad enough that "some weighty Points, such as that of Original Sin, Regeneration and Conversion, and Justification by Faith only" were not "so clearly explained, and so strongly pressed" as they ought to have been, but some pastors were guilty of teaching doctrines that were "grosly and notoriously false." Congregations were confused about the major tenets of Calvinism and lacked any sense of their significance.²

And the ministry was diffident. Shurtleff was horrified that clergymen were not constantly beseeching the Lord to stir up their people; they hardly discussed it among themselves. At Association meetings it was difficult even to introduce the subject. Lay persons who occasionally attended these meetings confessed to Shurtleff that "it was Matter of Stumbling to them to see us behave as if we had nothing further in View than to smoke and eat together, to tell a pleasant Story, and to talk of the common and
ordinary Affairs of Life." Clearly, the ministry did not behave according to a concern that Christ's kingdom be advanced or that "the Salvation of the precious Souls we had taken under our Watch and Charge" be secured. If ministers lacked a fervent evangelical piety, how could they hope to inspire it in their flocks? No wonder that with the arrival of George Whitefield many New Englanders complained of a clergy that had abdicated its responsibilities; of "dumb dogs" in the pulpit.3

Jonathan Edwards offered a sharp contrast. It was under his preaching, in Northampton, Massachusetts, that "a Concern about the Great things of Religion" began. In 1735 it erupted into revival. Then Whitefield exploded onto the scene in 1740 and the sporadic outbursts of religious fervor that had burst forth elsewhere in the colonies conjoined, resulting in full-scale, inter-colonial revival. Multitudes of Americans were, like their English cousins, suddenly overwhelmed by the need to know, "What must I do to be saved?" For them, Whitefield held the answer. For example, Nathan Cole, a Connecticut farmer, "longed to see and hear him and wished he would come this way." He was working his fields when a messenger came with the wonderful news that Whitefield was to preach in Middletown, Connecticut, twelve miles away. "I dropped my tool that I had in my hand and ran home for my wife...then ran to my pasture for my horse with all my might, fearing that I should be too late.... We rode as if we were fleeing for our lives." With three or
four thousand other excited people, the pair arrived in time to hear the great evangelist's sermon. "When I saw Mr. Whitefield...he looked almost angelical," Cole wrote. Men, women, and children, rich and poor; everywhere, every one was affected and the revival was indeed "great and general." 4

In Londonderry, New Hampshire, the Rev. David McGregor was curious. The young pastor had heard and read a lot about the religious excitement in and around Boston, and determined to go and see the "striking displays of divine grace" for himself. One can only guess through what small towns he journeyed. Did he ride through Hollis where Daniel Emerson was experiencing revival, through Portsmouth and Newcastle where William Shurtleff and John Blunt could tell of the extraordinary outpourings of the spirit of God? If his route took him through Hampton, he saw that the people of Ward Cotton were in an agony of soul. His curiosity finally led him to the Old South church in Boston. There the Rev. Thomas Prince was preaching sermon after sermon to illustrate his conviction that the Great Awakening was nothing new, but only the most recent manifestation of God's work in history. McGregor rode home to Londonderry a man inspired. Immediately he went to work preparing a series of awakening sermons. Boldly, and with a commanding voice, he preached a series of sermons from Ephesians 5.14; "Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ will give thee light." Soon, he too
found himself in the midst of a remarkable revival in his own church "through an uncommon Divine influence." Numbers joined his congregation and the meetinghouse was regularly thronged. Not long after his visit to various towns that were in the throes of revival, McGregor reported of Londonderry's citizens that they also were "the Subjects of religious Concern."  

It was the same everywhere that the revivalist contagion spread, and it spread like a forest fire. From Newcastle John Blunt reported the "great Display of God's Grace in this and several neighbouring Parishes....The Parish I am settled in is small; but God has I hope by the Influence of his gracious Spirit, made his Word and Ordinances effectual to the convincing and converting a considerable Number among us." "It was almost universal," Blunt noted. "Fear seem'd to fall on every Soul; and the great Enquiry was, What shall I do to be saved?" Blunt added fifty souls to his communion in the space of two years, and most of them declared "how they have felt the Power of God's Grace upon their Souls." To gratify their insatiable spiritual hunger, Blunt began a midweek lecture that was "attended by the generality of the people." Not far away, in Hampton, the Spirit was also moving. Whitefield had first arrived in New Hampshire in September of 1740, accompanied by Ward Cotton. On the first day of October, amidst the splendor of autumnal color, Whitefield preached "to some thousands in the open air." The wind from
the sea was strong, and the people gathered could not hear even his booming voice. Few were moved. But in the flush of fervor that was kindled in that parish, Cotton established not only a similar lecture but a "Society of Young Men." Founded in February of 1742, the group encouraged youths to "edify one another in the ways of Religion." They worshipped and prayed together, promised to lead sanctified lives away from the meetinghouse, and to avoid "worldly and unsuitable discourse." Members tolerated no frivolity. They agreed "to go directly from our meetings to our several homes...not to go to, or tarry in, any unworthy company whatsoever."6

While youth on the New Hampshire seacoast sought to remember their Creator, inland, in Hollis, under Emerson's watchful eye, the ninety-four members of the Young Men's Christian Association met together "about 2 hours every Sabbath evening in praying, reading and singing." They agreed to "watch over each other with a spirit of love and concern" and to "admonish and suspend" any who lapsed into "scandalous sin." What solemnity the revival engendered in impetuous youth!7

In Kittery, Maine, John Rogers, the pastor of the second church, praised God "for what he has done among his People here." There on the slender finger of land thrusting into the sea, was "the glorious Work of his Grace...begun and carried on in so remarkable a Manner." Neither did the Lord ignore the tiny congregations gathered at Berwick,
North Yarmouth, Scarborough, and Wells, all of which experienced dramatic increases in church membership in 1742. And York, for forty years Samuel Moody preached a forthright and sometimes frightening message. To wicked children who "serve the devil," Moody warned that God "may send indians to kill you...the ravens of the valley may pluck out your eyes, and the young eagles may eat them. So it was with a child at Cape Neddick." When Whitefield preached to Moody's people, their hearts leaped. The "grand itinerant" noted in his journal that it was comforting "to hear good Mr. Moody tell me, 'That he believed I should preach to a hundred new Creatures this Morning in his Congregation! And I believe I did. For when I came to preach, I could speak little or no Terror, but almost all Consolation. I preached both Morning and Evening. The Hearers looked plain and simple; and Tears trickled apace down most of their Cheeks.'" 

Sophisticated Portsmouth did not weep so easily. Congregations in that city were proper and polite; "unconcerned," in Whitefield's words. Their diffidence led him to "question whether I had been preaching to rational or brute creatures." Two days later, however, the scene was a different one. A "far larger congregation than before" gathered to hear the evangelist preach, and Whitefield "left great numbers under deep impressions." The citizens of Portsmouth had a reputation "for their Politeness in Dress and Behavior," and were "thought to go beyond most others in
equal Circumstances, if not to exceed themselves, in their sumptuous and elegant Living," Shurtleff observed of his parishioners. Like any seaport town, Portsmouth suffered the "Vices that have been usual in Sea Port and trading Places," and such vices were "common and prevalent." More important than the fact that "Diversions of various Kinds" were fashionable there, was the absence "of the Life and Power of Religion." Portsmouth was "sleepy and secure.""\(^9\)

Remarkable changes were not long in coming, however. Because of the "Work of God's Grace going on in many Parts of the Land," together with other neighboring ministers, Shurtleff agreed that his congregation would observe a monthly fast "to seek for the like Blessing." What followed after one such fast deserves to be quoted in full because the excitement there was typical of the Great Awakening wherever it spread:

One cried out in a Transport of Joy, and Others discover'd a great deal of Distress. The People did not care to disperse...and a great Number of them, and some of the Ministers with them stay'd 'till it was late in the Place of public worship. The next Day, a Sermon was again preach'd in Public, and had an unusual Efficacy upon the Hearers. The Day after we had two, or three Exercises, and the Congregation...continued Together 'till late at Night. This Friday was the most remarkable Day that was ever known among us. The whole congregation seem'd deeply affected; And there was such a general Out-cry, in some from a distressing Sight of their Sins, and in others from a joyful Sense of the Love of Christ; that could not but put a great many in Mind of the Appearing of the Son of Man.

It was November, 1741, less than two months after
Whitefield's visit. Shurtleff was convinced that his own preaching and that of Gilbert Tennent's was "instrumental of putting a great many upon shaking off their heavy Slumbers" in the profane seaport. Portsmouth's long-awaited awakening had begun.\textsuperscript{10}

But not without a degree of hysteria. Shurtleff recounted the remarkable events of the monthly fast:

Before the Body of the People had left the Place of publick worship; the Chimney of an House that stood near to it happening to take Fire and blaze out to an uncommon Degree; upon the sudden Appearance of the Light breaking in at the several Windows, there was a Cry made, that Christ was coming to Judgment: Which being really believ'd by a great many, some that were not before so much affected as others, were put into the deepest Distress, and great Numbers had their convictions hereby strengthened and confirmed.

Irrational behavior such as this gave skeptics ample reason to scorn the revival. Shurtleff knew it. He attempted to minimize it. Portsmouth was, no doubt, not amused by the fanaticism in Durham. One could go back and forth between Durham and Portsmouth on the Piscataqua tides, and so news traveled fast. The stories circulating about one Stephen Busse's visions in the Durham meetinghouse no doubt reached Shurtleff before he submitted his first letter to his friend Thomas Smith, editor of The Christian History. "I am not so unacquainted with the World as to be insensible with how much Derision such a Relation as this episode in the Durham meetinghouse is likely to be entertained by a great many of the Humourists of the Age,"
Shurtleff began. Were the "White Doves" and "Angels" and "bright Lights" that "lighted on a beam" of the Durham meetinghouse on his mind while he wrote? "However distasteful the relating such low Occurences, may be to some nice and curious Palates now, I make no doubt but Things of a like Nature will afford an infinite Satisfaction to the Saints hereafter," he continued. Would the ignominious business between one Mary Reed and her minister, the young Nicholas Gilman, afford infinite satisfaction to the saints as well? No doubt it produced some snickers over Portsmouth fences, but this was not the stuff of humor to a man like Shurtleff. He made every effort to subdue emotional display and unchristian behavior among his people.  

Shurtleff continued to preach with added fervor. He exhorted his hearers that they not "scoff at this work of Conviction" in the "Season" of revival. But he warned his flock of the pitfalls of uncontrolled emotionalism:

And here, as there have been various Reports spread abroad concerning the great Stress that many have laid upon Outcries, and such like publick Appearances; I think it proper to declare that the People here have been instructed to the contrary: that they have been taught from the Beginning, that they ought always to avoid them, when it could be done without great inconvenience to themselves, and never needlessly obstruct the Attention of others....Persons might be effectually wrought upon by the Word, without any Thing of this Nature.

Shurtleff may have been able to exercise a degree of control over his Portsmouth congregation, but elsewhere the revival raged and some of those affected lost all sense of
propriety. Not long after Shurtleff wrote to Prince of God's movement in Portsmouth, the congregation at Durham succumbed to the worst excesses of the revival. The dry bones of New England had come back to life indeed. But the face of the colonies was irrevocably changed, and the unhappy effects of the Great Awakening seemed to multiply exponentially.

On October 23, 1740, Whitefield may have looked angelical to Nathan Cole, and by the time he ended his first preaching tour, to thousands of other new converts as well. But in his wake, there was spiritual and social chaos—contentiousness, censoriousness, irregularities and disorders in practice, and, in some cases, bitter separations made for disarray in New England's hitherto comparatively composed congregational life. Enthusiasm, Antinomianism, emotional excess, and, in a few places, scandalous behavior, produced an ecclesiastical shambles.

A backlash was inevitable. Among those who experienced the new birth were "New Lights" who, with the belligerent zeal of the twice-born, leaped to attack the ministerial establishment with a vengeance. "Old Lights," who opposed the revival, rapidly grew defensive. By 1743 the clergy was in open warfare.
The term "New Light" would be far more valuable an interpretive device if scholars of the Great Awakening gave it specific definition, but they have not. Historians of the religious upheaval that rocked the colonies from 1741-1744 and prepared Americans for the Revolution, have written about New Lights as if they were of a monolithic "mind," and if indiscriminate use of the term has conjured up any specific image, it has been pejorative; generally referring to "evangelicals" who represented "revelation, mystery, theism, emotion, conservatism, supernaturalism, and medievalism." According to a view typified by Edwin S. Gaustad, whose work, The Great Awakening in New England, is the most widely read general study of the subject, Old and New Lights battled in a contest "between enlightenment and piety, between reason and faith," and Old Lights embodied "the forces of reason, clarity, humanism, naturalism and modernity." Gaustad's conception of Old versus New Lights was so abstracted as to be virtually meaningless. Other equally important monographs suffer from the same shortcoming. For example, Alan Heimert, in Religion and the American Mind, in reference to Old and New Lights wrote of "the fundamental cleavage between rationalists and evangelicals." In Isaac Backus and the American Pietistic Tradition, William G. McLoughlin referred to the "emotionalism of the new lights" while "old lights claimed that there was absolutely none of the power of God in this
kind of emotionalism." In his classic study of the Great Awakening, Richard L. Bushman argued that New Lights were "the forces of piety" and Old Lights "in reaction" opposed "emotional religion;" Leonard J. Trinterud, in his study of colonial Presbyterianism, compared "New Side and Old Side, evangelical and rationalist." In contrast, David D. Hall objected that the inclination of "American church historians... to construct a typology of evangelicals versus liberals for the eighteenth century is inadequate," but this viewpoint prevails. In a variety of articles scholars have treated the New Light monolithically, failing to acknowledge differences within the ranks of pro-revivalists who are regarded as more emotional and, ipso facto, less "rational." Few have explored the implications of the fact that, as Harry S. Stout observed, "hidden beneath the blanket label...'New Light' were variegated factions, sects and demoninations that often made strange bedfellows." Early studies persistently treated New Lights as if they were all cut of the same cloth. John C. Miller stereotyped New Lights as those who had "a good deal of contempt for 'worldly learning,' and each successive leader of the revival threw in larger and larger quantities of this seasoning." According to Leonard W. Labaree, New Lights were those who sought a "new" "intense, more emotional religious experience," and the Great Awakening "set the example for the emotional outbursts" characteristic of nineteenth-century revivalism. Eugene E. White believed
that New Lights reached "the heights" of religious emotionalism and when the "pure waters of pious feeling were...increasingly sullied by extravaganza," "a new army of critics"--i.e., more enlightened Old Lights--challenged the "entire movement of the Awakening." Modern scholars continue to stereotype New Lights. Robert D. Rossel, a sociologist, found them guilty of a medieval effort to dam a rising tide of "rationalism" and "Liberal religion." Other scholars continue to make only vague references to "moderate" New Lights who were appalled by radical excess. Harry S. Stout and Peter S. Onuf made critically important contributions to a composite socio/cultural picture of New Light clergymen and separatist congregations. Their pioneering studies, however, did not go beyond C. C. Goen's distinctions between "radical" and "moderate" elements within the New Light camp.14

This dissertation corrects the reductionistic labeling of mid eighteenth-century evangelical New Lights and establishes the subtle gradations of New Light piety according to appreciable differences in theology and religious practice. Based on the prosopographical analysis of twenty-five Maine and New Hampshire clergymen, it presents a typology that should facilitate a more sophisticated understanding of Calvinistic evangelicals and therefore provides insights into the dynamics of the Great Awakening.

Based on the conclusions of James F. Maclear, Geoffrey
Nuttall and F. Ernest Stoeffler, chapter one suggests that the strong pneumatic impulse that manifested itself in the most extreme New Lights was not anything idiosyncratic in New England. Rather, their yearning for a violently emotional relationship with God was a thread that continued unbroken from 1636, when Antinomianism was first suppressed in Massachusetts. It demonstrates that radical New Lights were heirs of a tradition long gone underground. Chapter two suggests that Jonathan Edwards's theological understanding of alienating radical behavior accounts for almost every aspect of New Light extremism in a way that, curiously, an array of socio-cultural and psychological interpretations have not. It illustrates that radical New Lights were guilty of precisely the behavioral pitfalls that Edwards warned were inevitable when Christians suffered various exclusively spiritual ills and deficiencies. He readily diagnosed them and understood them to be remediable. Few historians would dispute that Edwards was the spokesman for orthodoxy at mid eighteenth century, but remarkably, no scholar has attempted to explain the feverish behavior of radicals using the ideas he propounded in Thoughts on Revival. His understanding of the nature of revival gone out-of-control, and his description of the evangelical norm were so comprehensive that together they provide a yardstick against which scholars may describe and measure the deviation of new Light radicals.¹⁵

Chapter three argues that New Light moderates did not
offer a new interpretation of orthodoxy and refutes the notion that there was anything new about the New Light. What historians have written about the New Light is contradicted by the moderate understanding of the conversion process. Scholars have stressed that the Great Awakening was a "psychological earthquake" and a "revolution" that pitted the "forces of piety" New Lights against "those of order" Old Lights. Applied indiscriminately to the ministry, this view blurs differences within New Light ranks, fails to account for moderate loyalty to orthodoxy, and perpetuates stereotypical notions about pro-revivalists that are little more than caricatures. It is impossible to defend such a dichotomy in northern New England, where ministers who were "forces of piety" promoted "emotional religion" and encouraged conversions, but simultaneously quelled "ecclesiastical confusion." In The Shattered Synthesis, James W. Jones argued that "the balance" achieved by the Puritans "was lost in the course of the seventeenth century," and it was "never regained." But the homiletical literature of the mid eighteenth century that focused on the nature of the conversion process, indicates precisely the opposite. Indeed, it proves that New Light moderates made every effort to preserve "a balance of the objectivity of the head and the subjectivity of the heart, of divine predestination and human activity," a synthesis that was not shattered, but in fact, was one which they inherited intact from four generations of Puritans. Through comparisons of
the ideas of Cotton Mather, Jonathan Edwards and moderate New Light ministers on a variety of soteriological issues, it demonstrates that the position of the vast majority of northern New England clergymen was virtually indistinguishable from that of their Puritan forebears on the nature of the conversion experience.16

And genuine conversion wrought holiness. The convert embraced altogether new values, and these were expressed in a new life that was recognizably different from that which he had led before. Chapter four analyzes the holy life of the "new creature" as it was understood by moderate New Lights who ascribed as much, perhaps even more importance to it as the Puritans. If to them it assumed exaggerated significance, it was a defensive reaction to the radical neglect and aspersion of it. Precise definition shall be given to the deceptively simple elements of sanctification, but the quest to live the holy life, to perform good works, and to conform to the moral law did not determine that the moderate New Light cleaved only to the more perceptible aspects of his faith. He also aspired to and occasionally sensed the inexpressible joys of the more empyrean experiences that the radicals attempted to make a way of life.

Scholarly analysis of inner spiritual experience is in its adolescence. "We know far more now about what people believed and thought in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries than what they felt and experienced inwardly," but
the latter is the subject of chapter five, which is an effort to grapple with the ineffable essence of the mid-eighteenth-century spiritual experience. It examines the nature of the moderate "encounter" with God that believers occasionally related through the use of a paradigm that J. William T. Youngs developed to describe the Puritan encounter with God. To Youngs's categories of "providential events," "walking with God," "meditative communion," and "spiritual dreams," will be added spiritual dullness (seasons of darkness were disquieting precisely because they were a disruption to the communion with which moderate New Lights were accustomed), divine guidance, and devotional practice. The latter, as Charles E. Hambrick Stowe demonstrated, provides insights into the nature of spiritual experience. Chapter five illustrates that there were various ways in which moderate clergymen strived to achieve and indeed experienced an intimacy with the Almighty. They enjoyed epiphanous moments that stood, in Youngs's words, as "an actual force in history."17

Chapter six profiles the clergy as a professional elite and illustrates how secular values both clashed with and complemented the calling of a pastor on the eastern frontier. It shows first how New Light moderates conceptualized themselves as professionals and discusses this in relation to the recent findings of historians about the eighteenth-century clergy in general. There is evidence that as a professional class ministers on the eastern
frontier deviated from their colleagues in southern New England and adapted to their surroundings in a fashion that was distinctly different. Findings to date do not reveal the complete picture. Chapter six suggests that the phenomenon of professionalism, or what historians have labeled "Congregational clericalism," actually served to contribute to the financial woes about which the ministry complained so vociferously. Except on the eastern frontier. There, if an enterprising pastor grasped at secular opportunities to better his pecuniary situation, it did not threaten his social status. Secondly, it shows that what is so striking about these twenty-five ministers was the remarkable rapport most enjoyed with their flocks. Certainly they contrast with the picture various historians have drawn of a quarrelsome and troubled clergy. This chapter shows that scholarly arguments that eighteenth-century ministers "found it increasingly difficult to get along with their congregations" are inaccurate as far as the vast majority of northern New England pastors. Evidence points in the opposite direction.  

Chapter seven describes the effects of the Great Awakening as it unfolded in particular churches in Maine and New Hampshire and explores the varied New Light responses to the divisive issues that surfaced during the revival. On the basis of this, the Conclusion portrays five distinct New Light temperaments that emerged as a result.
Classifications will include what I have defined to be the "Innovative," "Conservative," "Partisan," and "Dogmatic" temperaments, as well as the "Radical," or "Enthusiastical" temperament. The five temperaments suggested themselves when it became clear that clerical responses to specific issues formed particular patterns. To cite examples: pastors of the Innovative temperament did not value ecclesiastical tradition so much as others, and willingly departed from it in order to promote the revival in remarkable ways; Conservatives championed ecclesiastical order above all else, and Partisans refused even to acknowledge the problems created by the Great Awakening. The Dogmatic temperament belonged to ministers who were heedless of disorders in practice and concerned themselves principally with doctrinal orthodoxy. Pastors of the "Radical" temperament were ecclesiastical miscreants whose overemphasis on the emotions and subjective spiritual experience led inexorably to ambiguities and inconsistencies in their theological and intellectual lives, and ultimately, served to enfeeble the Calvinist orthodoxy they professed to defend.

It was not always an easy task to identify New Lights. Evidence of the difficulties involved is apparent in the contrary views historians have about the loyalties of particular individuals. Take seventy-five year old John Newmarch, for example, pastor at Kittery, Point, Maine. On his position during the Great Awakening, Sibley did not
pronounce. Charles E. Clark described him as a "moderate" New Light and Elizabeth C. Nordbeck was convinced he was an Old Light. I tend to agree with Calvin M. Clark that there is simply insufficient evidence to warrant a conclusion. Most within the group isolated for this study were unquestionably New Lights, but in the case of Amos Main, for example, so little information was extant that only his approval of the "Testimony" justified his inclusion.¹⁹

In the face of a paucity of evidence a good case could be made that the Rev. Jabez Fitch belongs to a category that David Craig Harlan called "Old Calvinists." In an unpublished doctoral dissertation relevant to this study, Harlan argued that traditional interpretations of the Great Awakening have ignored "those ministers who occupied a middle-ground between the New Lights and the Old Lights." These "neuters" were ministers who welcomed the revival "without abandoning the compromises of inherited theology," that is, specifically, the Halfway Covenant. While Harlan exposed weaknesses inherent in the "prevailing interpretation of the Awakening as a contest between Liberalism and Calvinism, enlightenment and piety, reason and faith," because it has ignored those whom Samuel Mather labeled "Regular Lights," with reference to northern New England, his thesis is not so convincing. There, as Nordbeck observed, not a single church abandoned the Halfway Covenant, but it would be absurd, on this basis, to argue that supporters of the Great Awakening there were all "Old
If an admittedly oversimplified dichotomy of Old Lights and New Lights nevertheless retains value as an interpretive device—and Harlan admits that it does have value—perhaps it is more constructive to work within the Old Light-New Light framework and make it more sophisticated. As Goen took pains to emphasize, in the final analysis, at issue between New and Old Lights was whether or not the revival was a work of God, and without exception, Harlan's middle-of-the-roaders believed that it was. For this study it has proved more workable to analyze the multifarious expressions of thinking and practice within the New Light fold, rather than to introduce a new construct. What I have attempted to do then, is to refine our understanding of New Lights. (It should be understood that this is not a study of Old Lights who were a minority in northern New England. They deserve their own study.) Some individuals whom Harlan classified as "neuters," or "Old Calvinists," fit equally well, if not better, into one of the five New Light "temperaments" I shall suggest. For example, of Old Calvinists Harlan wrote that "the Great Awakening merely presented them with a problem—how to take advantage of this welcome freshening of religion with the least possible disruption to their theology and to the organization of their ecclesiastical polity." Harlan's words describe perfectly the "Conservative" New Lights of this study, clergymen who supported (and here I quote Harlan
describing Old Calvinists) "both the revivals and the standing order with which they aligned themselves." 21

Before proceeding, one word of caution is necessary. Scholars in the field have acknowledged that "radical" New Lights were a breed apart from "moderates," although little has been done to define the latter term satisfactorily. The perceptive reader will note however, that already the term "moderate" has been bandied about quite loosely. This is not to commit the same scholarly sin of which I am accusing others. Chapters one through seven build my argument for more precise treatment of New Lights. Until the Conclusion the term "moderate" refers in an imprecise way to twenty-two northern New England ministers who were doctrinal conservatives and offended neither Old Lights nor other supporters of the Great Awakening. With few exceptions, they were ashamed, embarrassed, and critical of radical excess. All twenty-five clergymen at whom we will be looking in this study supported the Great Awakening, although with varying degrees of enthusiasm. But the differences among them were substantial. It is in the Conclusion then, that the five archetypes will be found, and it should remedy the habitual tendency of historians to homogenize proponents of the Great Awakening and render oversimplified conceptions of the New Light obsolete.
CHAPTER I

THE APPRENTICE EVANGELIST

I wondered that all the world did not see and comply with this way of salvation, entirely by the righteousness of Christ.

David Brainerd

Always one could smell the sea. Except when the tide ran out and the mud flats of the Piscataqua reeked of dank weed and sulphur, and an easterly breeze snatched it up and worried it into one's nostrils, it was a good smell, a salty, pungent smell. From Durham across the Great Bay, south into Exeter, then northward to New Hampshire's queen city of Portsmouth, and up river onto the Maine side into Kittery, eighteenth-century settlers caught the estuarine scent.

There were other good smells, too. Earthen smells. Of a winter evening, woodsmoke; in the springtime, manured fields and apple blossoms, and twice in June, and again in July—if the Lord was pleased to shower the dry ground with abundant and refreshing rains—the scent of new-mown hay; the "perfume of the harvest." Then, as now, men hurried to stack the sweetness into barns and more than one parishioner flatly refused to aid his minister when his own hay lay in the field before a sudden storm.

"Rapt were my Senses at this delectable view," Anne Bradstreet wrote of her seat less than a mile from the
Merrimac; there was "So much excellence...below." But amidst the splendor there was dreadful judgment, too. Colonists knew the red man and in the collective consciousness was the memory of murdered kin: at York, Maine, in 1692, half the town was massacred, including the minister; at Oyster River, in New Hampshire, in 1694 and at Wells, Maine, in 1703, again blood cried out upon the ground. When the Rev. Samuel Moody preached in the 1740's to a York risen from the ashes, men still bore arms into the meetinghouse. And Indians arrogantly described for Amos Main, minister for twenty-three years to the straggling congregation at Rochester, New Hampshire, particular occasions when they might easily have picked him off at his doorstep, or on a forest path as he rode horseback to administer physic to his parishioners.

Indeed, Jehovah showed his righteous wrath in remarkable fashion. During the night of October 29, 1727, New Englanders were startled from their beds by the rumbling of an earthquake. The quake was a portent. In the promised land, God's people were stubbornly going their own way, and the Lord was displeased. More than a few contrite sinners were frightened into church, and historians have debated the nature of the relationship between quake and revival ever since.¹

New Englanders feared the punishments that God rained down upon them in the form of earthquake, pestilence, wind
and hail, snow and storm:

In the night awak'd suddenly with Thunder! Thot it was an Earthquake--was much Surprised, my Heart Shook, and flesh Trembled, had some sense of the dreadful Security the World lies in--think my Self half asleep as to Spiritual and Eternal Things, and that I might be awakened and keept upon the Watch, that I may not be Surprised...but ready to go forth to meet the bridegroom.

If the smell of ozone in the night turned Daniel Rogers's thoughts heavenward--indeed, Luther himself once tasted of that fear--how ghastly was the horror of a pestilence that stalked one's children.  

Nicholas Gilman grieved. On December 23, 1741, the Durham pastor lost his son Bartholomew, aged ten, and on January 13, 1742, his younger boy, Nicholas, aged eight, died. With trembling hand, Gilman wrote into his diary, "The remains of My Little Son laid in the Silent grave." "Throat distemper," or diptheria, snuffed out 984 lives in New Hampshire, a staggering number of persons given the sparse population that clung to life on the eastern frontier. Most of the dead were children about the age of Gilman's younger child, struck down between 1735-1740. They were the worst years of an epidemic that, because it ravaged some villages twice and left others untouched, conjured Yahweh's final plague upon Egypt. 

People bludgeoned by cruel epidemics, the ravages of Indian attack and war, and the day-to-day grimness of life in early eighteenth-century Maine and New Hampshire
languished in their sins, exhausted and weary. Life was nasty, brutish and short. If man was born to trouble as the sparks fly upward, too much trouble made him vulnerable to simple promises of redemption, salvation and eternal happiness. To many overburdened, heavy-laden new Englanders, the simple message of salvation offered by a youthful, fresh-faced Anglican priest came in the 1740's like a freshet to a parched land. Some drank more deeply of the new wine fermented by George Whitefield's words than others. Stirred to the marrow by his preaching, they were certain that a divine efflation was blowing across New England. Men whom history would disparage as the radical fringe of pro-revivalists caught something new in the wind, and they were intoxicated by it. Daniel Rogers, for example, was the "reluctant radical," a "perambulating ecclesiastical disturbance" who became "Massachusetts' most widely traveled itinerant." His response to Whitefield and the religious fervor he excited, was typical of radical New Lights everywhere across the colonies. They were destined to burst the skins of an old order that no longer could contain them. 

This chapter explores the nature of Whitefield's impact on Daniel Rogers, a radical New Light who, according to Elizabeth Currier Nordbeck, was "far more influential" than Nicholas Gilman, the "wildest of the New Lights" who has received far more scholarly attention. First, it follows his development as an evangelist made in
Whitefield's image and illustrates how he came to associate visible signs of emotional distress as the only evidence of God's presence—a heterodox notion according to Calvinists. Secondly, it suggests that Rogers's emphasis on subjective experiences and the emotions was, though excessive, not an unusual disposition among some Puritans. In the wake of the Antinomian crisis, the mystical and emotional dynamic inherent in Puritan spirituality was repressed. Daniel Rogers and Nicholas Gilman (and other radical New Lights) then, were heirs of a tradition long forced underground.5

Whitefield inspired the dramatic change in preaching style that appeared with the Great Awakening. Seventeenth-century Puritan pastors preached from notes, "dividing" and "improving" the text (to astonishingly erudite congregations) in the "plain" style. Often they read laborious sermons that explained complicated points of doctrine. Whitefield, however, did not read from a text or use notes and his was a histrionic style. Having studied for the stage he was the envy of David Garrick, a popular American actor, and he moved his hearers to the quick. Because they were repeated so many times, Whitefield's impassioned oratories had more in common with a perfectly
rehearsed one-act play. So powerful was his effect that even Benjamin Franklin dropped a few coins into the collection plate. Franklin recalled that the evangelist's "Delivery was so improv'd by frequent Repetitions, that every Accent, every Emphasis, every Modulation of Voice, was so perfectly well turn'd and well plac'd, that without being interested in the Subject, one could not help being pleas'd with the Discourse, a Pleasure of much the same kind with that receiv'd from an excellent Piece of Musick." Because he spent most of his first American tour (1739-1740) in Boston, Philadelphia and Charlestown, Whitefield's audiences generally consisted of large, electrified crowds. This added to the drama.6

In the summer of 1740, among the thousands of hushed and expectant people who crowded together on the Boston Common to hear the evangelist's every word, was the young and impressionable Daniel Rogers. A Harvard student and tutor, he was the son of the Rev. John Rogers of Ipswich, Massachusetts, grandson of a Harvard president, and through his mother, a descendant of John Calvin's sister. For him, the introduction to Whitefield was momentous. Like other young men at Harvard whom Whitefield had converted, Rogers was profoundly affected. He left the college. Abandoning his students to follow Whitefield on his preaching tour, he failed to answer a pastoral call from Boston's New North, and when Harvard finally located him, Rogers explained that he was "not at all Surprised at the Uneasiness that arises
upon my taking this Journey with Mr. Whitefield--I expected It; and know from what Quarter It comes, It confirms me in my opinion that the blessed Spirit of God has led me out; and how far I shall proceed He only knows."

Rogers and other Whitefield admirers trouped from Boston through cities and small towns across Connecticut and New York, and over and over he heard Whitefield's message of redemption and reconciliation; over and over he saw that people were moved by it. But he remained troubled over the state of his own soul. In Hartford, Whitefield preached that "the Kingdom of God does not consist in meats and Drinks, etc." Rogers thought he "did really believe...but today I'm under Fears and Doubts. I am a damned Creature without Thee. I am weary and heavy laden and help me to come to thee so that I may have Rest."  

Throughout October and into November Rogers traveled with the famous itinerant, witnessing the extraordinary responses to his preaching. Whitefield's message was an almost irresistible ploy to push hearers toward a reconciliation with God, so, naturally, Rogers hungered for precisely the sort of relationship with God that Whitefield described. Convinced he was "an hardhearted Unbelieving sinner," Rogers wrote, "I hunger and thirst after an Experimental knowledge of Jesus" and hastened to work out his own salvation. He was "determined to know nothing but Thee, Thee Crucified." After Whitefield preached in Wallingford, Connecticut, together they set out for New
Haven. As they rode in the rain, Rogers found his "Hopes rising up to God that his infinite Sovereign Grace would continue the work in my Soul."^9

Over the course of the next several days he suffered "great distress," and experienced "some sense" of his miserable estate. When Whitefield preached on the prodigal son, Rogers was "very much melted," but he was unable to resolve the tensions he felt. He accompanied the evangelist to Milford, Strafford, Fairfield, Norwalk and Stanford, where they met James Davenport—soon to be regarded as the most infamous of all radical New Lights. After they crossed over the Connecticut border into New York, the troubled young man, in a manner corresponding exactly to that of Whitefield whose own conversion was also immediate, found relief for his soul. He wrote into his diary that "Tho I was not much affected during sermon yet it pleased God of his free Sovereign grace to come into my Soul with power and so fill me with Peace yea with Such Joy in the Holy Ghost as I never experienced before--I...did not forbear smiling nay laughing for joy and gladness of heart... at what God had done for my soul. I communicated my state to my Dear Friend who rejoiced with me." Clearly, Rogers was overwhelmed by the presence of the evangelist, and after the fashion demonstrated by Baird Tipson, was "converted"--actually a second time. Whitefield bequeathed to Rogers the very vocabulary and structure of his own conversion.10

Immediately following this catharsis, Rogers attended
a meeting where the inflammatory Davenport preached. Rogers observed that "God enabled Davenport to speak with freedom and clearness...on those that hunger and thirst after righteousness. The power of God came down into the Congregation and in a few minutes spread throughout it. There was a great outcry...that lasted near half an hour. The like I never saw before--I am sure it was the Lord's doing...I hope God has begun a great work in New York."

Similar scenes astounded him. In one instance, after Davenport's preaching, Whitefield improved immediately "upon the distress of a nine-year-old boy and exhorted those present to hear the child's preaching...which wonderfully affected them so...several cryed out--some women fainting."

Whitefield's and Davenport's impact was phenomenal. Wherever they went, they were the agents of great spiritual distress that was subsequently followed by commensurate spiritual relief. Rogers was certain it was from the very hand of God. When Gilbert Tennent, whose preaching one offended listener described as "beastly braying," spoke to some 200 people in a barn one November evening, Rogers said he felt "the power of God like a mighty rushing wind."

Swept into the excitement, he confessed that he "had seen of Things before yet this exceeded them all--God was awfully Present in the barn. It appeared to be a dreadful place."

Exhilarated, he added that it was "impossible" for him:
to represent Things as they were—a number of convicted persons were weeping, sighing, groaning, sobbing...crying out...after Jesus. One young man who was crying out pressed forward to lay hold of...Mr. Whitefield who made a short earnest prayer for those...under Conviction and left the barn. I was persuaded to go out into the barn to give the people a word of exhortation. I prayed and God helpt me to speak His word. Afterward Mr. Davenport exhorted....Many continued in prayers...all night. I never saw such a night before. Tis a night to be remembered."

Remember it he did. And that night he took a critical first step. One may imagine that Rogers felt some anxiety when he was "persuaded to go out into the barn to give the people a word of exhortation." But previous nights had afforded Rogers necessary learning experiences. Before the young man were the unsurpassed examples of the three most powerful—and famous—charismatic preachers in the ranks of the revivalists: George Whitefield, Gilbert Tennent, and James Davenport. They all used the same formula and the formula worked. They were bringing in the kingdom of God, and Rogers counted himself among those whom Whitefield had converted. With his own eyes he had witnessed countless awakenings and conversions that resulted from their preaching and for him, this was indisputable proof that the revival was indeed a glorious outpouring of the Spirit. Rogers was eager to do his part. It would not be long before he attempted to imitate their tactics, prayerfully anticipating that the response to his own preaching would be similar.

Shortly after Rogers's conversion, Whitefield
departed. "Dear Brother Whitefield...I love him as my own soul--blessed be God I have seen and heard him so often," Rogers wrote, regretful of their parting. Then, three days later, while on tour with Tennent in Newark, New Jersey, Rogers tested his evangelistic wings, and preached on Acts 16.30, "What must I do to be saved?" Perhaps it was subconscious that he delayed the attempt until Whitefield's departure. How could he fail in front of him? To his chagrin, there was no response, and Rogers blamed it on his failure to depend wholly on God. At last though, later in the evening, his preaching won results. He noted jubilantly in his journal that "Some of the people were affected. Shed Tears." 13

The apprentice evangelist had learned his lessons well. He was immersed in the rhetoric and methods of his teachers. And because he had experienced it under their tutelage, he rapidly came to equate the presence of God's spirit and the process of conversion with visible signs of emotional distress, that is, weeping, crying out, fainting. A year after Whitefield's departure Rogers recalled:

a large assembly at Eastown, Massachusetts. It began with Singing--I prayed and preached. In the middle of the sermon many cryed out in Bitterness of Soul--the Lord enlarged me helpt me to Speak with Power--the cry increas'd--sang again and then Brother Wheelock preached with Great Power; the outcry began again and waxed louder. I prayed again and after the Blessing, we came down and discoursed with the wounded--and with some who had seen the Light--sang an Hymn God was with us of a Truth." 14
Rogers's journal is punctuated with descriptions of meetings like this. On another occasion he listened to the "relations" of three children, aged fourteen, twelve, and ten and then prayed with the entire family. The inevitable "great outcry" ensued and Rogers thanked God that "he has not left without witness of his mighty and Gracious spirit with us."\(^{15}\)

The best illustration of Rogers's growing dependence on visible signs that "proved" the presence of the Spirit was an incident that involved the Rev. Theophilus Pickering of Ipswich, Massachusetts. Pickering was no friend to the revival. He wrote to Rogers to say that he believed that Rogers was sincerely interested "at promoting the Interest of the Kingdom of Christ, by your most abundant and most zealous Labours." But like most Old Lights, he confessed that he was:

\[
\text{at a loss to understand the Distinction that you make betwixt the ordinary or usual Work of God in the conversion of sinners, and that work in which you are engaged which you emphatically call This work...of God....Therefore I beseech you...to resolve my Doubts with respect to this work...by declaring what it is, and wherein it differs from the converting work of God that was carried on in New England in the Days of our Fathers. And by shewing from the sacred scriptures that those Things (if such there be) in which It differs, are the work of the Spirit of God, and unexceptionable Ground for your Terms of Distinction.}^{16}\]

Together with his brother John, Rogers responded to Pickering's question:
By the work we hope our hearts are engaged in, which, as you may have observed, we call 'This Work--This Work of God,' we mean God's work of convicting and converting sinners; and we do not mean to distinguish it from the convincing and converting work of God, carried on in New England in the days of our fathers, or anywhere else in any age of the Christian church; for we suppose God's work in convincing and converting sinners to be ever the same, as to the substantial parts of it. Nevertheless, as this is a work distinct from all the other works of God, it may surely be spoken of with various marks of distinction.

Pickering was not satisfied. He wrote again and asked if by "This Work" the brothers included "some effects attendant, as visible signs or open discoveries" of the Spirit. When they did not reply, Pickering wrote a third time and repeated the same question:

That which I want to know is, What and how much you take into that which you call, 'This Work of God,' as grounds of distinction; and upon what authority you receive it. If there be a different manner of operation, or new evidences--that have not been usual in the conversion of sinners in later times,--I pray you to enumerate and ascertain them;--to show me what Scripture warrant you have to expect such things in the present age of the church; and evince, by the word of truth, that those things are to be believed to be the work of God.

Pickering tried to force the two men to assert that emotional distress and visible signs were the exclusive means by which God converted men so that he might have grounds to argue that the revival was spurious. Orthodoxy held that men could be converted "insensibly", like Cotton Mather was; God could work quietly to change the human heart. Undaunted by their silence, he wrote a fourth time, but they never answered.
Rogers probably neither understood what Pickering was
driving at nor gave much thought to how or if God's
converting work in early New England differed from "this
work." He was so confident that the revival was a work of
God, that for him the issue was the unwillingness of
ministers like Pickering to promote it. Pickering was wrong
about the revival. "Proof" of this came in provocative
fashion. Rogers wrote:

I replied that...I could give an answer to
Pickering's letter now, in a few words--and did--I
desired Him to go with us to the meeting House of
which Pickering was pastor --He declined....I asked
him whether He thought it was not Lawfull for people
to meet and pray and he answered all things lawfull
are not expedient.... In sum...he thought it not
expedient--his people and I tho't it was; and
accordingly I took my leave of Him and went to the
House of God where He gave us abundant Testimony of
the expediency of our meeting for towards the close
of my exhortation a young woman cryed out in great
distress....I immediately directed my discourse to
her and in a few minutes she received Power from
God.

Clearly, Rogers believed that emotional distress invariably
proved that God's spirit was moving, and those who disagreed
were either blind or enemies of His work. A year or so
later Rogers visited with Pickering again and "discoursed
with him upon this Work of God. Told him if he did not see
it to be so--He was blind."¹⁹

But Pickering saw the beam in Rogers's eye. Rogers
"lay such a Stress upon the outward Appearance as if you
hardly believ'd that the Lord Jesus could be present in your
Assemblies by his Spirit...without some Effects attendant as
visible Signs." Rogers's position was heterodoxy.\(^{20}\)

On those occasions when he preached and there was no distress, no visible evidence that the Spirit moved, Rogers was convinced that God had turned His face. He recalled a meeting in Ipswich when "there appeared a great Deadness in ministers and in the Children of God in general but some persons cryed out and mourned bitterly." He stayed until almost midnight, six hours after the meeting began, "exhorting and calling upon 'em to come to Christ. At last one young lad had his heart opened to receive Christ and went home rejoicing....God's spirit seem'd to withdraw that evening.\(^{21}\)

Rogers believed that a preacher could not produce the emotional extremes he associated with the mysterious workings of the Spirit; he was convinced that when the "Power of God came down" and the "Children of God were full of the Holy Ghost," fainting and other "proofs" of the Spirit's urgings followed automatically. Carried to its logical extreme, this idea led to the position that when there were no signs of distress, God was not present. Of this Rogers was convinced. Two illustrations will suffice. Davenport preached "upon an awful subject, vis., the coming of Christ. But, without any visible effects except in two or three instances. Which is a further proof that It is not in the power of man to produce those effects."\(^{22}\)

Rogers anticipated visible signs because Davenport's preaching was powerful. Because they were minimal, this
"proved" that only God could produce them. Two years later his assumption remained unchanged. Toward the close of a sermon, "the powers came down and numbers of God's children were filled with the Holy Ghost. God's sovereignty was discovered by his working powerfully when the preachers had little or no life." In this instance there were "signs" of the Spirit's movement when Rogers, a man accustomed to powerful preaching, did not expect it. To his way of thinking, the source of distress was indisputable: in both cases it was from God. 23

Paradoxically, Rogers went to great lengths to wring responses from his hearers because he was very insecure about his preaching. On occasions when there were no visible signs, he took it personally and felt "dull" and "lifeless," as if God had abandoned him. In the absence of visible effects, Rogers was never certain his preaching had had any effect at all; "he could only "hope" that it "sunk into their hearts, tho there were no visible effects."

Emotional distress and a conversion or two among his hearers were the signs Rogers needed that God wanted him in the ministry. Preaching on John 6:29 "to a large assembly," Rogers observed that the:

Gracious Lord caused his word to come with great Power, many persons cryed out in their distress. The Lord was pleased wonderfully to enlarge and strengthen me to speak with great Power and freedome for the space of two hours. The whole congregation were struck with a solemn awe and after the Blessing was given and we were coming out of the House a woman full of Joy told us she had found Christ ...I ask't when She first saw the Light She told me in the
Prayer before Sermon. this occasioned great part of the Assembly to tarry—and the distressed came round about us—and we exhorted...and prayed with em. discourse'd with two women who had received Light and great comfort thro' my ministry... This was an Encouragement to go on in the work of the Lord who has abundantly ...succeeded me in this place.

Clearly, Rogers needed the emotional buttress of a responsive laity in order to preach. He rejoiced when he read a letter from a person who told him that his "Labours here had been blessed with great success considering the formality and deadness of the people, hearing this I was able to depart—she earnestly desired me to preach again—blessed be the name of the Lord for this encouragement." Traditionally in New England a minister was called "internally," by the Spirit, and "externally," by the congregation over which he was lawfully ordained. Since Rogers lacked the latter, naturally he stressed the former. His emphasis was predictable if not inevitable, because he was an individual whose faith rested to a large degree on what F. Ernest Stoeffler called "pleasant feeling states."25

The importance that radical New Lights like Rogers (and, as we will see, Nicholas Gilman) ascribed to subjective experiences and feelings was not, however, anything idiosyncratic in the history of Christianity. In The Rise of Evangelical Pietism, Stoeffler argued convincingly that "from the days of the apostles we find running through the history of the Church what we might call
an experiential tradition," or an "inward religion." Stoeffler labeled this tradition "pietism," and Luther and Calvin were within it. All "pietists agreed to the fact that the essence of Christianity is to be found in the personally meaningful relationship of the individual to God." Calvin wrote, "we shall have a complete definition of faith if we say that it is a steady and certain knowledge of the Divine benevolence toward us, which, being founded on the truth of the gratuitous promise in Christ, is both revealed to our minds, and confirmed to our hearts, by the Holy Spirit." That Calvin's "emphasis upon the 'heart' is not an isolated instance in his writings is confirmed by many of his interpreters."

Stoeffler demonstrated that "essential differences between continental Pietism and what we have called Pietistic Puritanism cannot be established because they are non-existent." English Puritans such as Richard Greenham, William Ames, Richard Rogers, John Dod and Henry Smith, to name a few, were pietistic, that is, they "recognized the obvious psychological fact that a satisfactory personal relationship, in this case with God, naturally and inevitably issues in pleasant feeling states." Their ideas were carried across the Atlantic where they took root in Massachusetts Bay. Edwin S. Gaustad wrote:

The Puritans who settled New England were motivated by religious considerations not only of an institutional, semipolitical sort. There were reasons of the heart. The immediate sense of God's
presence and rule, the full-bodied experience of receiving his grace, the demanding response of total stewardship, the sustaining faith in things not seen—these were no less a part of the colonists' spiritual adventure. Furthermore, these very factors connote in the eighteenth century the essence of pietism. In England, Puritanism and piety were friendly toward each other; in New England, every effort was made to establish between them a permanent and happy union. In other words, "the important thing" for the Puritans was the "grounding of mind, will, and feeling—and behind these, the heart, the central wellspring of consciousness—in a participation in the life of God."27

Cotton Mather, descendant of Richard Mather, and on his mother's side, John Cotton, personified this union of puritanism and pietism about which Gaustad wrote; indeed, Richard Lovelace, his biographer, referred to the great divine as the American pietist. Mather hungered for and enjoyed an incomparably sweet communion with a holy, living God, and, conversely, despaired when He turned his face. And Jonathan Edwards, who sought to live unto God "with all the power, might, vigor, and vehemence, yea violence," of which he was capable, and whose "heart panted...to lie low before God, as in the dust;" experienced moments that imparted to him a sense of the "person of Christ who appeared ineffably excellent with an excellency great enough to swallow up all thought and conception."28

The subjective "sense" of God has been important in the lives of influential Christian believers from the Reformation. How then, did the "sense" of God experienced by radical New Lights differ in respect to that of the Puritans, whose tradition they inherited, and from moderate
New Lights? The experience *per se* may not have differed at all.

To describe a thing so "ineffably excellent" as subjective spiritual experience is a difficult task. Persons who have had such experiences have agreed that it is nearly impossible to communicate its nature to others. However, to demonstrate that the mystical experiences of Daniel Rogers and Nicholas Gilman differed intrinsically very little from those described by, for example, Cotton Mather and Jonathan Edwards, may not be so difficult. All four men lived out their lives in the same religious culture (Edwards, Rogers and Gilman were contemporaries; Mather was one generation removed from them), and although they differed in the particulars of their personal theologies, each claimed to be a Calvinist and each has left us accounts of the mystical experiences he enjoyed. This permits us to describe the mystical experience perhaps typical of the mid-eighteenth-century Calvinist.

Cotton Mather, Jonathan Edwards, Daniel Rogers and Nicholas Gilman "sensed" God through the dark glass of his own peculiar temperament and the deepest convolutions of his psychological make-up. But to each, the encounter with God was emotionally overwhelming, and for Mather, anyway, it produced "a certain wear and tear on the psyche and even the physical health:" "the Joy of the Heavenly World, a little of it, breaking into the Mind of a Believer, while he is yet on this side of Heaven, Oh! It Ravishes him! It Amazes him!
It even overcomes him! He is not able to subsist under it. It is unsupportable. It makes him cry out, Lord, stay thy hand! If thy Joy be so Exuberant, when a little of it here enters the soul, what will thy Joy be, O Faithful Servant, when thou shalt Enter into the Joy of thy Lord!" Mather thought that the mystical experience was untranslatable into human vocabulary: "What is that Fulness of God....This filling, truly, it is a thing better felt than spoke....It is one of the unutterable things, yea, it is one of the unfathomable things....We may say, as in 1 Cor. 2:9, Eye hath not seen it, nor Ear heard it....Not accurate Scholarship, but experimental Christianity alone will help us to conceive of these things."²⁹

Edwards's mystical encounters with the Deity were no different. An account of a typical experience follows:

The whole book of Canticles used to be pleasant to me, and I used to be much in reading it, about that time; and found, from time to time, an inward sweetness, that would carry me away, in my contemplations. This I know not how to express otherwise, than by a calm, sweet abstraction of soul from all the concerns of this world; and sometimes a kind of vision...of being alone in the mountains or some solitary wilderness, far from all mankind, sweetly conversing with Christ, and wrapt and swallowed up in God. This sense I had of divine things, would often of a sudden kindle up, as it were, a sweet burning in my heart; an ardor of soul, that I know not how to express.³⁰

Daniel Rogers also knew what it was like to be consumed by a vision of Christ. A few examples will suffice:
a little before Meeting retired and Seeking Christ's Presence with me in preaching his word; The power of his Spirit came upon me--giving me a Sense of the Greatness, majesty, glorious Holiness of God, and his wonderful Love and condescending Grace...to poor sinfull Dust and ashes. My Self in Particular.

In another instance, while he was at a "private Meeting," he recalled in words reminiscent of Edwards's:

The power of God's Spirit increased upon me, giving me a Sweet and Awfull View of the Beauty, Excellent Majesty and Glory of the Lord Jesus."

Rogers was fond of the Canticles, also. He described an instance of communion with God in which he used the imagery of that book:

In the Evening I had an Unexpected Gracious Visitation of my Soul's beloved, Sweetly feeding, and assuring me of his Love."

And finally, in a fashion similar to Mather, who, in an effort to write objectively about his mystical experiences, observed that there were moments "when His Glory appears unto us, glitters before us," Rogers wrote:

Reading in Dr. Goodwin upon that Precious Word of Scripture Who gave Himself for us, It pleased God to give such a poor vile sinfull creature, as He knows I am, a Surprising...awfull, astonishing Sight and sense of his Love, infinite...unspeakable, Incomprehensible Love, in giving Himself Himself for sinners....N.B. by Such Because of Light let into the Soul...there is great Darkness in the Mind and much Ignorance in the Understanding and unbelief in the Heart, for this among other Reasons that Such Times, divine Truths seem to be new to us, as well as real, almost as if we had never seen them before--!
Nicholas Gilman enjoyed similar, profoundly emotional experiences. As he was by the vast majority of his contemporaries, Gilman has been regarded by historians as the most extreme of radical New Lights. But when Gilman expressed the sweetness of communion with God, he described an experience that was familiar to the most orthodox. In a fashion reminiscent of his close friend Rogers, Gilman was particularly moved when the Spirit prompted his thoughts on the nature of Christ's sacrifice:

I cannot but reflect with Wonder on the gracious Discovery the Lord was pleased to make to my Soul...when at One View there Seemd to be a Marvellous display of the Most important truths of the Gospel, I Seemmed to Behold in Christ a Body of Divinity, and to have a Glorious Discovery of the Manifold Wisdom of God in Man's Redemption--such as I can compare to Nothing More fitly than, the Blank paper in the Printer's press receiving upon it a Variety of Truths at One and the Same Impression--& tho the General Impression lost its Strength as I came to apply My Mind intensely to Consider particular Truths, yet I trust My Faith...is hereby strengthened.

Not long after this experience, Gilman wrote:

It pleased the Lord to give me Some Views of the glorious Method of man's Redemption So that My Faith Seemd considerably to revive--Oh! for a Fresh Breathing from the Spirit of Grace that Doubts and Unbelief may Vanish and I may be Filld with Divine Light and Love...Dearest Dearest Dearest Adored Lord Jesus Sieze My Heart fully for thy Self.

Gilman frequently reported emotionally satisfying encounters with God that occurred during his devotions:
Awoke early, arose, Sought the Lord, and Praise be for ever to his glorious Name, he heard me, comforted Me—and assisted Me in My Meditating on Psalm 142:5....Jesus Drew nigh of a Truth, glory to his Dear sacred name for ever more—O The Bright Light the Sweet peace, the Solid Joy, that pen can never Express.

Clearly, for all three men there was what J. William T. Youngs described as a "compelling quality" about moments of communion with God.33

However, similar as their mystical encounters may have been intrinsically, the theological dispositions of radical New Lights differed not only from that of Edwards (with whose writings they were all no doubt familiar), but from other Puritans, as for example, Cotton Mather. (The degree to which the theology of Rogers and Gilman diverged from orthodoxy is the subject of the following chapter.)33

There was a strain in Puritanism that drove believers to seek more inward and subjective spiritual experiences that differed little, really, from the emotional states valued by Rogers and Gilman. To make this point it is necessary to look briefly at the resolution of the Antinomian crisis, an event that "rent the heart of New England" six years after the Bay Colony's founding.34

When Anne Hutchinson asserted that the Holy Spirit spoke to the believer apart from the Word, and claimed to have experienced immediate revelations, she threatened the foundation of Massachusetts Bay. The general court judged that "she walked by such a rule as cannot stand with the
peace of any State; for such bottomlesse revelations...being above reason and Scripture...are not subject to controll."

Governor John Winthrop recognized immediately that the logic of Hutchinson's conception of a ministry of the Spirit led inexorably to the point where there need be no formal ministry at all. This "iconoclasm," to borrow J. F. Maclear's appropriate term, was inimical to the very existence of the Bay Colony, and was instantly suppressed. Hutchinson was banished, John Cotton, whose pneumatic thought provided much of the inspiration for her yielded to political pressure, and from that time forward, whatever loss may have been incurred, New England's compass was set by the strictest conjunction of Spirit and Word. The result, as Perry Miller pointed out, was that the course was laid for the development of predestinationism. And, importantly, the mystical and emotional dimension of Puritan spirituality was repressed.35

The Puritans did not, as a result of this crisis, cease striving to hear the still small voice of the Spirit. Theirs remained a profoundly spiritual theology, but one which for most, anyway, became grounded in the absolutist assumption that the era of immediate revelation ended with the apostolic age. The spirit no longer spoke apart from the Word. Significantly however, in the wake of the Antinomian controversy, there were Puritans who rejected this, although to all appearances they stepped in tune to the music of the establishment. In the Bay colony a more
mystical stress on the Spirit "continued a subterranean existence," "'sometimes like Wizards to peepe and mutter out of the ground.'" Indeed, there were many Puritans who, like Cotton, believed that "in the course taken for the clensing of God's field...some truths of God fared the worse."

Individuals convinced that by the resolution of the crisis man had attempted to circumscribe the movements of the Spirit and suppress more emotional experiences soon welcomed Quaker missionaries as "messengers of God:" one of Maclear's points was that "in New England as in Old England, the mystical element in Puritan religion had...come to rest in Quakerism." In Everett Emerson's words, "'Heart Religion'...became a thing of the past."36

Most Puritans tread about the issue with exquisite caution. So cautious were they, in fact, that pastors believed Christians were inclined to dismiss or repress the genuine voice of the Spirit from fear that it was vain imagination. In any case, after 1637 Puritans of the mainstream took the orthodox view of the relationship between Word and Spirit.

There was in seventeenth-century Puritanism, then, a strong pneumatic impulse that manifested itself in an irresistible yearning for emotionally satisfying encounters with God. Clearly a spiritual dynamic impelled some Puritans toward a more subjective encounter with the Spirit that might be expressed in private or public worship. It is important to keep in mind as we explore the workings of the
radical mind, that in a limited sense, Rogers and Gilman were heirs of a tradition long gone underground. However, their assumptions about the nature of the workings of the Holy Spirit and their understanding of the relationship between man and the Spirit went far beyond anything to which even John Cotton would have subscribed prior to the Antinomian crisis. Until he realized the political inexpediency of his position, Cotton resisted the Spirit-restricting model of preparationism. He believed that the heart might be taken by storm, and so he might have regarded the meetings over which Rogers presided with some sympathy. But much of Rogers's thinking and behavior would have horrified even him. Cotton was disturbed that Hutchinson's "Faith was not strengthened by publick Ministry, but by private Meditations, or Revelations only." He was cautious. By 1743, radical New Lights had thrown all caution to the winds, doing violence to a theological and ecclesiological edifice that had been more than one hundred years in the making. 37

In sum, the intrinsic nature of Rogers's "sense" of God's presence in his life differed little from that of many New England Puritans and what differences there were, were more quantitative than qualitative, at least in Rogers's early years as an itinerant. Qualitative differences, that is, differences that subverted orthodoxy, emerged later and were, as the Puritans learned through their experiences with Antinomianism, predictable. It was then, the degree to
which Rogers relied on the emotions—he depended on both the emotional response of those to whom he preached and tokens of the Spirit's movement (that is, visible signs)—that was extreme, and this distinguished him from the vast majority of Puritans. On the effects of preaching, for example, the Puritans assumed that human emotions "in themselves...carried no power to convince," and certainly did not "prove" anything. "Properly, they served to intensify previously established conviction" and so ought to be "released only after the listener had been persuaded through rational means." Mather, for instance, who made every effort to excite the feelings of his listeners, urged that a preacher be handmaiden to the "reasons of the heart," so that persons might respond to the "voice of God." But his modus operandi was grounded in the firm conviction that a minister preached so that the affections of his flock were subordinated to reason.38

This is not to suggest that Puritan congregations resisted any impulses to show their emotions while they worshipped. It was not uncommon for Puritan congregations to cry out. For example, "when the famous Mr. John Rogers of Dedham in England was preaching,...it was usual for many that heard that very awakening and rousing preacher of God's word, to make a great cry." Joseph Tracy noted that early Puritans "were by no means scandalized when their people felt so strongly that they could not conceal their emotions." And Thomas Shepard "scarce ever preached a
sermon, but some or other of his congregation were struck with great distress, and cried out in agony, 'what shall I do to be saved?' As a matter of fact, this was so typical that people who had been unable to attend worship would inquire, 'Who hath been wrought upon today?'"\(^39\)

But what distinguished Rogers (and other radical New Lights) from the Puritans, as well as from more moderate New Lights was the primacy, the unequivocally central place that they accorded the emotions. This was altogether a new thing, unfamiliar in New England's psychic landscape. It alienated Old Lights and moderate New Lights and knitted the radicals together in mutual defense and support of one another. It was according to his feelings, his "emphasis upon inward, subjective experience," that Rogers evaluated the state of his own soul, continuously assessed his relationship to God, and felt qualified to judge the spiritual condition of others. His feelings were the measure by which he gauged the efficacy of his own and others' preaching, and by his feelings he appraised the course and heat of the revival. No other soteriological aspect was so important to a radical as his subjective responses to God's redemptive presence in even the most trivial affairs of daily life. Because of this disposition, the radical New Light suffered the agonies and ecstasies, the anguish and exaltation, that is, the psychological extremes that inevitably buffet any individual convinced that God speaks with greatest authority to human emotions.
Because what they "felt" colored, if it did not dictate, the moment-by-moment tenor of their daily lives, ultimately radical New Lights were inclined to subvert the Calvinism they thought they were defending. The degree to which they did so is the subject of the following chapter. Chapter two describes radical deviancy in detail, analyzes the source of it, and finally, suggests that at the root of the radical temperament was spiritual immaturity.
CHAPTER II

JONATHAN EDWARDS'S THOUGHTS ON RADICALISM.

In all the possibility of things there is and can be but one happiness and one misery. The one misery is nature and creature left to itself, the one happiness is the Life, the Light, the Spirit of God, manifested in nature and creature. This is the true meaning of the words of Our Lord: There is but one that is good, and that is God.

William Law

"A great affair should be managed with great prudence: this is the most important affair that ever New England was called to be concerned in," Jonathan Edwards wrote in 1742 of the Great Awakening. But prudence was not a characteristic of the radical wing of pro-revivalists and their excesses soured many against the revival. Edwards believed that God would make use of their "imprudent and rash zeal, and censorious spirit, to chastise the deadness, negligence, earthly mindedness, and vanity" that characterized the ministry before the revival broke out in 1740, but he also realized that unless the offensive excesses of the radicals were accounted for, the divine nature of the revival itself would be called into question. He turned to this task in the "Revival of Religion in New England," a masterful treatise which diagnosed virtually every spiritual disease and deficiency from which radical New Lights suffered, and offered a comprehensive explanation for their extreme behavior.
Precisely how he accomplished his task will be demonstrated in the following pages. While no historian has made it his object to conduct a thorough analysis of these figures, without exception, every important scholar of the Great Awakening has described the radicals' unseemly conduct and some have offered explanations for it. These explanations have been cursory and superficial. C.C. Goen, for example, offered a theory to explain the scandalous antics of the Rev. James Davenport, the most notorious of all radicals, in less than two pages. Nicholas Gilman was Davenport's northern counterpart and according to Charles E. Clark, it was the loss of two young sons that lay at the root of his disreputable behavior. His fanaticism was merely the climax of a long history of neuroses, and Clark argued that "sublimation" explained the fanatical fashion in which the "mad evangelist" "found the answer to his grief;" Gilman "plunge'd into the affairs" of his Durham, New Hampshire congregation "with renewed energy." Similarly, William Kidder attributed Gilman's shameful antics to intellectual insecurity, a personality all too easily influenced and chronic health problems, "the strain of which may have burst free in the electric atmosphere of the Great Awakening." Elizabeth Currier Nordbeck observed that "while Gilman's enthusiasm stopped somewhere short of madness, there is little doubt that it was in part the product of a sick mind and body." Few would disagree with her assertion
that "Nicholas Gilman was not representative of any but the most radical fringe," and to her thinking, the Rev. Daniel Rogers, the "principal northern itinerant," was "far more influential." But she made little effort to account for Rogers's behavior, either.  

While all of their observations may be true, the theories promulgated by these historians are less exhaustive in comparison to the exacting treatment Edwards gave to an entire spectrum of grave spiritual maladies that expressed themselves--predictably and invariably--in the form of irrational behavior patterns. Obviously, modern historians use psychology to explain such behavior patterns and while as Darrett B. Rutman wrote, psychology may very well be "the metaphysics of the twentieth century," it has not, to date, explained radical deviancy as satisfactorily as Edwards, who of course had a different agenda and was doing theology, not history. Edwards specifically identified virtually every negative manifestation of radical New Light conduct, subjected it to a painstaking theological scrutiny, and showed that the radicals fell into precisely the behavioral pitfalls that he predicted. And on the basis of the formidable logic for which he was renowned, he demonstrated that the remedy, like the cause of all of these particular dysfunctions, was exclusively spiritual. Though some historians would dispute Perry Miller's contention that Edwards was "one of America's five or six major artists who happened to work with ideas instead of with poems or
most would agree that Edwards spoke for orthodox evangelicalism at mid eighteenth century. Certainly his contemporaries acknowledged him to be an intellectual and theological leader. Among northern New England New Light clergymen, few would not have been acquainted with his writing, for by 1743-1744 his was a household name in New England. A Divine and Supernatural Light went to press in 1734, A Faithful Narrative of the Surprising Work of God had gone through three editions and 20 printings by 1739, The Distinguishing Marks of a Work of the Spirit of God and Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God were both published in 1741, and Some Thoughts Concerning the Present Revival of Religion in New England in 1742. Nicholas Gilman read aloud from Edwards's sermons to his own congregation and triggered a string of surprising awakenings. Jeremiah Wise's deference to Edwards's "Mind" was typical. Wise, minister to the congregation at Berwick, Maine, referred readers of his own "Attestation" to the ideas of "the worthy pastor of Northhampton" on the "Conduct of the Friends of this Work," rather than attempt to justify or explain the "Disorders, Irregularities, &c" himself. The Rev. Samuel Moody's welcome to Edwards, who was to deliver a sermon in Portsmouth, New Hampshire, dramatizes the nature of his and his wife Sarah's fame across New England:

As soon as the prayer was closed, Mr. Moody turned round, and saw Mr. Edwards behind him; and, without leaving his place, gave him his right hand, and addressed him as follows, "Brother Edwards, we are
all of us much rejoiced to see you here to-day....I didn't intend to flatter you to your face; but there's one thing I'll tell you: They say that your wife is going to heaven, by a shorter road than yourself." Mr. Edwards bowed, and after reading the Psalm, went on with the Sermon.

With Edwards as the representative spokesman for the orthodox center of an uncompromising Calvinism then, this chapter illustrates the degree to which radical New Lights deviated from the evangelical norm. Edwards's theological understanding of the nature of revival gone out-of-control was so comprehensive that it provides a yardstick by which we may measure the excesses of Nicholas Gilman, Daniel Rogers, and another radical, the Rev. Joseph Adams of Stratham, New Hampshire. Finally, his incisive thinking will help us to formulate the nature of the radical "temperament."³

Accordingly, each behavior pattern will be examined in turn in an attempt to demonstrate that the hysteria (manifested in a bewildering variety of "enthusiastical" notions), bitterness, ungodliness, and censoriousness that poisoned the radical wing of New Lights was caused by several specific spiritual errors identified by Edwards. These causes were "a considerable degree of remaining corruption," "spiritual pride," "wrong principles," "a mixture of the corrupt and the divine," and finally, "disproportion."
There were few ministers who behaved more imprudently—with more "intemperate heats, wildness and distraction"—than New Hampshire's Nicholas Gilman, Joseph Adams and Daniel Rogers. Of the three, the most infamous was Nicholas Gilman. Even in the popular imagination the Great Awakening is associated with congregations that lost themselves in varying degrees of emotional extravagance, but Gilman's congregation outdid them all. The "Durham dancers" illustrate religious hysteria in the extreme, and we will take a close look at them (and others) before we consider Edwards's explanation for their behavior.⁴

The Rev. Samuel Chandler, minister to the congregation at Gloucester, Massachusetts, visited Durham in 1747 and wrote a detailed account of the kinds of things that were going on there. His report follows in its entirety:

I set out on a journey to Durham to a fast at the desire of the church there, they being under difficulty....Mr. Prince, a blind young man supplies them during their Pastor's silence & neglect to discharge his pastoral office. When we went into the pulpit Mr. Gilman went out & went into the pew. I began with prayer. I was under some restraint....In the exercise were a number, 4 or 5, that were extraordinarily agitated. They made all manner of mouths, turning out their lips, drawing their mouths awry, as if convulsed, straining their eye balls and twisting their bodies in all manner of unseemly postures. Some were falling down, others were jumping up, catching hold of one another, extending their arms, clapping their hands, groaning, talking. Some were approving what was spoken, and
saying aye, so it is, that is true, 'tis just so, &c. Some were exclaiming and crying out aloud, glory, glory. It drowned Mr. Wise's voice. He spoke to them, entreated them condemned the practice, but all to no purpose. Just after the blessing was pronounced, Mr. Gilman stood up to oppose some things that had been said. He read 1 John 1.8 & 9th verse, & began some exposition on the 9th verse what God hath cleansed let no man call unclean & went on to prove perfection as attainable in this life. Then Mr. Wise rose up and there was some argumentation between them. Mr. Gilman took some particular text & turned it contrary to the general current of scripture. Then we went into the house & were entertained. Mr. Gilman came in & after him a number of those high flyers, raving like mad men, reproaching, reflecting. One Hannah Huckins in a boasting air said she had gone through adoption, justification & sanctification & yet had a bad memory: I reasoned the point with her, but presently she broke out into exclamation 'Blessed be the Lord, who hath redeemed me, Glory, glory, glory &c.' fell to dancing round the room, singing some dancing tunes, jiggs, three more fell in with her & the room was filled with applauders, people of the same stamp, crying out in effect Great is Diana of the Ephesians. One of these danced up to Mr. Gilman & said, Dear man of God, do you approve of these things? Yes, said he, I do approve of them. They began to increase and the house was full of confusion, some singing bawdy songs, others dancing to them, and all under a pretence of religion. It is all to praise God in the dance and the tabret. One woman said it was revealed to her that the minister that was to come to the Fast was one that did not know Joseph, & that Joseph was Mr. Gilman. These mad people prophesied that there would be great trials at the falls, that is at the meetinghouse that day....Mr. Gilman justified their proceedings. 

This kind of conduct was only the tip of the iceberg. Gilman was impressionable, and persons of questionable character both in and outside his congregation easily gained ascendancy over him— with serious consequences. (This is not to assert that he was weak. He had the character to question George Whitefield's blessing upon the Louisbourg
expedition, a popular cause, and the boldness to criticize the worldly motives of Colonel William Pepperell—the single most powerful man in Maine). These persons convinced him to expect immediate heavenly guidance, and they delivered it to him themselves in the form of visions, dreams, and other supposed directives of the Spirit.®

The most shocking episode involved a female. Mary Reed's "fascination for Gilman—now transformed into charismatic prophet—included an ill-disguised attraction that was more than spiritual." The young minister was no Elmer Gantry, and throughout his life he remained very much in love with his wife. Nevertheless, the fact was that the young woman remained in the parsonage for four nights when Mary Gilman was away. "Knowing how My Character and Conduct at the present day would be represented abroad—I asked her—whether I ought to mind What men said of Me?" "No, No, Mind what the Spirit of Christ Says....He has a Great Work for you to do, but don't be afraid He will carry you through it," she responded. Gilman was disgruntled about the "great and very unreasonable disturbance made in the Town about her being at My House," and though he was, obviously, simple-minded to encourage Reed to to share her night-long spiritual ecstasies, he was also guileless: "Dear Jesus give Me all Needfull Light in this Dispensation of Thine," he prayed.®

The town was in an uproar over their behavior, but Mary Reed's domination over Gilman was complete. Two weeks later
she shared another vision with him, and he heeded her instructions obediently: "Now Last night Mary Reed in a Revelation had the 49th Psalm to bring me to read, and to desire me to call the people together every Wednesday for two Months, for their Time was but Short. accordingly I notifyd a lecture on Wednesday, and purpose to Wait on the Lord for further Direction."

Daniel Rogers also responded to Ms. Reed's visions unquestioningly: "Towards night we were called in to see a young woman Mary Reed who had just been in a vision, and as she told us she had a terrifying view of hell and the damned there—that she heard their dreadful blasphemies—and was tempted by the Devils to blaspheme God—but she cryed to the Lord for help and was heard—She had her heart impressed with a sense that she had justly discovered? illeg. Hell. Lord help me to make a wise improvement of such dispensations of thy Providence." 

There were other, similar incidents. Rogers's brother, the Rev. John Rogers, was pastor of the church at Kittery Point, in Maine, and Daniel marveled when, following his brother's service, three men reported "that in sermon time they saw a Bird much larger than a Dove white as snow hovering at one of the upper windows, one of 'em saw it several times and other once or twice, may the Holy Ghost as a Dove descend from Time to Time upon the minister and congregation in that House."

The radicals also believed that children might be
heavenly oracles. "Out of the mouths of these Babes of Suckling," Rogers wrote, "God brings forth Praise."

Historians have understandable misgivings about Edwards's analysis of four-year old Phebe Bartlet, but whatever psychological sins were committed in relationship to her were quite different from the blows dealt to orthodoxy by the radicals' conviction that the Lord spoke through little children to reveal new truths to sinful men. Rogers recorded the "remarkables" of one evening meeting as follows:

A young lad--fell into what he called a trance in which the body is insensible--...about 7 O'clock we were sent for....the Lad was come out of his Trance and had told the people he had seen Heaven and Hell, that he had (in Spirit) seen Christ, that the day of judgment was coming which exceedingly moved the people--some rejoiced and they tho't of Christ's coming--several children and some young men...were seized with strong convictions--we came and found' em in a great Tumult crying out some in an agony--we examined the young lad--who told us much as we had heard that his Spirit had been drawn out and carried up to Heaven where he had a view of Christ in Glory sitting at the right hand of God--and of angels, and saints--particularly his Grandfather. after this he had a view of Hell as a Place of dreadful Darkness, full of Devils, The angel told him not to be afraid--moreover He said that Christ told him to declare these Things to the People--to warn 'em to repent--and that He would die in three months.

Rogers believed not only that a child might be the "best preacher" on occasion, but that the exhortations and visions of children were the immediate revelations of God:

The people continued in God's house all Day--between three and four P.M. I went to em and found a young man reading a discourse when He had done I spoke to 'em in a most lively affectionate manner. This is
that Spirit of Prophecy which is the Testimony of Jesus—the Lad was sensible of It—and told the people that It was the Spirit of Christ that spoke in Him—that if he thought it wasn't He would not speak a word more. I believe in this Holy Ghost....I spoke to the people again and asked 'em whether they didn't believe Christ had been speaking to 'em by the mouth of the Child—I told 'em I did—I exhorted 'em to hear his voice.

Convinced that the Spirit spoke unmediated in Mary Reed's visions and through unsophisticated children, Gilman and Rogers were equally confident that the mutterings of unlearned itinerant preachers were the utterances of God. Therefore, they were vulnerable to the likes of self-appointed "prophets" like one Richard Woodbury who was extremely volatile, offensive to almost everybody, and yet gained such an influence over Gilman that they formed an alliance. Contemporary witnesses who inquired into the situation at Durham learned that:

said Richard Woodbury is an illiterate person generally apprehended of a disordered brain; who having in the late years frequently taken upon himself the part of an exhorter did about two months ago receive private ordination to the Work of the ministry from the Rev. Nicholas Gilman, said Mr. Gilman with several Laicks, imposing hands upon him in the ceremony. Woodbury was convinced that he was not only a Minister of Christ, but extraordinarily and immediately sent and commissioned of him to perform great and wonderful things, which were at the door. The mad enthusiast,...pretending to inspiration, uttered several blasphemous and absurd speeches, asserting that he was the same to day, yesterday, and forever, saying he had it in his power to save or damn whom he pleased, falling downs upon the ground, licking the dust, and condemning all to hell who would not do the like, drinking healths to King Jesus, self-existing Being, 'nd prosperity to the Kingdom of heaven, and a thousand other such mad and ridiculous frolics.
We shall have more to say about this individual later.\textsuperscript{12}

Gilman's partnership with Woodbury was at least consistent, for Gilman now believed that human erudition, study, and learning hindered the work of the ministry. Convinced that human preparations inhibited the more spontaneous promptings of the Spirit, he accused pastors who relied on notes of preaching without the Spirit. Chandler recalled that "Mr. Gilman says he has a witness within him that I neither preached nor prayed with the Spirit. I told him I had a witness myself that I did both. He said how can that be when you have your thumb papers, and you could hardly read them? He seemed to speak by way of reflection and an air of disdain."\textsuperscript{13}

Rogers also equated the Spirit's presence with extempore preaching. Early in his evangelistic career, shortly after his conversion and about one month following Whitefield's departure, Rogers thought it significant enough to enter into his journal the fact that he preached for the first time "without notes." Two days later he "preached again...without notes--and partly extempore...God was graciously pleased in answers to prayers to assist me much. I was greatly enlarged toward the latter part of sermon. This is a great encouragement to me to go on in this way of preaching--blessed be God for this Encouragement." Not long after this, Rogers felt he was "provoking God by unbelief" because after a mood of "discouragement," he was afraid to
preach without notes. When we recall the months that he spent with Whitefield and Tennent, and reflect that the men who were his role models preached extempore to great effect, no wonder it was important to him to preach as the Spirit moved him. It was but another "sign" that God wanted him in the ministry; it was a divine blessing upon his efforts.

Rogers, as was explained in the first chapter, was insecure of his role in the ministry in the first place. To rely on "thumb papers" was to succumb to a doubt like that of St. Thomas's, and so preaching without preparation became a test of faith. If he did any homiletical homework, he was relying on the flesh.  

Early in his career, Gilman was also unsure of his fitness for the ministry:

read out the first chap. in George Hutch eson , on John--where I met with this Encouraging Observ. on John 1.31.-'Men called of God to the Work of the Ministry, must not stand back because of the Conscience of Much inability but ought to hazard on the Call expecting that the furniture Shall grow upon their hands as they Need it for John is Sent Not only to preach Christ but to Point him out, when yet he knew him not, but had a promise that he should know him, as afterward he did.

Reassurance also came for him with "success," or evidence of the kind that Rogers valued, i.e., evidence of conversions, visions, emotional distress and other discernible "signs."  

Rogers's refusal to prepare sermons reached the point where he expected the "immediate suggesting of words from
the spirit of God." One entry in his diary reads, "In the morning the Lord gave me a word to pr. 1 Peter 2.9 a gt number of people gathered some from far." On another occasion, he was addressing a large audience of approximately 1000 when he:

began to speak to the People, but found myself quite empty of a sense of Spiritual Things--confessed to the People--but my heart was in Distress. I could not speak to 'em as I Earnestly Desire'd. I sat down and lifted up my Heart to God for help...and attempted to speak again--and God was pleased to give in help--particularly to apply some passages of the prodigal son with earnestness of Spirit....The Spirit of God came down in an astonishing manner--2 or 3 cried out--it spread like fire...some hundred--3 or 4 at least cryed so great a weep of lamentation I never heard before! I extended my voice as much as possible--but could not be heard half over the House, upon which we sang...like the Tumult.

In this scene, Rogers's may have been compelled to a subconscious strategy to affect his hearers. Convinced that God spoke most cogently through the preacher who did not make any preparation, he knew that they would be moved by his humble acknowledgment that he felt "empty," and his sincere pleas for help from God showed a total dependence on Him. In such a large assembly the drama of his fervent prayer and God's subsequent "help" is obvious. And as a tactic, it worked--hundreds manifested distress. 16

The net effect of this kind of dependence was inertia. Rogers wrote, "Found my mind shut up as to any subject to preach upon, but stayed upon the Lord for assistance...The Lord of his free grace suggested the subject to me giving me a clear and distinct view of it and great freedom of
utterance on 57 Isaiah 15...I find by constant experience that when I am enabled to trust in the Lord for assistance, He never fails me." And it was so easy! When one assumed that effort cramped the Spirit's style, inaction was appropriate.17

How then, if in the aberrant behavior described above, there was an inordinate degree of spiritual pathology at work did Edwards, eighteenth-century America's premier metaphysician, diagnose it? First, he established that the various behavior patterns were, indeed, abnormal. Then he isolated their causes.

In Edwards's mind there was no question about the bacchanalian meetings over which the Rev. Nicholas Gilman presided. The Durham dancers exemplified what seventeenth-century Massachusetts Puritans dreaded most—Antinomianism completely out of control. Edwards's horror at this sort of behavior did not, however, derive from any inherent opposition to emotional display. To anyone even superficially familiar with Edwards's writings it is obvious that he defended "raisd affections" as the very core of true religion. But to Old Lights it was sufficient reason to condemn the revival because it appeared that inflammatory rhetoric inflamed the passions of New Lights. They complained that preachers like James Davenport and Gilbert Tennent promoted emotionalism without appealing to men's reason. Charles Chauncy, for example, despised that "the Gentlemen, whose preaching has been most
remarkably accompanied with these Extraordinaries, not only use in their Addresses to the People, all the terrible Words they can...but in such a Manner, as naturally tends to put weaker Minds out of the Possession of themselves." 18

Gilman's tactics epitomized what horrified Chauncy. A contemporary observer reported Gilman's histrionics:

One day this fellow...exerted himself in the utmost to move assions in his audience by using such pathetic expressions s dull, costive fancy could frame. 'What!' said he, 'not one tear for poor Christ, who shed his blood for you; not one tear, Christians! not one single tear! Tears for blood is but a poor recompense. O fie! fie! this is but cold comfort.' At that an old woman bolted up in pious fury and mounting the pulpit steps, bestowed such a load of close hugs and kisses upon the preacher that she stopped his mouth for some time, and had almost suffocated him with kindness." 19

Edwards responded that Chauncy's position was "in a great measure built on a mistake, and confused notions that some have about the nature and cause of the affections, and the manner in which they depend on the understanding. All affections are raised either by light in the understanding, or by some error and delusion in the understanding; for all affections do certainly arise from some apprehension in the understanding." For Edwards, the issue reduced itself to the question of whether people's emotions were being aroused by "apprehensions that are agreeable to truth, or whether they are mistakes." Since the "truth" with which Edwards concerned himself was no less than that of the Gospel, he believed it his duty "to raise the affections of my hearers as high as I possibly can, provided that they are affected
with nothing but truth." Impassioned preaching of itself did not incline persons to emerge with false understanding the way "a moderate, dull indifferent way of speaking of them would." Therefore, the preacher ought to be earnest and affectionate in his delivery, commensurate with—or in "proportion" to—the nature and importance, or "worthiness" of the subject. He did not believe that preachers should be reproved "for raising the affections of their hearers too high, if that which they are affected with, be only that which is worthy of affection, and their affections are not raised beyond a proportion to their importance." In sum, Edwards was convinced that "our people do not so much need to have their heads stored, as to have their hearts touched; and they stand in the greatest need of that sort of preaching, that has the greatest tendency to do this." Furthermore, if the use of terror awakened lost souls, "why should we be afraid to let persons that are in an infinitely miserable condition, know the truth...for fear it should terrify them?" To fail to do so would be to act like the surgeon who merely plastered over a serious wound and left the "core" untouched.20

This was not, however, all he had to say on the subject. He issued a warning. Any effort "to bring a congregation to that pass that there should be...an uproar among them," was justifiable only if the affections raised were good and had a "good effect." What was going on in Durham was not "good." Clearly, something was awry when
parishioners used "terrible language" and were quick to accuses others of being "from the devil, or from hell; and said that such a thing is devilish or cursed, and that such persons are serving the devil," so that the words devil and hell permeated their vocabulary. When Gilman's people "struck one another with their fists, saying you are a devil and you are a devil," Gilman approved. Similar behavior among other New Lights made Edwards fear that the "lovely appearance of humility, sweetness, gentleness, mutual honor, benevolence, complacence, and an esteem of others above themselves that ought to clothe the children of God all over" was disappearing in a rising tide of Antinomianism. And it was "directly contrary" to the Biblical injunction to "be sober, be vigilant."

Rogers was also guilty of encouraging unlovely behavior. In one instance a man among his listeners became so distraught "with the Terrors of the Lord" that others present "were forced to bind him." Rogers verbally flailed his hearers until he wrung from them some sort of physical response because he believed that distress was a token of the Lord's presence. Evidence of his herculean efforts to evoke distress in his hearers comes from an almost amusing situation in which he scolded that his hearers had better meet his (and God's) expectations. At a six o'clock meeting:

the people below sat in silence a considerable
while...I told em...when the Lord is working powerfully especially by the Law in a Way of conviction then it would occasion some external disorder—and we must be willing that God should carry on his work in His own Way and ask'd em further whether they were desirous that the Lord would come down now by his Spirit and carry on his work in His own way....After this some new converts were filled with the Holy Ghost a little Girl appeared to receive Christ a woman that had been long under conviction found satisfying comfort in Him.

And Rogers, it must be said, was apparently satisfied.  

Edwards believed that physical effects could indeed be signs of God's presence, and the preacher who encouraged them stood on firm ground: "but for speaking of such effects as probable tokens of God's presence, and arguments of the success of preaching, it seems to me they are not to be blamed, because I think they are so indeed." But he warned that this was not always the case. Physical effects were not always the product of the Spirit's movement. Error was possible, indeed, probable, because often Satan had a hand in it. Edwards warned that "the devil's main strength shall be tried with the friends of the revival and he will chiefly exert himself in his attempts upon them to mislead them."

Furthermore, as Edwards emphasized in Part II of Religious Affections, the Spirit could work a true impression without causing any physical response at all. He concluded that raised affections, as well as ecstatic transports, were not to be "wholly unlimited" and should be accompanied by inward spiritual growth. Otherwise, "the outward show will increase...with less and less affection of soul...until
their actions and behavior become indeed very absurd."
Edward was "far from thinking" that religious affections
"should be wholly without...regulations," and he insisted
that "some have erred in setting no bounds, and indulging
and encouraging this disposition without any kind of
restraint or direction."23

Edward had thoughts about the transports, visions and
revelations that Gilman's people claimed to have
experienced, as well. Few among the orthodox would
subscribe to the authenticity of Mary Reed's revelations, of
the testimony of those who saw "Doves" and "Angells" and the
visions of children. And for Old Lights, these things
proved that "multitudes" were indeed, in the words of Ezra
Stiles, "seriously, Soberly and solemnly out of their
wits." Edward did not defend or justify such excesses and
the dubious behavior of Reed and Gilman. But neither did he
say that raptures and transports were impossible. He was
himself "particularly acquainted with many persons that have
been the subjects of the ...extraordinary transports of the
present day...and where the affections of...love and
joy...have been raised to a higher pitch than in any other
instances I have observed." In the case of his wife, it was
as if Sarah's "soul dwelt on high, and was lost in God, and
seemed almost to leave the body; dwelling in a pure
delight."24

Nevertheless, Edward was distressed at the slightest
hint of reliance on supra-scriptural phenomena such as was
common to both the Durham dancers and Rogers's supporters. "Why cannot we be contented with the divine oracles, that holy, pure word of God, that we have in such abundance, and such clearness, now since the canon of Scripture is completed?" he complained. "Why should we desire to have anything added to them by impulses from above?...Or why should any desire any higher kind of intercourse with heaven, than that which is by having the Holy Spirit...infuse and excite grace and holiness?"^25

In view of this it may be surprising that Edwards did not attack Christians like Mary Reed. Rather, he painstakingly explained that this kind of behavior was attributable to the "mixture" of the "corrupt" and the "divine" in all believers. This mixture was "what Christians are liable to in the present exceeding imperfect state." Christians never experienced the purely spiritual "without any mixture of what is natural and carnal." And true believers were especially vulnerable to:

impressions on the imagination; whereby godly persons, together with a spiritual understanding of divine things, and conviction of their reality and certainty, and a strong and deep sense of their excellency or great importance upon their hearts, have strongly impressed on their minds external ideas or images of things. Italics mine A degree of imagination in such a case...is unavoidable, and necessarily arises from human nature, as constituted in the present state; and a degree of imagination is really useful, and often is of great benefit; but when it is in too great a degree, it often becomes an impure mixture that is prejudicial. This mixture very often arises from the constitution of the body.
It commonly greatly contributes... to natural affections and passions; it helps to raise them to a great height.  

What was "natural and carnal" often derived from overheated imaginations. For Theophilus Pickering (the Ipswich pastor who took issue with Daniel Rogers over the divine origins of the Great Awakening), the explanation for extreme New Light behavior was simple. "Pickering attributed the hysterics to and in part to People's meeting in the night," Rogers noted with chagrin. In reality, people were simply not used to the kind of excitement generated by the revival. Night-long meetings contributed to visions of Doves, hell, and the torments of the damned.  

Such agonizingly protracted meetings were physically and emotionally draining, and their very novelty contributed to the unusual behavior we have described. Gilman's own account of what was probably a typical meeting in Durham amidst the revival demonstrates this:

I found myself grow lively in Sermon—and I trust, the Spirit of the Lord came powerfully on Me and the Assembly—Jesus (I am persuaded) opened mine understanding to understand the scriptures. Blessed be his Name—I continued (I believe) at the least Eight hours in My Sermon—the Nature of this perfect Work much unfolded...for it abounded—Many portions of Scripture Opened...Towards sunset Anthony Jones came and took me out of the Pulpit led me abroad—the People Screamed—I soon returned and went on with My Discourse—and dismissed the Assembly about half after ten in the Evening—.

If overheated imaginations explained the behavior of Mary Reed and Hannah Huckins to some degree, one can be sure
that excessive imagination played an even greater role in the response of children to the tumult of revival. Edwards's suggestion that "a degree of imagination...in too great a degree" helped to explain the visions and trances—or the "external ideas or images of things"—articulated by persons like Mary Reed, provides insight into an episode recorded in Rogers's diary.

Probably like most persons past and present who often speak publicly, Rogers was particularly fond of certain phrases. They pepper his diary and no doubt peppered his sermons. One that he used repeatedly was to describe the presence and power of God's spirit as unto "a mighty rushing wind," a Biblical phrase. Rogers recorded that he was present at a meeting when "the word ran swiftly among the dear Children of God...and particularly a little girl, who I was told never tasted the love of Christ before, I askt her how it was with her, she said Christ was come into her I askt how she answered by his spirit like a mighty rushing wind." About the genuineness of the child's conversion the historian cannot pronounce. But in this case, almost unquestionably, Rogers put words—an external idea or image of a thing—into the mouth of the little girl.\[29\]

Children as well as adults attracted a lot of interest with this kind of behavior, and perhaps their visions derived to some degree from egotistical desires for attention. As Edwards pointed out, "in what true Christians feel of affections toward God, all is not always purely holy
and divine; every thing that is felt in the affections does not arise from spiritual principles, but an improper self-love may have a great share in the effect." He was not opposed to the "religious meetings of children," however. Children who were "capable of society one with another, are capable of the influences of the Spirit of God." Edwards was convinced that God "was pleased in a wonderful manner to perfect praise out of the mouths of babes and sucklings," but he warned that "care should be taken of them, by their parents, and pastors, to instruct and direct them, and to correct imprudent conduct and irregularities." Gilman and Rogers failed to do this. The children under their charge succumbed to a variety of Antinomian enthusiasms and instructed them. 30

In any case, Edwards understood that the visions of Mary Reed and the children were due to the fact that with the spiritual mingled "a great mixture of that affection or passion which arises from natural principles." Occasionally even "that which is animal" or purely physical had its effects. What was so execrable about the Reed-Gilman incident was, obviously, that it smacked of sexual sin to an entire town, and Christians, especially ministers, were enjoined by scripture to avoid even the appearance of evil. Besides, Edwards understood that zeal, mixed with "a natural love to the opposite sex, may degenerate more and more, until it issues in that which is criminal and gross," and there were enough incidents of this nature to give skeptics
ample reason to regard the revival as a work of the devil.\textsuperscript{31}

Revelations were not always manifested in visions and ecstatic transports, but in less spectacular ways. They were, however, equally pernicious and issued from what Edwards termed "wrong principles." Of all wrong principles, none proved more harmful than the idea that, in Edwards's words, "it is God's manner, now in these days, to guide his saints, at least some that are more eminent, by inspiration, or immediate revelation, and to make known to them what shall come to pass hereafter, or what it is his will that they should do, by impressions that he by his Spirit makes upon their minds." Edwards believed that this notion explained most other errors, for if an individual believed that God led him "immediately," it made him feel "incorrigible" and "impregnable." How could anyone contend with a person convinced that he was "guided by the immediate counsels and commands of the great Jehovah?"\textsuperscript{32}

Edwards consistently denied the heterodox notion that new revelations, that is, "new truths," could come from visions, dreams, or even from Scripture. Persons were deluded who believed that God directed them immediately "because the impression is made with a text of Scripture, that comes to their mind" directing them to do a particular thing or to behave after a particular fashion, "while the text in itself, as it is in the Bible, implies no such thing." The Spirit led through the Word in a far different
Reliance on divine guidance of this nature was contrary to the "Spirit's enlightening the mind to understand the precepts or propositions of the word of God, and know what is contained and revealed in them, and what consequences may justly be drawn from them, and to see how they are applicable to our case and circumstances." This was not done by any "new revelations, only by enabling the mind to understand and apply a revelation already made." To ask God to guide by immediate revelation or to reveal the future was "not of the nature of the gracious leading of the Spirit of God." Rather, a "holy distinguishing taste" inclined one to do God's will: the "sanctifying influences of the Spirit...rectifies the taste of the soul so that it...naturally delights in those things that are holy and agreeable to God's mind."^34

Rogers and Gilman both violated orthodoxy's insistence that the Spirit gently "opened" the word to the believer. (I shall argue below that there was disagreement among Puritan theologians over precisely what constituted "orthodoxy" insofar as this issue is concerned.) Rogers practiced what amounted to "bibliomancy." Uncertain whether to go ahead with his ordination, an affair that won notoriety in Boston newspapers and rocked the clerical establishment, Rogers "sought the Lord again in secret for his direction (by his word) upon the affair of Ordination. upon which I took up...my Bible and open'd to the 3 chapt. of 1 Samuel 3 times
successively and...to Eph. 3.8 3 times successively—and then
to Acts 13. 12. 3x times also and then to 1 Cor. 4.1 twice
l chap. 17. This confirmed me in my faith that it was my
duty to seek ordination." Similarly, Gilman had some doubts
removed by being spoken to directly from his Bible: "Today
heard, Mr. Whitefield's Orphanhouse was deserted; the Work
is opposed in Scotland and written against—and that Mr. W.
is erroneous in Doctrine—these Things Seemd to move me a
little, but was directed to the fourth Chapter of
Nehemiah—and hope it will please the Lord to give me a
fresh Courage and Strength in his Service." 35

Reliance on wrong principles, then, misled the radicals
into inordinate dependencies on "immediate revelations,"
"bibliomancy" and impressions. And as we saw above, the
radicals also led themselves to believe in the Spirit's
immediate assistance in their preaching.

The act and art of preaching, it need hardly be said,
was paramount in the lives of the radical New Lights. It
exacted from them extraordinary mental and emotional
energies and took its toll physically as well. At the
height of the revival, Gilman, who did not enjoy good health
to begin with, was frequently abroad all night in the
meetinghouse, if he was not praying in the woods until
daybreak with Woodbury. Rogers reported that "it seems to
be beyond my natural strength to preach three times a day,"
and about another long meeting, he observed that "my voice
and bodily strength held out so that I could have spoke till
morning." He recorded several instances of marathon meetings that continued until dawn, and others that lasted an exhausting twenty-four hours. Sometimes they preached to enormous crowds (by eighteenth-century standards), and this of itself must have been energizing, although tiring over prolonged periods.\(^{36}\)

In the inebriating atmosphere of massive revival, many people were carried away by their eagerness to sense the Spirit and approved of a preacher only if "he furthered... inward experiences," which was Rogers's and Gilman's primary objective. Predictably, both came to expect divine assistance in an immediate fashion that sundered Word and Spirit and in effect represented a request for "new statutes and new precepts."\(^{37}\)

Both men sought God's aid in their preaching and in so doing they were entirely orthodox. A minister naturally sought His assistance and asked for His guidance; he prayed that God would illuminate the word for him and speak to the congregation through him. References to prayer as the very foundation of an effective ministry are frequent in the homiletical literature of moderate supporters of the revival, and in that of opposers as well. When Gilman cried out to God to 'dart a Quickening Ray of Divine Light into my Soul, cause the Scales to fall from mine Eyes, restore My Spiritual light," his plea was quite orthodox: "I read much one day after Another, I desire the Knowledge of Christ, I hope God blesseth what I read, for My Instruction but am
More and More Convinced, if I come to see the Truth clearly, and embrace it as it is in Jesus—it must not be meerly this My own Improvement of My Native Powers, and consulting the Works of Men—No; the Spirit of God must lead me into the Knowledge of it." Of these words both Calvin and Edwards would have approved. But the sort of assistance for which Rogers and Gilman came increasingly to pray was not that which Edwards had in mind at all.  

Even in a "dull and dead frame," a phrase that is repeated ad nauseam in his diary, Rogers expected immediate spiritual resuscitation by a vivifying breath of the Spirit. This was in contrast to Edwards's rejoinder that "when a person is in a holy and lively frame in secret prayer...and if he has these holy influences of the Spirit on his heart in a high degree, nothing in the world will have so great a tendency to make both the matter and manner of his public performances excellent." Edwards believed that the Christian who sought the Spirit had to strive for it, had to make an effort (an idea with which Cotton Mather wholeheartedly agreed). Rogers, however, grew passive, as we have seen. 

Rogers's "waiting on the Lord" to give him a word to preach would have horrified seventeenth-century Puritans as well. Thomas Foxcroft wrote that it was "'a glaring impudence and daring presumption to dream of immediate irradiation from above. The deep things of God must be digg'd out, and fetch'd up from the mine in the common way
of study, reading, and converse." Edwards addressed the issue squarely:

So the assistance of the Spirit in...preaching seems to have been greatly misunderstood, and they have sought after a miraculous assistance of inspiration by immediate suggesting of words to them, by such gifts as the apostle speaks of...instead of a gracious holy assistance of the Spirit of God, which is the far more excellent way....The gracious, and most excellent kind of assistance of the Spirit of God in praying and preaching, is not by immediate suggesting of words to the apprehension, which may be with a cold dead heart, but by warming the heart and filling it with a great sense of those things that are to be spoken of, and with holy affections, so that that sense and those affections may suggest words. Thus indeed the Spirit of God may be said, indirectly and mediately to suggest words to us...and to teach the preacher what to say....But since there is no immediate suggesting of words from the Spirit of God to be expected or desired, they who neglect and despise study and premeditation in order to a preparation for the pulpit in such an expectation are guilty of presumption.

How the Spirit spoke was at issue here. According to the Puritans it was unacceptable for "the Puritan minister to read his text and apply it as his mood or the spirit dictated," although, as Perry Miller observed, this was the method of the "exuberant fanatic" who, apart from any scholarly training, "jumps to the conclusion that he as well as any man can read and understand the word of God."

Radical New Lights expected the Spirit to aid in a way that they could experience "like a mighty rushing wind;" they sought an almost tangibly identifiable response from God. According to Edwards however, God's Spirit was always at work. One acknowledged this and carried himself accordingly, with serenity.
Edwards did concede the possibility of extempore preaching: "doubtless it may be lawful for some persons, in some cases (and they may be called to it), to preach with very little study, and the Spirit of God, by the heavenly frame of heart that he gives them, may enable them to do it to excellent purpose." But he reiterated that if "the Spirit of God sometimes strongly inclines men to utter words," it was "not by putting expressions into the mouth." If men were "urged to use certain expressions, by an unaccountable force," it was "very probably...of the devil."\(^42\)

Extempore preaching rapidly became the sin
equa
non of evangelical New Light homiletics but it derived from the same "wrong principle" as the other "enthusiasms" we have discussed, that is, that God revealed his will "immediately" to persons. Those who rested their faith on visions, dreams and immediate revelations, provided themselves with a rationale to argue that human erudition, study, learning, and preparation was not only useless but that it obstructed the mysterious workings of the Spirit. The principle became so overdrawn that in one instance, a group of New Lights attempted to form their own church because their minister carried his manuscript into his pulpit, "then prayed for divine assistance in delivering his sermon--rank hypocrisy!"\(^43\)

This anti-intellectual disposition led inexorably to an uncritical acceptance of lay exhorting. And it encouraged the notion that "remarkable experiences" and not special
education were sufficient qualification for the ministry. This was an especially poor judgement "at such a day as this," Edwards lamented, because unlearned individuals "for want of an extensive knowledge, are oftentimes forward to lead others into... dependence on impulses, vain imaginings, superstition, indiscreet zeal, and such like extremes; instead of defending them from them." There is irony in the fact that Gilman prayed for the healing of his church and in the same breath noted the arrival of Woodbury who proved to be the cause of so much of the bitterness.44

"How little do they seem to look forward, and consider the unavoidable consequences of opening such a door!" Edwards wrote in response to the idea, rapidly spreading among extremists, that unsophisticated persons were peculiarly fitted to enjoy "whispers from heaven." He continued that it was of "absolute necessity that there should be some certain, visible limits fixed, to avoid bringing odium upon ourselves, and breeding uneasiness and strife amongst others....those only should be appointed to be pastors or shepherds in God's church, that have been taught to keep cattle from their youth, or that have had an education for that purpose." Like earlier Puritans, Edwards was unalterably opposed to "'illiterate usurpers' who...claimed that the call of God was the only preparation they needed to preach." He, like the "established clergy...believed that God's call was always accompanied by years of formal training, a regular election, and an
ordination carried out with decency and order."\(^{45}\) As we have seen then, New Light extremists lost their way in a labyrinth of what Edwards identified as wrong principles. Edwards was not surprised at the results of reliance on supra-Biblical or purely Spiritist guidance— they cut a broad path that led into a bewildering, Antinomian no-man's land. Persons who depended on these did violence to orthodoxy and were not relying on the Spirit, in Edwards's phrase, to teach them "his statutes" and cause them "to understand the way of his precepts." Therefore, they "lay themselves open to the devil," and were "greatly exposed to be deceived by their own imaginations."\(^{46}\)

At the height of the revival Daniel Rogers wrote that he was "extraordinarily affected with a new sense" and wished to expend himself for the glory of God. He confessed that he "felt a sweet power of his Love in my Heart, constraining me to love him with all my Heart....the Love of Christ...particularly to enemies flow'd into my Soul. I cd have lain at their feet and begg'd em to come to Christ....I call Christ my beloved, my Sweet Saviour id trust Him for all--was made freely willing to be, do, and suffer anything for his Sake."\(^{47}\)

"Shall I mind what a Mad world Say of Me?" Gilman wrote in his journal, noting that his parishioners would think him foolhardy for riding three miles in a November gale on a pastoral call. "Wont love to Christ and Souls carry me thro storms for the Advancement of the Redeemers
Kingdom?" He too was eager to do a good work. "May I...sincerely aim at thy glory and demean my Self as becomes a disciple of Christ," he wrote; "I blush when I recall...My own Indolence. Make me O my God More Zealous than Ever to do good." 

Obviously, these two men loved their God. And, according to Edwards, even their excesses were not inconsistent with "a high degree of love to God," for it was easy for weak and sinful men to be moved" to that which is very wrong and contrary to the mind and will of God. For a high degree of love to God will strongly move a person to do that which he believes to be agreeable to God's will, and if he is in error, his love for God will move him to do that which is actually quite contrary to His will." Youthful impetuosity explained some part of their alienating zeal and enthusiasm. Rogers was thirty-three and Adams was only twenty when Whitefield arrived in America; Gilman was thirty-one when he was ordained at Durham. Moreover, Edwards explained that since they were so strongly affected "with a new sense...of the greatness and excellency of the divine Being, the certainty and infinite importance of eternal things, the preciousness of souls, and the dreadful danger of the unsaved, it was no wonder that now they think they must exert themselves, and do something extraordinary for the honor of God and the good of souls of their fellow creatures, and know not how to sit still, and forbear speaking and acting with uncommon earnestness and vigor."
In spite of the "truly gracious influence of the Spirit of God," because the radicals suffered from a "considerable degree of remaining corruption" and too "many errors in judgment in matters of religion, and in matters of practice," they persisted in their bad behavior. Edwards was fully aware that in the headiness of the revival the new sense could lead converts to perversities unless they were of uncommon "steadiness and discretion, or have not some person of wisdom to direct them." Without exquisite caution it was inevitable that irregularities would issue in much that was detrimental, and emotional extravagance and heterodox reliance on supra-Biblical phenomena were only the most flagrant. Radical New Lights were guilty of other crimes that were equally disturbing to both opponents and more moderate proponents of the revival.50

Of these crimes, the most pernicious was censoriousness. The censure of others was, according to Edwards, the "worst disease" with which extremists were afflicted. Rogers was guilty of this; actually, few among the newly converted were not, but Gilman's and the Rev. Joseph Adams's vitriolic attacks on other ministers were infamous.51

With Gilman's assistance, Woodbury took it upon himself to write "in the Name of the King of Kings and Lord of Lords," "letters of reprehension and exhortation" to a "great number" of clergymen. In a missive to the Rev. Mr. Webster of Salisbury, Massachusetts, for example, he
reminded him:

that you have Precious Souls committed to your care....Think what account you have to give when You and others must give Account of Your Stewardship and how you have improv'd the Talents committed to your Trust. Consider whether you are in the way of your Duty, while you do not come forth to vindicate and promote the good Work of God that has been going on in the Land So remarkably....If you cou'd but understand What a great Charge, Yours is--'twould be enough to make you tremble to think how dolefull it will be, and how Awfull your account, if you are guilty of the Blood of Souls perishing thro' your Neglect. Read Ezek. 33d & 34th Chap.--Now, Sir, if you would approve Your Self a Faithful Soldier of Your Lord and King, Gird on Your Armour, come forth and vindicate the Lords Quarrell.--If you have not experienced a Work of Grace in Your Own Soul, you are not capable of duly instructing others in the Way of Life....the work that has been going on in the Land, I know to be a good work of the Grace of God, by many Years experience of it in My own Soul which has of late been greatly reviv'd....the Love of Christ...constrains me to write thus to you.

The two men followed their letters up with pastoral visits. In Ipswich, Woodbury singled out both clergy and lay people for his vituperations, "arrogating to himself the Revelations of secret things, by pretended predictions and denunciation of temporal and eternal curses upon particular persons." To one individual "who questioned his extraordinary mission," he said that "before he saw his face again he should be convinced thereof, as sure as there was a God in Heaven." To "a woman in distress of conscience," he said "that she should receive comfort by the morning light; and further to another person at whom he was enraged, that he should be dead, dead, and in Hell, in the space of an hour or two."
Gilman literally stood by Woodbury's side throughout these proceedings, so of his sins he was guilty by association. "They do it out of a good design," Gilman once remarked of the singing and dancing of his people," and offered that "the reason we cannot approve of it is because there is no light in us." The clergy, however, was mortified, and thanked the Lord that there were "few, scarcely exceeding the number of one or two, beside Mr. Gilman, who has been greatly carried away by the delusions of said Woodbury, and contributed to the strengthening those delusions."54

The verbal assaults of the Rev. Joseph Adams differed little in tone from the pontificating letters of Woodbury and Gilman. Adams won notoriety among the opposition when, shortly after he took his degree at Harvard he wrote a letter to the Rev. Thomas Barnard "without any Provocation" to reproach him for his failure to support the Great Awakening:

Wo be to those Ministers, that are idle in such a Day as this is....Don't be angry if I deal plainly with you....I don't think it any Breach of Charity, to call you an opposer of this blessed Reformation, inasmuch as you don't apear for it;....you shall not go unpunished. Tho' you stiffen your Necks so, you'll find God a match for you all. And God in his own Time will frown you into Hell....I hope the Lord will convert you...or turn you out of the ministry.55

Barnard responded immediately:
For what is your Letter?.... but Insinuations of your own Instrumentality in the revival .... In a Word, every paragraph contains...an infallible style which belongs to none but God.... It is enough to make a sober Person tremble. To see how free you have made with the Thunder of the Almighty. Arrogant young Man! who take upon you to seat yourself in the Throne of the most high God, and without any Hesitation, to deal about the Threatings God has denounced against the worst of Sinners.

The censoriousness of Gilman, Woodbury and Adams attracted a good deal of attention, but Christians who censured others in more subdued fashion were no less guilty. Rogers, for example, used the "key of knowledge."

This was the idea that only individuals with whom one "held communion in the inward actings of their own souls" were regenerate. The key was "presumed to be so infallible that those who held it believed that a Christian may be known from an unbeliever as clearly as a sheep may be known from a dog." This form of censoriousness was very damaging; Edwards condemned it by implication in his funeral sermon for David Brainerd. He explained that when a new convert encountered an individual he would attempt "to discern him, or to fix a judgment of him, from his manner of talking of things of religion, whether he be converted, or experimentally acquainted with vital piety or not, and then to treat him accordingly, and freely to express their thoughts of him....they think they can easily tell a hypocrite." One example will show Rogers's tendency to censure others in precisely this fashion:
Last evening went to Mr. Smith's and supp'd there, was invited to lodge there but declin'd Elisha Marsh an opponent of the work of God being there, by who's advice I suppose Mr. Smith was strengthened in his unwillingness that I should pr. for Him----and by his praying and preaching satisfied me that he was unconverted....The people here...are in a state of dead Security nothing of the work of God has appeared among 'em--The Lord of his infinite mercy pity them and their minister.

Censoriousness was not, as most would hastily assume however, totally inconsistent with "true godliness." Edwards noted that the Bible contained many illustrations of it; as for example, in the story of Job. Reliance on one's own inner experience often led to the sin of censoriousness. Edwards explained that when spiritually dead persons were brought into "uncommon degrees of light, it is natural for such to form their notions of a state of grace wholly from what they experience." They know little about the "different degrees of grace." Nor did they realize that God's Spirit worked to convert sinners in an infinite variety of ways. "They therefore forming their idea of a state of grace only by their own experience, no wonder that it appears an insuperable difficulty to reconcile such a state, of which they have this idea, with what they observe in professors that are about them." This did not excuse their inclination to judge others, however. Woodbury, for example, was woefully out of line in his misuse of authority. "Laymen ought not to exhort as though they were the ambassadors or messengers of Christ;...nor should they
exhort and warn and charge in his name," Edwards wrote. Woodbury went too far when he wrote letters "in the Name of the King of Kings and Lord of Lords," for he was, in effect, "speaking in Christ's stead, and as having a message from him." Edwards made it clear that Scripture "strictly forbid" judgement in any form, and it was not justifiable under any circumstances. Christians were not to judge even those persons who opposed the revival. Edwards wrote that the "business is too high for me; I am glad that God has not committed such a difficult affair to me; I can leave it wholly in his hand who is infinitely fit for it, without meddling at all with it myself. We may represent it as exceeding dangerous to oppose this work of God; but I know of no necessity we are under to determine whether it be possible for those that are guilty of it to be in a state of grace or no."58

At the root of judgment and censure was the most insinuating sin of all: pride. Pride was "most like the devil its father, in a serpentine deceitfulness and secrecy: it lies deepest and is...most ready secretly to mix itself with everything....the very nature of it is to work self confidence, and drive away self-diffidence....it perverts...everything, and even the exercises of real grace, and real humility... are an occasion to exert itself." In Edwards's view spiritual pride was the primary means through which Satan worked to subvert believers and obstruct revival. Pride was the "main spring or at least
the main support of all the rest." It was "God's most stubborn enemy" and exceedingly difficult to root out because it was so insidious.  

Particularly were ministers to guard against spiritual pride and to be much in prayer about it. Edwards was convinced that spiritual pride led Adams, Gilman and Rogers to question the regeneracy of other ministers. "Spiritual pride is very apt to suspect others," Edwards insisted, "whereas a humble saint is most jealous of himself, he is so suspicious of nothing in the world as he is of his own heart. The spiritually proud person is apt to find fault with other saints, that they are low in grace, and to be much in observing how cold and dead they be." Humility, however, caused the believer to be busiest about his own heart and inclined "a person to take notice of everything that is...good in others." "Alas!" Edwards wrote, "what is man at his best estate? What is the most highly favored Christian, or the most eminent and successful minister, that he should now think he is sufficient for something, and somebody to be regarded and that he should go forth and act among his fellow creatures, as if he were wise and strong and good?" It was profitable only for "every one...to look into his own heart, and see to it that he be a partaker of the benefits of the work himself, and that it be promoted in his own soul." God required "pure Christian humility" of the ministry: if preachers were to be "like lions to guilty consciences," then they were also to be "like lambs to men's
persons." Gilman and Adams were like wolves in the fold. The diaries of Rogers and Gilman are punctuated with confessions of pride. Both men tried to suppress it, especially when their abilities to evoke extreme emotionalism made it flare up. And spiritual pride gave birth to other, equally obnoxious children. "A certain unsuitable and self-confident boldness before God and men," was among them, and this, of course, comprehended the readiness to judge others that was a radical characteristic. Clark pointed out that this unsuitable boldness was reflected in the very change of tone apparent in Gilman's diary. In contrast to the entries prior to the revival, those of the later period reflected "an unassailable self-confidence" and an assumption of error in his opponents. Two days after his ordination, for example, Gilman "Publickly admonished a Carnal Reasoner and violent opposer Of this work who took it Heinously." Edwards warned that ministers who promoted the revival should not, like Moses when he struck the rock, mingle bitterness with zeal. Gilman's hostility toward other ministers (Samuel Chandler noted that Gilman "has a witness within him that I neither preached nor prayed with the Spirit") certainly conveyed pride and bitterness. In the final analysis, Edwards attributed these tendencies to the failure of men to consider "with a reverential trembling...the awful majesty of God, and the awful distance between God and them." But spiritual pride was not the only fountainhead for
error. Still another Mephistophelian door provided entry for sin. There was a lack in some believers of what Edwards termed "proportion": there was "indeed much of some things, but at the same time there is so little of some other things that should bear a proportion, that the defect very much deforms the Christian, and is truly odious in the sight of God." Pride, for example, was unbecoming to the Christian and was a "deformity" that arose from "too much" in the mixture, and produced a "monstrous excrescence." Conversely, when something important was lacking the Christian was "maimed," because some "member" is either altogether wanting, "or so small and withering as to be very much out of due proportion."62

In Jesus, by way of contrast, the proportions were perfect. Christ was characterized by "two kinds of excellencies or perfections of his nature": those that reflected his love, graciousness and gentleness and those that pointed to his terrible majesty; "his holy and searching purity. By the one he appears as an infinitely great, pure, holy, and heart-searching judge; by the other, as a gentle and gracious father and a loving friend." These attributes were perfectly welded in order to reveal the nature of God the Father and to provide "for our necessities." But it was critical that man apprehend these two excellencies in a fashion that was also proportionable. "Having much of a discovery of his love and grace, without a proportional discovery of his awful majesty, and his holy
and searching purity," led to "spiritual pride, carnal confidence, and presumption." Equally serious defects were borne out of the converse. "Having much of a discovery of his holy majesty, without a proportionable discovery of his grace, tends to unbelief, a sinful fearfulness, and a spirit of bondage." Christians might very well enjoy encounters with God, "but sin comes in by the defect." It was especially easy for spiritual pride to enter through the "back door."63

To a degree the radical temperament is explainable by this disproportion of which Edwards wrote. Gilman, for example, seemed at times to suffer burdensome anxieties directly related to the importance he ascribed to God's "awful and holy majesty." "Uncommonly sensitive" and "morbidly introspective" indeed he was, and, to a degree greater than even most seventeenth-century Puritans, Gilman was a psychological flagellant: with good reason might William James might have included him among that unfortunate group of spiritual lepers whose self-loathing fit them into the category of the sick soul.64

There was nothing unorthodox about Gilman's prayer that he "have Such an Affectin Sense and feeling of my own Sinfulness and wretchedness as to drive me to Christ;" he was facing up to the nature and power of sin. But Gilman was a man consumed by sin. It tyrannized him. Tormented by the loss of two young sons, Gilman wanted to exorcise what he was convinced was the causative factor in their deaths:
his own sins. "O Unchangeable God, thou Alwise Best of Beings who choosest out all my Changes for Me--forgive Oh! for Christ's Sake forgive the Sins whereby I have Incurred thy Displeasure." One by one, he listed them in his diary, and begged of God, "be pacifyed towards Me-Oh! Rebuke me not in thy wrath...Sanctify these repeated strokes of thine Hand--O Father of Mercies with the Rod give Instruction--Teach Me how to Believe under these Visitations--O may they be for my purifying." Even that he enjoyed his wife made him feel guilty. To his mind it was a pleasure that was idolatrous, and he despaired over his marital happiness several times in his diary. Though he believed that personal sins "Incurred the Late frowns of Providence," Gilman had the Olympian fortitude, the sheer audacity, to preach, two days following the burial of little Nicholas, on Genesis 43.14: "and as for me I shall be desolate without children." Little more than a year later he castigated himself for his "Vile Ingratitude." Nicholas Gilman was either a fool or a saint.

There were times however, when Gilman's God was not a terrible, wrathful judge but infinitely loving, all-merciful and kind. Before the revival Gilman wrote that when he contemplated "the many great and precious privileges and mercys Spiritual and temporal wherewith Almighty God has been freely favouring of me thro the whole Course of my life I am ever wrapt up in Admiration of the Divine goodness and bounty and desire Never to forget the mercies of the Lord
Nor prove unmindful of his benefits." Historians have not acknowledged this other side of Nicholas Gilman. Though it would be absurd to take issue with the scholarly beating he has taken, nonetheless, the prevailing view of him is to some extent, misleading. Prior to the deaths of his sons Gilman was simply not a singular individual. Rather, he was among the multitude H. Richard Niebuhr described as the persons whose spiritual "experiences were genuine and who through them, anticipated the coming of the Kingdom by dying to self and rising with Christ." One passage in his diary evokes the Gilman who has been neglected; it reflects a man who loved God and wished to serve him with all his heart and with all his soul and with all his might:

When I awake in the morning, it is as to Me a coming out of an inactive State into a state of action as really as tho' I had not existed before but came Anew and afresh out of Nothing into being. Now suppose...If Heaven had bro't me out of Nothing in the Morning and given me the Being the Knowledge and Understanding and the Blessings I now Enjoy, should I think I acted worthily to pass this day any otherwise than I tho't agreeable to my great Creator's Will....When I Behold the Sun Arise...Let me only imagine that this glorious orb of Light was just then found...for my Use, to Light me in my way and befriend me in my employments, suppose it was made for no other End but for My Service--for what use I could possibly make of its Light and heat, should I...be unmindful of My Great Creator's kindness...to trifle away So great a Blessing.

Gilman's life was not all disproportion. Rogers was also afflicted with disproportionate discoveries of God, although not to such an extreme degree
as was his Durham friend. Rarely did he attain the relief of an emotional plateau. There were only peaks and valleys, sloughs of despond, periods of wretchedness and "unbelief," or times when "it has been as one of the Days of Heaven." If Rogers did not sense God's presence, he felt "dead," "dull," or in a "cold Frame." There is little evidence of emotional in-betweens, and nothing suggests that Rogers ever lived his life with a quiet, more cerebral acknowledgement that the umbilical cord was still there even when God seemed to turn his face. Consequently he lacked what Edwards described as a "more happy sedateness and composure of body and mind" that characterized the believer who sensed God's majesty and grace. Rogers's diary is permeated with emotional highs and lows that must have been exhausting. 67

His "highs" were often coincident with moments when he experienced the Christ of infinite lovingkindness, or, not surprisingly, with some spiritual triumph. But exactly as Edwards predicted, Rogers's view of the Deity disposed him to battles with his pride. One instance in particular affords evidence of this. Rogers was in a meeting when:

I told the people of my inability in mySelf to Speak--I prayed for Help, I had an Immediate Answer the Spirit of God came into my Soul in Light, Strength and Love. I felt Somewhat of the suffering, dying Love of Christ in my Soul--and compassionate Love to Souls--I never felt so much of the Power of God's Spirit in preaching in my Life--blessed be his name--Amen. I continued Speaking an hour and then pray'd--was afraid of Pride--fell down upon my knees...and prayed that the Lord would keep it down--and forg'd his grace sufficient for me. Blessed be his name. 38
Rogers was buffeted between spiritual exaltation and despair because the ground on which he rested his faith, and the criterion according to which he understood and acted on Christian principles was personal, inner experience. More than any other single factor, this contributed to the emotional roller coaster to which he clung, sometimes desperately, throughout his life. He relied on his own emotional state as a barometer of his relationship to God, rather than on an acknowledgement of Scriptural promises that formed the ground of Calvinism. The whole tone of his diary suggests that Rogers's Christ, Rogers's God, were far more loving, gracious, and merciful than stern, wrathful and righteous: "My desire is for an interest in the Son of God for He is all Love and Beauty and comeliness." 69

Rogers admitted that he relied on subjective experience. He confessed that he gained "more in this half Hour's gracious visitation of the ways of the divine spirit's comforting and Sealing Believers--than by all the reading and hearing of my Life upon this Blessed Subject." Furthermore, he believed that any one could determine his spiritual estate on purely subjective grounds: "persons might know they were spiritually healed--when they receive power to touch Christ by Faith....the thing carried its own evidence--The Spirit coming into the Soul with healing-renewing-sanctifying Powers--giving in the highest strongest clearest fashion... is the best Evidence." Rogers
objected to another minister's contention that a "Good Life" was the "best Evidence" of regeneracy. As far as he was concerned, personal experience offered the best proof of salvation, "better than any works of righteousness done by a Believer--those who have not experienced this witness of the Spirit know nothing of it." 70

Rogers needed what amounted to a lover's passion in his relationship with God. There was an element of "religious selfishness" at work here. Though Richard Lovelace used the label with reference to Cotton Mather, the same observation is applicable to Rogers. As there was in Mather's case, even in Rogers's mystical encounters there was "an almost indissoluble admixture of self reference." Owing to his insatiable emotional needs, Rogers's daily walk with the Lord became an increasingly painful exercise. The stress he gave to emotion was distorted; according to Edwards, it led to the neglect of other, equally important areas. If there were any indisputable "proof" of regeneracy at all, and ultimately Edwards's position was that only God could judge, it lay in a life lived in reliance on the Word and the promises; a life of practical godliness where the walk with God produced fruits of the Spirit. 71

Rogers was unconvinced. Edwards described a delicate balance between the affections and the sanctification that came through prayerful obedience to the Scriptures. Rogers reduced the vitals of Christianity to interior experiences to which everything else was subordinated. Though he did
admit that "works of Righteousness... in 'emselves considered were not evidence of a gracious state," only once, in a diary that spanned 13 years, did he acknowledge the importance of good works, and that came in an admonition that his hearers not extort a dear price for corn in times of scarcity.  

Rogers continually repented of his pride, but of his carnal confidence he may not even have been aware. It is curious that for all the doubts these men suffered about their preaching, they came to exhibit a presumptuousness, an arrogant certainty, about the pneumatic origins of what they experienced or witnessed. This was especially true of Rogers. This disposition led to a supersentient posture that alienated them from their colleagues and served to unravel their own psyches (to varying degrees) as well. In their confidence that they might understand God's actions in the world, Rogers and Gilman made Him scrutable. In one instance, for example, Rogers recalled that "a minister told me He had an impression on his mind that we Should see the doings of our God and King in the Sanctuary... and we did in a wonderful manner." He observed the work of the Author of the Universe in much the same manner as a pathologist casually anticipates the movement of a familiar organism under a microscope. Rogers behaved as if God were almost knowable, and exercised a familiarity with Him that on occasion suggested a Lord more akin to guru than Omnipotent Being. To cite a few examples: Rogers "prayed for Help" and
enjoyed an "Immediate Answer"; individuals who heard him preach enjoyed "a Spirit of...Prophecy by which I here mean a Person Speaking the Truths of the Word or Gospel by the immediate Help—or Influence of the Spirit of God"; he was invited to preach a lecture, but finding himself dull, "cryed to the Lord and he heard me...and came with power into my soul. I went in to preach...and he did not fail me"; "God gave me to pray earnestly for the descent of his Spirit and presently answered our prayers—for while I was speaking the word again...the Holy Ghost came like a mighty rushing wind"; Rogers was undecided about what to preach upon," but the Lord of his free grace suggested the subject to me giving me a clear and distinct view of it." In each of these instances it is clearly apparent that Rogers waited for God to behave according to his own expectations. Rogers's God was then, predictable. Circumscribed by the limits of Rogers's own imagination, God became scrutable. And so, Rogers's God was clearly not the God of Jonathan Edwards.

To Edwards, Almighty God was indeed a Being with whom he might "converse," and before whom he "might become as a little child." But compared to Rogers's Deity, Edwards's was, although certainly personal, infinitely more distant and awesome; too unfathomable to be known in the perfunctory fashion of Rogers. Gilman and Rogers both would have vehemently denied it, but given the logic of their actions, they "created" a God of lesser sovereignty. Virtually every
aspect of Edwards's philosophy was grounded in the assumption that God was absolutely sovereign. The very characteristic of the Deity to which he so objected in his youth, he came to embrace as God's most important trait and the all-sufficient explanation for the very foundation and continued existence of the universe. Inferior minds had reservations.

Rogers even admitted he was recalcitrant. He confessed that "upon the Doctrine of divine Sovereignty in the Salvation of Sinners found my Heart dreadfully quarreling...and questioning whether Ever I in Heart Submitted to It." Kidder concluded that "lingering doubts constantly bugged at Gilman's conscience" regarding this same matter. When he read John Wesley's ideas on Free Grace, Gilman was quite taken and prayed that God would reveal "what is Necessary to be known in those matters of which he treats; May I always Maintain an Awfull reverence of thy Sacred Majesty." In disposition and in behavior, though neither would ever admit it, both men were decidedly Arminian; as far as Rogers was concerned, only a sinner's "willful unbelief" prevented closing with Christ. Finally, their Arminianism in the pulpit is beyond dispute.

We have seen then, that Edwards ascribed both the inclination to Arminianism and the censoriousness of radical New Lights like Gilman, Rogers and Adams to the corruption of the flesh, to disproportion in their apprehension of the Deity, and to pride. He added the finishing touches to his
explanation by describing, to offer a contrast, the "most excellent experiences." These had "the least mixture, or are the most purely spiritual." Furthermore, when the carnal was at work to a minimal degree, such experiences could be "raised to the highest degree." Regardless of "how high they are raised if they are qualified as before mentioned, the higher the better. Experiences thus qualified, will be attended with the most amiable behavior, and will bring forth the most solid and sweet fruits, and will be the most durable, and will have the greatest effect on the abiding temper of the soul."^75

In contrast, Gilman and his enthusiastic followers descended to the very abyss of what Edwards described as the "degenerating of experiences." Disproportionate apprehensions of God and the mingling of the carnal with the divine led inevitably to bad behavior. For example, "talking of divine and heavenly things, and expressing divine joys with laughter or light behavior" were common in the course of the revival. This behavior emerged initially from "high discoveries and gracious joyful affections," that is, it arose from a "good cause." But isolated from "a sense of the awful and holy majesty of God as present with them," it degenerated. With the exception of the Rev. James Davenport, who danced his way to the docks of New London, Connecticut, where he burned, among the works of other notable divines, those of Cotton Mather, few New Englanders descended to behavior like that of Gilman's people. Their
actions proved that believers might indeed lose "their sense of things." The "jiggs and minuets" of Hannah Huckins, "damning the Devil Spitting in Persons Faces whom they apprehended not to be of their Society," striking "one another with their fists, saying you are a devil and you are a devil": all of these supported Edwards's conviction that "persons experiences may grow by degrees worse and worse...more and more...deficient, in which things are more out of due proportion; and also have more and more of a corrupt mixture, the spiritual part decreases, and the other...hurtful parts greatly increase." Experiences that "began well," degenerated to but "violent motions of carnal affections, with great heats of the imagination, and a great degree of enthusiasm, and swelling of spiritual pride." Gilman participated wholeheartedly in an alarming array of aberrations that reflected "great heats of the imagination," enthusiasm and pride, but he was insensible of "his own calamity." Consequently, "he found himself...violently moved, suffered greater heats of zeal, and more vehement motions of his animal spirits," but he "thought himself fuller of the Spirit of God than ever."

With these words Edwards was describing any extremist, but they fit Gilman perfectly. 76

Edwards also warned that the degenerating of experience could delude persons into thinking that they were "high and peculiar favorites" of God. If at one time both Rogers and Gilman were dubious about their roles in the
ministry, when the revival crested and seemed to break over their very heads, they waxed confident of their roles in it. "It seemeth to Me and the Event will better show," Gilman reflected, "that the Lord did then Anoint me with that Holy Anointing...and as it were touched My Lips as with a Coal from his altar." Indeed, "Nicholas Gilman fancied himself set apart with special gifts." Certainly his partnership with Woodbury, who assumed for himself an "immediate commission," reflected a belief that he was cast in a special, prophetic role. 

In fairness to Gilman, it must be reiterated that he did not always perceive himself as a favorite of God. Gilman castigated himself all too often, as his response to the loss of his sons demonstrated. But there was brass in the other side of the scale as well. On occasion his was a life lived in acknowledgment of the Biblical premise that "power is perfected in weakness." "What a Blessing it is to be made an instrument of Winning souls to Christ," he wrote after the revival was underway in his church. "Will it please thee, My Dear Lord to Make me An happy instrument in thine hand of saving good to precious Souls." 

Rogers frequently uttered prayerful thanks that God had chosen to "succeed" him in his preaching. And if in conjunction with this "success," bothersome twinges of spiritual pride insinuated themselves into his
consciousness, then to that degree it might be argued that he, too, fancied himself peculiarly favored of his Creator. Edwards's had warned that the success God permits some persons is not necessarily a sign of approbation."

Martyrdom is inevitably accompanied by the idea that to suffer it is to be singled out by the Almighty for the privilege, and Rogers thrived on small doses of persecution. But no doubt it was with sadness that Rogers noted that Boston ministers no longer invited him to preach. "My old friends look shy upon me," he wrote in his diary. To him it was apparent that "friendships with the men of this world must be broken if we would be faithful to Christ." This he counted as but dross, however, and anyway, he had grown accustomed to it months before. Echoing St. Paul, Rogers wrote, "I left this day to set out upon a journey to preach the everlasting Gospel--not knowing what shall befall me but only that opposition...and reproach await me in every Place." It does not seem that Rogers was among those whom Edwards decried as guilty of "glorying in persecution," enjoying hatred and vilification "as an evidence of their excelling others, in being good soldiers of Jesus Christ." If Rogers thought himself favored of Jehovah, it was manifested more subtly.

"Visited young Mr. Joseph--"Handkerchief" Moody who remains yet in great darkness. The Lord spoke to me by him, of the danger of losing spiritual life and falling into deadness." Anyone familiar with the diary of
this son of the famous York, Maine minister, the Rev. Samuel Moody, cannot help but be moved by the pathos of a man who was tormented virtually his entire life by the certainty that he was damned. But far from being one of spiritual "deadness," Joseph Moody's life remained an impassioned religious quest. In him we have a grim portrait of a man consumed by a search for salvation that was not inimical to his intellect. Rogers must have had at least a passing acquaintance with the tortured man; "Old Mr. Moody" was a close friend whose fellowship he enjoyed often. That the younger man remained aloof from the revival his father supported so enthusiastically undoubtedly contributed to Rogers's mean estimation of him. But in his appraisal of Moody he was not merely presumptuous, he was unfair. "There lives more faith in honest doubt, Believe me, than in half the creeds," Tennyson wrote, and Rogers's injustice may be forgiven him only because his was an intellect inferior to that of the man by whose "deadness" he exalted his own relationship to God. 81

Rogers was never a man to take his own intellectual misgivings about anything, from Richard Woodbury to the doctrine of election that mortified young Moody, seriously. Though he was troubled by the idea of election, he was even more troubled by his skepticism, and attributed it to the "Exceeding Sinfulness and Vileness of my Corrupt Nature." Woodbury's demeanor was so opprobrius that at moments Rogers wondered whether he really was called by God.
Characteristically however, his emotional response to the man overcame any qualms he harbored and he supported him even when "Mr Woodbury Exhorted and pray'd...but most of the People went away." He admitted his uncertainty to himself when Woodbury's "motions" "generally offended" the people present at a Gilman lecture: "I find Pride and Shame working in me upon the Acount of Woodbury and his Ways--But the Lord in an Hour or 2 delivered me." In this instance Edwards would have upbraided Rogers for failure to use his carnal reason and judgment. 82

Finally, Edwards criticized the radicals' failure to consider the effects of their behavior on the future. Especially was the ministry to:

be governed by discretion and...not only look at the present good, but our view must be extensive, and we must look at the consequences of things....ministers should exercise the utmost wisdom they can obtain, in pursuing that, which upon the best view of the consequences of things they can get, will tend most to the advancement of his kingdom....the work of the ministry is compared to that of an...architect, who has a long reach, and comprehensive view; and for whom it is necessary, that when he begins a building, he should have at once a view of the whole frame, and all the future parts of the structure, even to the pinnacle, that all may fitly be framed together.

Using the example of St. Paul, who was careful not to offend those he sought to convert, Edwards reminded his readers that the evangelist avoided any behavior that would alienate or antagonize, and conformed to the "customs and various humors," of nonbelievers "in everything...so that he might not frighten men away from Christianity...but on the
contrary...with condescension and friendship win and draw them to it."83

In contrast to St. Paul's efforts to ingratiate himself, the radicals were often completely unrestrained, rejoicing in "great strife and division" and a "loud clamor and uproar against the work of God...because it is that which Christ came to send." This perverted the meaning of the "sword." Rogers was not so impulsive as Gilman in this regard; he did not, for example, encourage separations indiscriminately, or preach in a parish without the consent of the minister, for both led to dissension. By disposition he was not a man given to conflict and was indeed, in Nordbeck's words, a "reluctant radical." Here was a man "unwilling to antagonize or create ill feeling unless prayer and meditation indicated clearly that God called him to it. That he was disruptive during these years...is a yardstick of his firm conviction that he was about God's work." There were practices he was bold enough to dispute. In 1746 Rogers "Had Discourse with Mr. Gilman. Told plainly I thot he was out of the Way as to the W...b..y Perfection doctrine" and "his leaving his People."84

Long after the muddy waters of the Great Awakening had receded, Rogers continued to suffer dizzying vicissitudes in mood. Ten years after the revival crested his diary entries reflected continued vacillation from wretchedness to euphoria, and his papers give us little ground to suspect that this was ever otherwise. To the end of his life,
Rogers's emotional tie to his Creator remained adolescent. But by 1751 he finally admitted to himself that he was no longer able to "speak without notes with Power." Eventually he abandoned the conviction that human effort obstructed the Spirit; extant sermons dating into the 1780's witness to that.  

Quietly he slipped into the mainstream. Rogers presided over the Separate congregation at Exeter until his death in 1785. He moderated the New Hampshire Convention of Ministers; during the Revolution, he served as Chaplain to the New Hampshire Assembly and he prayed before the General Court. If Rogers never publicly confessed that he erred in his unflinching support of Woodbury and Gilman, his uncharitable judgements of others and his absolutist identification of the work of God with emotional distress, even in the form of enthusiastical visions and the wild dreams of children, by the very pattern of his life, he did. Rogers's life proved that unless one had the constitution of a Cromwell, it was impossible to live continuously at a fever pitch of religiosity. Ultimately he, too, assented to the vital need for order, externals and the regular use of means that Edwards described. Order was among the "most necessary of all external means of the spiritual good of God's church; and therefore it is requisite, even in heaven itself....without it, it is like a city without walls...for though it be not the food of souls, yet it is in some respect their defense."
While still a young man Gilman had resolved always to act "prudently and moderately." He was determined "to preach With the sort of Judgment...that requires an Attentive Meditation upon the first principles of religion, an Exact Knowledge of morality, an Insight into Antiquity, strength of reasoning and Suitable Action." His later life parodied these words. In 1747 the New Hampshire convention of Ministers investigated the situation in Durham and found that Gilman had, in effect, separated from his own church. They could not prevail on him to "reingage" in his pastoral labors and preach from his own pulpit. The "Committee was further informed by divers of sd Church that at sd separate Meeting there were very disorderly vile and absurd Things practiced (such as profane singing and dancing)...greatly to the Dishonor of God and Scandal of Religion." With a little help from tuberculosis it was not long before Gilman's obsessions led to his death, and so he did not live long enough to repent of his behavior.  

Joseph Adams did. "I have offended God, and griev'd the Ministers of Christ," he confessed to New Hampshire's convention in a vein similar to the retractions and confessions of Gilbert Tennent and Davenport; "I am heartily sorry for it, and ask forgiveness."  

"God indeed will never suffer his true saints totally and finally to fall away, but yet may punish their pride and self-confidence, by suffering them to be long led into a dreadful wilderness, by the subtle serpent, to the great
wounding of their own souls, and the interest of religion," Edwards concluded. In the lives of the radicals his words were prophetic.89

This examination of radical New Lights suggests that the orthodox in New England (represented by Jonathan Edwards) may very well have agreed on what the Holy Spirit did not do. But on what the Spirit did do they differed—sometimes sharply. For example, Edwards and Cotton Mather disagreed on the nature and significance of extraordinary operations of the Spirit. While Edwards flatly rejected any possibility of it in the post-apostolic age, Mather did not. There were times when Mather "felt himself directly guided under the Spirit's impulse." On "particular faiths," the two divines disagreed as well, although both assented to the possibility that one might know that God would respond to a particular prayer positively. According to Edwards, though, particular faiths still remained "only a drawing rational conclusions from the particular manner and circumstances of the ordinary gracious influences of God's Spirit." They were not, he emphasized, "whispers...from heaven." In contrast, Mather was convinced that "sudden impressions" or "impulses" or "revelations of
this sort are the supernatural gifts that God often gives those who are marked out as spiritual leaders within Puritan Christendom." Mather's attitude is especially revealing. He enjoyed a profusion of particular faiths in his youth, but the disappointments he met with later led him to a "studied caution." Nevertheless, Mather remained certain that "it is as dangerous wholly to deride such assurances as it is wholly to trust them, since he was concerned not to despis prophesyings and thus quench the Spirit." Particular faiths were experienced by John Cotton, Thomas Hooker, John Wilson, and, according to Mather, entire congregations. This, Lovelace explained, was evidence that "Mather ...spoke for one strand within New England Puritanism, which was unwilling to rule out all supernatural acts of the Holy Spirit, although it cautioned against antinomian enthusiasm."90

While this does not affect our evaluation of radical New Lights as men who veered wildly from the beaten path of orthodoxy, it should be borne in mind that, like Rogers, some of the most respected Puritan divines also experienced extraordinary operations of the spirit, not only in the form of particular faiths, but in the guise of prophetic impulses as well. Among those who enjoyed the latter were Samuel Stone, Francis Higginson, Thomas Parker, John Eliot, and once again, Thomas Hooker.91

If scholars have neglected this area, perhaps to some degree it is because, as Kenneth Murdock noted, most
Puritans were reluctant to talk about it. But a more credible explanation lies in the fact that scholars have deliberately ignored the Puritans' biblicism, christocentrism, pietism, and spiritualism because it contradicts a twentieth-century understanding of them as exceptionally rationalistic and cerebral people, a view Miller cultivated assiduously. As George Marsden demonstrated, however, the Puritans were not so grandiosely intellectual in their daily walk with God as Miller would have us think. In any case, Edwards's rejection of even the possibility of extraordinary operations of the Spirit distinguished him not only from eighteenth-century radical New Lights, but from important seventeenth-century Puritan figures as well, even from such luminaries as Mather, Hooker and John Cotton. And so, in this respect, Edwards stands aloof from both groups, an isolated genius.92

This is significant, because from it one might easily deduce that Cotton Mather, Thomas Hooker and John Cotton would have distressed Edwards with their conviction that the Spirit could and did manifest itself in a variety of extraordinary ways, even in visions and dreams. It is hard to imagine how Edwards would have responded to Mather when the latter asserted that he was once "visited by an angel in his study."93

It is precisely because Edwards and Mather were irreconcilable on the matter of divine visitation that another important difference between them emerges: Edwards
expected the heroic from average and unheroic people. Of persons of far less intellectual stature than himself (and this would comprehend virtually all of his contemporaries), he assumed a spiritual sophistication simply unattainable, and even unattractive to the vast majority. Edwards neither sought nor needed the peculiarly comforting spiritual experiences of angelic visitations, visions, guidance in dreams, or extraordinary prophetic impulses made with texts of scripture.

In the light of the prophetic impulses experienced by Stone, Higginson, Parker, Eliot, and Hooker, and the extraordinary operations of the Spirit and angelic visitations that Mather claimed to have experienced, Rogers's experience of being spoken to from his Bible does not seem so radical, and is, perhaps, more palatable to the twentieth-century religious mind than the flutter of celestial wings in Mather's study. Actually, it has much in common with the "stunning experience" of Samuel Sewall, who, shortly after the death of his infant son, went to the Thursday Lecture, just before the child's funeral. There the words of the tenth verse of the 21st Psalm leaped out at him in the same fashion that other texts did for Rogers when he was unsure whether he should assume the pastorate of the newly formed Exeter church. For both men—one a seventeenth-century Puritan, the other an eighteenth-century radical New Light—the experience was intrinsically the same. God seemed to speak directly to situations about
which each was immediately concerned and had been fervently praying. Rogers, Mather, and Sewall then, would have understood one another's extraordinary experiences in a way that Edwards would not, and intellectually and theologically could not.94

This leads us to another difference between the radicals and Edwards that is largely the result of the latter's greater intellectual power, and provides us with another clue to the nature of the radical temperament. Rogers and Gilman recalled the most trivial instances in which they discerned the hand of God. Rogers pointed to Providence when he fell from a horse and walked away unscathed; in the fact that he was spared when others drowned in a ferry accident. Gilman discerned God's hand when as a small child he tumbled into a well and was preserved. Edwards's view of Providence derived from an ultimately Platonic view of a sovereign God from whose Mind continuously emanated both creation and consciousness. Within the Edwardsean framework, "providences" such as Rogers and Gilman recalled were manifestations of a Divine logic of incomprehensible grandeur and Beauty. In contrast, Rogers's and Gilman's perception of "providences" was deduced from assumptions that they, like most average people who are nurtured in the Christian faith, never really analyzed. They accepted as a given the Biblical first principle of a Creator God apart from any philosophical paradigm of their own. That they failed to construct, or
more fairly, were incapable of constructing a mental edifice within which they might have grappled with "cause" and "effect" (how few minds could!), led to the ease with which they fell into inconsistencies and a quarrel with the Calvinist principles that posited an all-powerful God who held time, space, and the whole universe together. Their Arminianism was inevitable. Rogers, as we have seen, expressed grave misgivings about the doctrine of election, and though it continued to trouble him, he simply asserted that "again that Some and not all are Chosen to Salvation must be resolved into the sovereign Grace of God....Grace is all and in all." Years after the Great Awakening, he flung all his doubts aside, not out of any incontrovertible intellectual conviction that was borne out of a philosophical contrivance, but because "the Scripture resolves all into the meer good Will and pleasure of God--who saith Exodus 33.14 I will be gracious to whom I will be gracious and will show mercy to whom I will show mercy." In contrast, Arminianism in Edwards's philosophical system was incongruous. Where Edwards assented that God's concern with the sparrow followed logically from his nature, because He upholds the world, and because He was a kind of divine "cosmic glue," the one immutable Law that explained and governed all other laws, Rogers and Gilman were sensible of providence in only the most unthinking, uncritical, and superficial sort of way. And so it was easy for Rogers to believe that Beezlebub himself inflicted him with a cold!
In this light it is easy to understand why, for the likes of the radical New Lights, in the rarified atmosphere of the Great Awakening, their cups bubbled over. For some, perhaps most individuals, it proved far too exacting to keep the faith in a manner that was quietly cerebral. The radicals derived no little comfort from their "sense" of God. But in rejecting the check of the intellect, of carnal judgment, their behavior became scandalous. And so emerged what we might call a "radical temperament." Mather was convinced that God did bestow his immediate help on believers, but he also believed that "extraordinary operations" were really a "work for children and beginners in the faith." For the the mature Christian, faith should not depend on the "'sight' of direct experience of God." But the radicals did depend on it and this impulse was the most distinctive hallmark of their disposition as a group.⁹⁶
CHAPTER III

CONVERSION AND THE NEW LIGHT

Perfectly respectable and time-honored doctrines are often now ridiculed as New Light and they who Preach the same Truths of the Gospel and experimental Piety as those great Divines, Hooker, Cotton, Shepard, Goodwin, Owen, Flavel, the Mathers, Willard, Stoddard, are represented by some as New Light Enthusiastical or Antinomian Preachers.

Testimony and Advice

In this chapter I shall argue that evangelical New Light moderates did not offer a new interpretation of orthodoxy. Through comparisons of the ideas of Cotton Mather and Jonathan Edwards with those of fifteen moderate ministers on a variety of soteriological issues, it demonstrates that the position of the vast majority of northern New England clergymen was virtually indistinguishable from that of their Puritan antecedents on the nature and morphology of the conversion experience. It challenges the assumption, prevalent among scholars of the Great Awakening, that there was anything "new" about the New Light, at least as far as moderate evangelical proponents of the revival were concerned, and contradicts what many historians have concluded about the New Light. For example, until the reader is more than halfway through Richard L. Bushman's chapter, "The Church and Experimental Religion," in From Puritan to Yankee, he is presented with a distorted
view of the New Light. "As the forces of piety New Lights grew in size and fervency, those of order Old Lights, in reaction, took a firmer stand against emotional religion and ecclesiastical confusion," Bushman wrote. Old Lights feared "that emotional ecstasies would obscure the importance of good works," and so, "in order to redress the balance that was weighted heavily on the side of emotion and grace," they emphasized "reason and good works" and the use of "God's own appointed Means." Obviously, Bushman assumed that New Lights de-emphasized the latter and were more "emotional," but this chapter refutes this.¹

With few exceptions, scholars have taken the position that the Great Awakening was a "psychological earthquake" and a "revolution" that pitted the "forces of piety" against "those of order." While it cannot be denied that the revival "reshaped the human landscape," to argue that New Lights "were new men, with new attitudes toward themselves, their religion, their neighbors, and their rulers in church and state," is misleading. Applied indiscriminately to the ministry, this view blurs appreciable differences within New Light ranks, fails to account for moderate loyalty to orthodoxy, and perpetuates stereotypical notions about pro-revivalists that are little more than caricatures. It is impossible to defend such a dichotomy in northern New England, where ministers who were "forces of piety" promoted "emotional religion" and encouraged conversions, but
simultaneously quelled "ecclesiastical confusion." In The Shattered Synthesis, James W. Jones wrote that "the balance" achieved by the Puritans "was lost in the course of the seventeenth century," and it was "never regained." But mid eighteenth-century homiletical literature about the conversion process indicates precisely the opposite; indeed, it confirms Richard Lovelace's conviction that "the Awakening in America was still Puritan to the core." This chapter illustrates that moderate evangelical supporters of the revival made every effort to preserve "a balance of the objectivity of the head and the subjectivity of the heart, of divine predestination and human activity," a synthesis that was not shattered, but in fact, was one which they inherited intact from four generations of Puritans.2

In order to demonstrate this, the ideas of Maine and New Hampshire moderate New Light clergymen about conversion and evangelical preaching shall be compared to the views of two representative Puritans, Cotton Mather and Jonathan Edwards: to Mather, because he "so fully accepted and magnified the outlook of his locality that he has entered folklore as the archetypal Puritan," and because he was at the "center of the genetic line that leads from the colonial Puritans to...later evangelicals of the revival period"; to Edwards, because, as the acknowledged spokesperson for orthodox Calvinism at mid eighteenth century, he established what might easily be interpreted to be an evangelical norm. He was a "consistent and authentic Calvinist."3
Comparisons of the ideas of Mather and Edwards (and a sprinkling of other well-known Puritans such as Samuel Willard, Thomas Hooker and Thomas Shepard) to the ideas of moderate supporters of the Great Awakening reveal that the latter were far more conservative than historians have generally acknowledged, particularly with reference to the morphology of conversion and the role of the minister in it—both key issues during the revival. Theirs was not a mere "compromise between order and piety", as Bushman wrote; they were, as this chapter will demonstrate, as uncompromising about the conversion process (and the sanctified life, as the following chapter will demonstrate), as any Puritan. Mid-eighteenth century moderate New Lights shared with Thomas Hooker, Thomas Shepard, Cotton Mather and Jonathan Edwards, an affirmation of preparationsist Calvinism and all it implied about the role of reason, good works and the use of means; from Edwards, they differed only in intellectual power and consequently, in degree of subtlety.4

Specifically, this chapter will demonstrate that the moderates were identical to the Puritans (represented by Mather, Edwards and others), in their insistence that 1. salvation was neither easy nor simple; 2. the use of reason grounded in orthodoxy was indispensable; 3. conversion involved the "affections," but the emotions were unreliable indicators of one's spiritual estate; 4. "presanctification" was necessary; 5. "preparation" was essential; 6.
notwithstanding the necessity for effort, the whole work of conversion was wrought by God through his Spirit; 7. the need for effort and preparation was not mitigated by orthodoxy's stress on predestination and election; 8. the sinner must strive violently to enter heaven; 9. preaching style must respect man's intellect, regard the fine line between superficial emotionalism and spiritually raised affections, and overcome notions of "inability"; 10. genuine conversion wrought holiness.

Contrary to the position of Bushman and others, J. M. Bumsted recognized that "with a single voice and tremendous determination, moderates insisted upon the essential orthodoxy of their position and...explained the revival only in quantitative terms. It was more not different." To pastors like Thomas Prince and Jonathan Dickinson, the revival was perfectly consistent with Puritan orthodoxy, and in northern New England, moderate revivalists were equally conservative. There was nothing "new" about the New Light as it expressed itself in the thought of moderate clergymen there.5

One reminder is necessary. In this chapter the reader will be introduced to most of the twenty-two moderate clergymen of Maine and New Hampshire who piloted their churches through the high waters of the Great Awakening. As explained above, since the term "moderate" will not be given precise definition until the concluding chapter, I have chosen to follow historiographical tradition and use it
loosely. For the time being it refers to clergymen who were convinced that the revival was a work of God and promoted it, but who did not suffer the pitfalls analyzed in the previous chapter, and, in contrast to the radicals, never sacrificed good works or degenerated into enthusiasm, Antinomianism, and an unbalanced emphasis on subjective, inward experience. Finally, although the Puritans are represented by Mather, Edwards and others, the term also refers generally, in Darrett B. Rutman's words, to "the people called Puritans who sailed from England in 1630 intending to settle somewhere in the area of Massachusetts Bay" and their descendants to the fourth generation. I have quoted from Rutman's *Winthrop's Boston: A Portrait of a Puritan Town, 1630-1649*, because in this study and elsewhere Rutman has specifically addressed the difficulty, if not the impossibility of defining "Puritanism" satisfactorily.

In the first two chapters it became clear that in the hands of radical revivalists like Nicholas Gilman and Daniel Rogers, the way of salvation became so attenuated that it led Hannah Huckins to boast that she had experienced "adoption, justification and sanctification" and encouraged Rogers to reduce the process to something effortless and
objectifiable, to something that he might watch, as if it were a one-act play. In contrast, like their Puritan progenitors, more moderate New Lights believed that great labor was needed to work out one's salvation. "Do you think it is a Thing so easily obtain'd that there is no great Care or Pains requir'd in order to it?" the Rev. William Shurtleff inquired of his Portsmouth, New Hampshire congregation. He warned them that they had "a great deal to do in order to...be saved: if you ever enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, you must press and force your Way into it." Cotton Mather agreed. Those who sought salvation would "have to Wrestle for it with Importunate Supplications," with "Agonies of Importunity." Repentance alone took great effort; "an Old Nature, is like an Old Devil; it goes not out without much Prayer to God," Mather wrote. William Perkins, the eminent English divine, fully expected that the "holy desperation" the sinner experienced before he was saved could last for months. And Edwards warned that to seek salvation was a great undertaking....Not only must the faculties, strength, and possessions of men be devoted to this work, but also their time and their lives; they must give up their whole lives to it." Because conversion was neither easy nor simple, Edwards urged that seekers "count the cost beforehand, and be sensible of the difficulty attending it." Moderates did not, however, eschew the possibility of
the less painful, instantaneous conversions that Rogers and Gilman promoted and Puritan tradition allowed. John Cotton was certain that the heart might be taken by storm, and even Edwards believed that "the suddenness of conversions" had little to do with their genuineness: "though the work was quick,...the thing wrought" could be "manifestly durable." But moderates agreed with Mather, Edwards and other Puritans that to "expect Salvation without some Degree" of agony was foolhardy. Those who though it would be easy would find themselves "deceived." The Rev. Samuel Moody, of York, Maine, warned, "If you think 'tis an easy thing to repent and believe you will never be converted." 9

The Puritans expected the typical conversion to follow a pattern. Leonard J. Trinterud pointed out that during the revival there were instantaneous conversions and conversions that took as long as two years, but "each conversion...involved the essential elements common to all." These elements, according to the Puritan understanding of conversion, could be resolved into a series of stages, and although there was considerable diversity in individual experiences, in general, the process was the same. William Perkins outlined up to twelve stages; William Ames, his equally influential pupil, analyzed four. Richard Sibbes believed that the work of the Spirit was far too subtle for man to discern and one might be quite unable to pinpoint the exact time of one's conversion. Cotton rejected the necessity for preparation, a view that was actually more
purely Calvinistic, but in the wake of the Antinomian crisis, preparationism became the way of salvation in New England and the harsher views of Thomas Shepard and Thomas Hooker, both strict preparationists, prevailed. There was much that the sinner was expected to do if he wished to go to heaven from New England.  

The Puritans and moderate New Lights agreed that the process of conversion began with the mind. Man was created a reasonable creature, and God intended that man exercise his rational faculties. Without intellectual engagement, or what Samuel Willard labeled the "understanding," conversion was simply not possible. "The Gospel Salvation can't be received till 'tis understood," Moody asserted, and Richard Elvins, his colleague in nearby Scarborough, Maine, agreed:

Faith contains assent....There is the assent of the Understanding to the Truth of the Gospel concerning the Lord Jesus....Now take Faith for assent, it contains in it a Belief that Christ came into the world, to be a Surety and Savior; that he was incarnate; that he lived a Life of perfect Obedience; that he died on the Cross, to make Satisfaction for the sins of Men: that he came to save his People from their Sins; and that he is the Author of eternal Salvation unto all them that obey him."

An assumption of doctrinal orthodoxy is implicit in Elvins's remark; as Edwards explained, "there is but one way to heaven and all the rest are ways to hell." Every Puritan assumed that doctrinal knowledge had to be correct, and this explains their emphasis on scriptural knowledge and the plain style. John H. and Jonathan Neil Gerstner pointed
out, "the Puritan was not a sentimentalist. A wrong way was a fatal way and no amount of commitment to it or labor in it would make it end up anywhere but the wrong place." English and American Puritans from Perkins to Mather insisted on doctrinal orthodoxy rooted in the Word as the very ground in which one worked out one's salvation. One began with reason and right thinking.\footnote{12}

Moderate New Lights were equally insistent. For example, the Rev. Thomas Smith, of Falmouth (now Portland), Maine, objected to the emotional "come-to-Christ" tactics employed by the likes of Rogers and Gilman, but not because he believed that preachers should not exhort their hearers to come to Christ. "Our best Preachers have not forebore to use it, upon fit Occasions." The "best Preachers," however, were men who addressed "understanding Persons who thoroughly perceived, what was meant by it." Such preachers "clearly explained themselves." Edwards emphasized that salvation "required much instruction, consideration, and counsel." There were few areas where "men stand in need of counsel more than in this" and it was essential that "they search the Scriptures, and give diligent heed to the instructions and directions contained in them...and that they ask counsel of those skilled in these matters.\footnote{13}

So important was the use of the mind and the understanding in the conversion process that many persons created problems because they focused on the wrong things. For example, they worried that they were "not elected, or
that they have committed the unpardonable sin." Some became enmeshed in doctrinal labyrinths. Such problems indicated that persons were not really "engaged in their minds," and were not "pressing towards the kingdom of God; because their exercise is not in their work, but rather that which tends to hinder them in their work."\(^{14}\)

Mere assent, objective knowledge and right thinking were only the beginning, however. The involvement of the "heart," or what Edwards called the "religious affections," was equally important to salvation. "There may be a strong belief of divine things in the understanding," he warned, "and yet no saving faith." Earlier Puritans agreed. The understanding and the affections were equally important, and the Puritans claimed "allegiance to both pure doctrine and practical divinity—head and heart held in meaningful relationship." For example, Willard explained that "all the literal light that men get by study hath no heat in it" when it did not "engage the heart at all in love to God." It was only when "the soul hath tasted that God is gracious, hath felt the bitterness of sin, and been distrest by reason of the wrath of God," when the seeker truly understood the "grace of God in giving him repentance and pardon," and could "set the seal of his experience to it" that his knowledge became meaningful. Similarly, Ames was once warned to "beware of a strong head and a cold heart."\(^{15}\)

Edwards always stressed that apart from holy affections there could be no true religion. This is the
theme of "Religious Affections," and colors most of his other writings as well. Contemporaries who supported the revival were no different. For example, David McGregor, outspoken pastor of New Hampshire's Londonderry Presbyterians, understood that many people "have been Catechised and Instructed in the Principles of Religion from their Childhood; they have heard and read many excellent Sermons." In other words, they assented to doctrinal truths. However, this was only the first step. McGregor spoke words of warning to "Professors," that is, to persons who did not need to be told of the necessity of faith for they knew it. "Your heads are right, but your hearts are wrong," McGregor told them. Professors were "Believers already: They have been Baptized...bred up in the sound Orthodox Faith" and possessed the correct "speculative knowledge." But if mere assent was all they claimed, they rested dangerously "in the outside of Religion" and lacked "vital experimental Religion." Consent was the very core of true religion, and by it Elvins meant that "faith taken for Consent, takes Christ on the Terms, on which he is offered, even as Lord and Saviour....which implies Obedience to him as the Fruit and Result of Faith in him." According to James Pike, pastor of the congregation at Somersworth, New Hampshire, consent implied a full-hearted acquiescence to the beauty and excellency of God's plan of salvation through Christ. The sinner need "first be in Christ by Faith," he "must believe" in Christ "with all his Heart," he needed to
"receive and embrace him as offered to Sinners in the
Gospel, before he could have any Part in Christ." Smith
reiterated that if the sinner wanted "Peace and
Reconciliation with God, it must be by sovereign, free, rich
Grace in Christ Jesus... He must be brought to see the
Necessity of his being reconciled to God in Christ
Jesus."16

According to the Puritans, one recognized Christ's
all-sufficiency after he understood the nature of his sin
with his head and repented with his heart. Sin made man
God's enemy, and earned His holy wrath. McGregor asked
members of his congregation whether they had "ever been
convinced of Sin," not merely in their "Judgment," but if
they had had "a practical, heart-affecting and realizing
Sense of Sin;" did they "see and feel it?"17

When an individual understood the significance of his
sin, he was prepared to consent to God's plan of salvation,
for "yet while you have 'an evil Heart of Unbelief in you,'
God is as much your Enemy, and you as much Enemies to God in
your Mind, as ever," Pike wrote. And consent, observed
Smith, "which certainly according to Scripture Use, can mean
nothing less than believing in him," meant also that the
believer gave himself entirely to Christ "to be taught and
govern'd & made happy by him." Coming to Christ meant an
acceptance of his "Person," of him "as a King and Ruler, as
well as a Priest and Saviour"; it meant "a Desire and
Disposition to obey his Gospel...and to become good and
holy, to resolve and endeavour, an Imitation of him; and an Observance of his Laws and Precepts, which was the Design of his coming to us.  

There were pitfalls at this point. The affections were essential to one's salvation, but it was easy to mistake one's feelings and emotions for genuine conversion. Edwards recognized that divinely wrought religious affections might easily be confused with the emotional distress that usually accompanied the new birth:

Persons may be in very great exercise and distress of mind, and that about the condition of their souls; their thoughts and cares may be greatly engaged and taken up about things of a spiritual nature, and yet not be pressing into the kingdom of God, nor towards it....we are not to judge of the hopefulness of the way that persons are in, or of the probability of their success in seeking salvation, only by the greatness of the concern and distress that they are in....persons were most likely to obtain the kingdom of heaven, when the intent of their minds, and the engagedness of their spirits, is about their proper work and business, and all the bent of their souls is to attend on God's means, and to do what he commands and directs them to. 

McGregore cautioned that persons might mistake "Conviction for Conversion." Those who sat under evangelical preaching might remember Joy when their hearts melted, but this "Joy was not caused by a Love of Holiness...but merely from a Prospect of Heaven....In a word, They have never seen Jesus; they have rested short of Christ, and are putting their Repentance Tears, their sudden Fits of Joy and Sorrow in his Room." 

Nicholas Loring, New Light pastor of the congregation
gathered at North Yarmouth, Maine, issued a similar warning. He enjoined sinners not to confuse "the Clashing of their Conscience for the work of Regeneration." Christ came to bring to sinners "ease peace Liberty and things comfortable for their Souls," but the sinner was "delivered from the reigning power of sin" only by his help. If he relied on his emotions to determine his spiritual estate, a man might very well lose his soul. McGregore exhorted his hearers not to trust to their "Conviction." "Is it the Ground of your Confidence that you have shed a few Tears and can remember the Time when you were under some concern?" he asked. "Remember, that this of itself will not do....Your Hearts must be changed, your Affections must be turned into another Channel: Yea the prevailing Bent and Temper of your Souls must be quite altered: In a Word, you must become new Creatures, 2 Cor. 5.17."  

Conversion then, was not mere emotional catharsis of the sort Daniel Rogers's preaching engendered. After a sermon on Ezekiel 36.25-26 in which Rogers urged "thoroly convinced sinners" to "go to God and plead this promise," he recalled one young woman's struggle "in the pangs of the new Birth...with her Pride and hardness of heart, obstinacy of will." Together he and "Old Pierce's Daughter" prayed and Rogers wrote that "God seemed to appear for her help." The woman discovered that "she was now heartily willing to accept Christ and she did close with Him. The Love of God and Christ came into her soul--and she called upon us to
praise God." Perhaps Elvins would have been skeptical of Rogers's confidence that the woman "closed with Christ, for he recognized that oftentimes seekers rested in a false security. "Old Pierce's Daughter" may have been among those who were "convinced of their miserable Estate; that they were under the Curse of the Law, and the Wrath of God; and afterwards they have had Comfort and Joy." But this was insufficient evidence on which to "conclude their State is good: Whereas these Things may be; and yet Persons never close with Christ." It was easy to "love the Name," but not so easy to love "the Practice of Duty....Oh! There are many going to Hell, with the Name of Christ, Faith, and free Grace in their Mouths." "If they would look into their own Hearts," McGregor agreed, "they would see that the Bent of them is the same it was before; that the Current of their Lives is the same; that they have not yet learnt to walk with God, and to mind the things of the Spirit."22

The Puritans were especially distrustful of the emotions. According to them, the heart was always to be subordinated to the head. In the Compleat Body of Divinity, which Perry Miller described as a "magnificent summation of the Puritan intellect," Willard maintained the supremacy of reason: "to raise the affections, without informing the mind, is a fruitless, unprofitable labor, and serves to make zeal without knowledge." This meant that "in the active life, the affections should be 'let out upon' only that which the intellect pronounces good." The moderate New
Light position was the same. Loring expressed it when he asserted that "our duty may be consider'd with respect to ourselves; as to be govern'd at all times by Right reason."²³

The understanding and the affections were critical in the search for salvation, but for most, if not for all Puritans and for moderates as well, the quest also demanded what Miller and others have termed "presanctification." Edwards stressed that the struggle to enter the strait gate implied evangelical obedience and good works, though neither were meritorious. Prior to conversion, God expected a "thorough reformation. Some men are reformed, that are not converted but none are converted but what are reformed."²⁴

Smith agreed. To go to Christ required nothing less than to pray unceasingly, to attend on "the Use of the Means of Grace," and to strive "to our utmost against Sin, and to become vertuous and holy renouncing all Notion of...Righteousness in these our Endeavours;--We then and thereby go to Christ, as far as it is in our Power to do."²⁵

Although, according to Elvins, "all our good Works, until we are married to Christ are illegitimate bastard Fruits because they have not Christ for their Father," they were still necessary. The good works of "unbelievers" were "dead works," but "the Person sins" who failed to do his duty. Elvins explained that although "we can do nothing
that is spiritually good, before conversion; yet God expects that we act as reasonable Creatures, in attending on the Means; and as such we may do that which is morally and materially good. And whilst Persons are doing this, God oftentimes bestows his Spirit on them, to work Faith in them."

Loring expressed the same idea:

Some make an Idol of their good works Setting them up in place of Christ's righteousness--our good works merit nothing in matter of our Justification...but the Difficulty is to reconcile this with our Duty--consider: there is such a thing as keeping the commandments in a qualified sense--....we can't keep the Commandments but...it's possible for men to perform the conditions as to receive the promises of reward and thro' Christ our sincere Services tho' Imperfect are acceptable to God....Our duty with respect to others we should Love our neighbours as ourselves....He must Sanctifie our natures before we are Inclin'd to hear his voice and after that its by the help of his Grace that we do anything acceptable to him.

In Moody's warning to "avoid whatever may provoke...the Spirit...to depart from you," is a similar sentiment. He rebuked those who chose to identify with the ungodly. They had "no hope of Conversion" if they could not be convinced "to leave off bad Company. There never was an Instance. If you are not so bad as your Companions, yet the Love...of their Company will damn you." Moody assured youths in his congregation that on their deaths they would "be gathered to that Company which you now like best."}

The Puritans believed that even sinners knew the moral
law and could, to a degree, obey it. Furthermore, even after he was converted the Puritan was guided by the law, for "no heresy was so evil as a bad life." According to Edwards, "'outward' morality had to be well-nigh perfect before a person could be considered a seeker for the grace which alone could produce true morality." As far as the Puritans were concerned, one "had to exceed the morality of those who hoped to save themselves by morality before they could qualify as 'seekers.'"

For Puritans and moderate New Lights alike, the use of the means of grace was as essential to the conversion process as the presanctified life. In Puritan tradition, the seeker was expected to utilize prayer, Bible reading, the sacraments, preaching, and church discipline. It was hazardous to "neglect the stated means of Grace... because such as neglect them neglect their own salvation," Loring wrote. Smith affirmed Loring's view: the sinner made use of the means of grace "not relying or depending on them, as if Faith was annexed to the Use of them," but because it was "the Way God has graciously marked out, and directed us to be found in." It was expected that while sinners were in the use of the means, God "would open our Eyes to see, the Need we stand in of him; and our miserable hopeless condition without him; the Suitableness, and adequate Sufficiency of him, as our Remedy."

Moderate proponents of the Great Awakening affirmed the use of means in this regard and in so doing, were
indistinguishable from the Puritans. To the question of, "What must I do to be saved?" Pike answered, "You must be diligent and serious in the Use of all the appointed Means of Grace. You must pray, you must consider and meditate, and you must search the Scriptures, and diligently hear the Word Preach'd; You must be found diligently waiting on the Lord."31

Moody explained that "God himself undertakes to convince and convert" and though He makes use of whatever means he chooses, including "Mercies, Afflictions, Temptations, ordinary and extraordinary Dispensations," the "Principle Means is the Word of God Rom 10.17." Like Edwards, Mather, or any Puritan preacher, Moody urged that sinners "use our utmost Endeavours to obtain converting Grace but not to have any Dependance upon them." Sinners were not to "abuse this Doctrine." Moody admonished his congregation to "wait upon God not in the careless Neglect but in the diligent Use of all Means....You must cry to God Day and Night ask Counsel and Help of others and patiently wait on the Lord."32

At this stage, however, there was still no evidence of grace. Sinners arrived at this point of their own flesh. In precisely the fashion of the Puritans, who knew that the natural man, terrified by the imminence of hell, could cry out for Christ's help, moderate New Lights insisted that only through the aid of the Holy Spirit, that is, through grace, might the sinner "turn" to Christ. This was central
to Calvinism: "God...sends His Spirit to work Faith; it was "the Gift of God." Elvins exhorted his people to "ask...Earnestly beg...And continue asking until God bestows it upon you." Smith explained that the sinner was directed "to go to God by earnest Prayer" that the Spirit "work Faith in us, & enable us thereby to receive Christ." In other words, the sinner put himself "in God's Way, of receiving Christ by Faith;" the sinner went to God "for his effectual Drawings to enable us to come to Christ."^33

Puritan theology held that the seed of faith, the whole work of conversion, was wrought by God. Like three generations of Puritans before him, Cotton Mather preached that it was "very true, that GOD Commands us to Turn unto Himself...but it is also True, that we are unable to Turn ourselves." The moderate New Light position was identical. For example, Smith preached that "with Respect to our coming to Christ," it was "not in our Power to do it--It is not, cannot be of ourselves, but is the Gift of God, and the Operation of his Spirit; and consequently, we cannot of ourselves come or go to Christ: for no Man cometh to me (saith Christ) except the Father draw him."^34

The notion of "inability" had crippled many who sat under Puritan preaching in the seventeenth century (the English divine, Richard Greenham, advised that the sinner should confess his inability to repent), and "was also the source of a paralyzing blight of passivity that may have been a cause of spiritual decline in New England." It had
two opposite effects. Some it made overscrupulous and this expressed itself in the fear that "if they are earnest, and take a great deal of pains, they shall be in danger of trusting to what they do; they are afraid of doing their duty for fear of making righteousness of it." Others used the excuse of inability to continue in their sin and refused to make any effort at all to work out their salvation. Moody had words for them:

Tho'God is the Author of Salvation from first to last (the very Act of Believing is from his Spirit) yet there are Endeavours to be used by Men. Accordingly we are commanded to strive to enter in at the strait Gate and are told that the Kingdom of Heaven suffers Violence and the violent take it by Force....Satan suggests... that If it be God that worketh all, than I need do nothing but wait and see what God will do for me. What can I do? But the Holy Ghost argues quite contrary; It is God that worketh, therefore do you work &c.

Moody's comments show that inability continued to plague people and pastors at the time of the Great Awakening. From Scarborough, Elvins reported that:

some may then inquire, Must we forbear Duties, 'till we believe? To which I Answer, that I oppose not the Performance of Duty unto believing, but Dependance upon Duty done; or thinking thereby to fit ourselves for Christ.... some may object...since they that are in the Flesh cannot please God...it is better not to pray, or perform other Duties. But this is to fail to distinguish between Duties and Sins and in speaking as tho' a Person sinned as much by the Performance of duty; as by the Neglect of it....Those Things that are commanded are Duties, and are to be done...The Person sins, if he does not do his duty.

According to both Puritans and New Light moderates,
salvation required effort. Miller wrote a lot about the incipient Arminianism of the Puritans and many scholars have followed suit. He and others have charged that "Calvinism subtly changed so that by the time of the Great Awakening...New England Puritans held doctrines affirming human ability to move toward salvation." But, although both Puritans and moderate New Lights insisted on preparation for salvation, however paradoxical, it never precluded the predestination and election of orthodox Calvinism.  

Moderate New Lights also assumed that although God did all, man must do all he can as well. Smith reiterated that the sinner should pray that he be given power:

to embrace, the Religion of Christ, as well as his Person; to seek after his Image and a Conformity to him in his Holiness as well as to be interested in his Salvation; yea, the former as a real proper Part of the latter: and at the same Time...to watch as well as pray; to guard against every thing that may occasion the divine Influences to be withheld from us, and to do all that our own Hands find to do as if we could do all of ourselves, in order to the bringing about our Reconciliation with God, and the Salvation of our Souls.

The Gerstners demonstrated "that precisely what Hooker and Shepard preached (that to Miller spelled the seeds of the Arminianism which Edwards so vigorously opposed) Edwards himself also preached." Calvin believed that all men, saved and unsaved, were to do their duty to glorify God. Edwards made it clear that God expected the natural man to live unto the Lord, to do good works, and to make every effort to obtain salvation, although none of it had the least merit.
Though "we are justified only by faith in Christ and not by any manner of virtue or goodness of our own," Edwards emphasized that sin never crippled "the hands," but the willingness of the heart. One performed outward duties and did everything in his power to save his soul. "As Puritans were wont to observe, the sinners' legs could take them to the meetinghouse as easily as to the tavern. For them, therefore, to excuse themselves for not doing what they could, because of what they could not do, was inexcusable." 39

Over and over, the Puritans and moderate clergymen expressed this important idea to their congregations. God expected individuals to seek salvation actively because it was "externally right." For Edwards, "the most fundamental moral justification for seeking is not that it is right but that it is less wrong than not seeking." God commanded it, and one would most certainly perish without it. "So God hath appointed that man should not be saved without his undertaking...and therefore we are commanded 'to work out our own salvation with fear and trembling.'" 40

At this point it should be abundantly clear that in both Puritan and moderate New Light thought, sinners were not saved unless they made an effort. Complacency or lethargy in any form paved the way to hell. Moody and other moderates preached repeatedly that heaven must be taken by storm, that it must suffer violence by the seeker. The whole thrust of Puritan and moderate preparationism
reflected the principle that man must strive. And Edwards, who in Miller's view represented the apotheosis of Calvinism (the theology that appears most incompatible with preparationism), made every effort to "prove that predestination by God did not preclude action by men." The moderate New Light and the Puritan expected the sinner to do a lot to work out his salvation. Edwards, the most gifted of all Puritans, expected him to do even more. 41

Although none of the Puritans or moderate New Lights possessed the singular philosophical and literary genius of Edwards, they were no less heroic in their efforts to reconcile man and God through Christ. Anyone might learn ultimate spiritual truths from the Bible, but the path to reconciliation with God was rendered less hazardous by evangelical preaching. Evangelical preaching assumed importance because it was the mode in which Scripture truths were presented most efficaciously. It was in their preaching that the "pulpit Arminianism" of both Puritans and mid eighteenth-century moderate evangelicals clearly asserted itself.

Richard Lovelace argued persuasively that if Cotton Mather has appeared inconsistent (historians have regarded his attention to human effort as a departure from Calvinism), it is only because, "like all Calvinists endeavouring to preach biblically, he was striving to lay hold of both ends of a paradox and call his hearers to work out their salvation with fear and trembling without
forgetting that it was God within them who was working both
to will and to do." Mather cared about the needs of his
audience and considered "the variety of spiritual conditions
in the local congregation." Puritan pastors and theologians
recognized that God dealt differently with different
individuals. People were not all converted in the same
way. Moody observed that "the Lord considers the various
Tempers and Distempers of men and accommodates his Dealings
thereunto. Some he draws and some he drives." McGregore
understood this as well:

I would not be understood as if I asserted, that the
Convincions of all Persons operated exactly
alike....I am sensible there is a great
difference....This may, in part, be accounted for from
the different Ages, Sexes, and Complections of
Persons; and the sort of Lives they have lived....Some
Persons are more driven with Terror; some are drawn
with the silken Cords of Love; and some are Sanctified
as it were from the Womb. But....in the main Things,
they all agree; They have all the same Sensations;
there is a desireable Identity of Symptoms among them,
as one Face answers to another in a Glass.42

Mather recognized the paralyzing effect of the
doctrines of election and predestination, and so he preached
in a fashion that encouraged his hearers to press on in
spite of orthodoxy's harshness. He incorporated the notion
of inability into his exhortations, and informed his hearers
that although they could neither repent nor believe of
themselves, they should "make some essay to Repent and
Believe in hopes that the Pity of the Most High may help you
go through with it....You may make a Tryal. There can be no
hurt in trying, whether you can turn and live, or no. There is at least, a Who Knoweth? there is a, Who Can Tell? of salvation for you."\textsuperscript{43}

Even Edwards preached like this. "A possibility of being saved is much to be preferred to a certainty of perishing," he wrote. If one did nothing one would certainly be damned. "Of one thing about seeking in Edwards we may be absolutely certain: eternal salvation following on it...is at least possible....Where there is a life of seeking there is hope." The greatest peril lay in not seeking.\textsuperscript{44}

In his efforts to reconcile man and God, Mather "plunges to the very limits of Calvinism" by preaching that "nothing shall hinder thy Salvation by the Blood of the Lord Jesus Christ, O Sinner, but thy wilful Refusing of it." Moderate New Lights preached the same thing, and did not yield an inch of their Calvinism. Moody, for example, asserted his fidelity to the doctrine of election. He explained that "God...has committed a certain Number of the Children of men to his Son Jesus Christ to be...saved," and this was "proved from sundry Places of Scripture." Although those who would be saved were "collectively but a Remnant," nevertheless they constituted "a certain definite number." Moody wanted no misunderstanding. As far as 1 Tim. 2.4 was concerned, that is, that God would have all men to be saved, he explained that "this can't be taken in a strict literal sense." It was every believer's "Duty to pray for the
Salvation of all Men and to do what in them lies to promote the Salvation of all Men." But it did not mean that God willed "the Salvation of all Men absolutely....When it is said God would have all men to be saved, the Sense may be that God requires all Men to Labour after Salvation tho' Faith be beyond their Power."45

Like Mather, however, Moody attempted to ameliorate this doctrine by preaching that "God has not appointed any Man to Damnation that does all he can towards his Salvation." The York pastor encouraged sinners. He assured the seeker that "the blessed Spirit" would strive with him "if you don't forsake him" and this was a "wonderful encouragement." "Hold on and hold out," he exhorted. "Tis infinite Mercy if you obtain Grace after you have done all you can." He reminded his hearers that Scripture "said that not so much as one shall strive to enter in and not be able." Then he assured them that "if there were to be but one more soul to be converted I don't see why it might not be you." Moody went as far as Mather when he insisted that God:

is able to save to the uttermost all that come unto God....The Holy Spirit affords wonderful Encouragement to Sinners that have wandered far from God....Whence then are so few savingly converted? It is from themselves. They are ignorant, obstinate, they put away conviction; they can't endure to sit alone and think of their miserable condition and meditate Terror, they don't love to hear awakening Sermons. The sabbath is a Weariness and they are filled with Prejudices against the Ways and People of God....The sinner never surrenders himself up to God nor submits to his sovereign Disposal as to eternal Life and
Death. He is unwilling to be brought home in God's way.

When he argued that God does all, but man must do all as well, Moody was as orthodox as Cotton Mather. God commanded men "to strive and he is with them by his Spirit while they are in the Use of means, they find it so and He never leaves them till they resist his Spirit." But, Moody warned, those who scorned their "Duty" and fought "God's Counsels and the Methods he prescribes" and refused to "take Pains to obtain converting Grace" risked damnation and proved "the dreadful Enmity of their Hearts against God. They are sullen and will do nothing for God."^46

Moody used language identical to Mather when he, too, plunged "to the very limits of Calvinism" and preached that

"the Truth of the Case is We are dead and can't ascend one step of the Ladder to Salvation till Almighty Power has put new Life into us.... Nothing can hinder your Salvation but your careless and willful Refusal of it. Your Sin and Guilt can't hinder you....Ask any damned Soul in Hell How came you hither? Was it for want of Power to receive the Offer of Salvation? No, he would say, 'tis true I had no Power, but I was not willing to be Saved in God's way, to deny myself and venture on free Grace for Salvation, and therefore I justly perish.

Moody was confident that any person "may be saved if he will, yet no Man can will aright to be saved....The obstinacy of the Will is one of the strongest Bolts that keeps Christ out of the Soul."^47

Moderate preachers, in conformity with Puritan teachings on the subject, exhorted their hearers in the
fashion of Mather to "make a Tryal." With a stern warning that good works merited nothing towards one's salvation, Elvins, for example, entreated his hearers to go to Christ immediately and not to delay in an effort to make themselves better. This was "as if one coming into a House in cold Weather, and being asked to come to the Fire, should say, 'I will, but I must get warm first.'" Elvins's, however, was not a hard sell. He did not badger his hearers to get up from their seats and come forward to Christ in the style of Charles Finney and other nineteenth-century evangelists. Elvins was restrained: "But I again say...come as you are....labour not by your Duties, or good Works, to fit yourselves for Christ: But believe in him, that you may Perform good Works."^48

Moody also encouraged his hearers to "make a Tryal," exhorting those "that have never yet been under Conviction (tho' it is scarce to be thot there are any Such above twelve Years old) now lift up your Prayers to God. Plead with God....yet press forward; tis for eternal life: Your labour will not be lost."^49

There was a strand in Puritanism that was optimistic and encouraging. The seeker would find salvation. The Gerstners pointed out that although they could "find no unedited statement by Edwards that clearly says that any unregenerate seeker will certainly find....there can be no question that Edwards is very encouraging."^50

Moderates shared this optimism. He who made a "Tryal"
would find salvation:

From Elvins: "With dependence not on the self but on Christ you'll be accepted in the Beloved.\textsuperscript{51}

From Moody: "God has not appointed any Man to Damnation that does all he can towards his Salvation." "If you trust in him you need fear nothing." "God has everywhere declared that he is able to convert Souls and has made absolute Promises that he will do it."\textsuperscript{52}

From Joseph Adams, pastor of the church gathered at Newington, New Hampshire: "Oh be persuaded then all of you...to labour after a true and saving Faith in Christ, without which you are undone forever and by which, if you obtain it, you are made to all Eternity, and which...you need not fear obtaining, in case you seek in time, and seek aright: for Christ bids all welcome that come to him."\textsuperscript{53}

From Loring: "It is our Duty to walk while we have the Light--Let this Stir us all up to use the utmost of our endeavours to Save our Selves. Its our Duty to ask of God his holy Spirit and he has promist if we ask we shall receive...let us lament our backwardness. The Lord Jesus speaks to every Soul....The Lord Jesus invites all men without Exception that are weary and heavy Laden to come to him for Life....Christ is engaged by his promise to save all that come to him for Life."\textsuperscript{54}

From Shurtleff, with reference to the thief crucified with Christ: "It was in the Exercise of a deep Repentance, that the condemned and dying thief makes this Prayer that
Christ remember him: And in the like penitent frame, must every one put up this Request, if he hopes to succeed, as he did....in the same Manner must every one put up this Request to his Lord, and Saviour, if he hopes for the Success the thief met with....Do this this Day, you shall be with him in Paradise." 55

The moderate ministry was, then, "Arminian in the pulpit." But these men were unequivocally opposed to the dangerous and oversimplified come-to-Christ tactics of radical evangelists. It is worth quoting Smith's objections in their entirety:

That Manner of Address, that has so much prevailed, and for a while became the common Pulpit Method of working upon the Passions of People--'Come away to Christ'--Come and Welcome--What, won't you come &c; This...ought by no Means to be treated...in that general unguarded Manner, it so often was.....to use it perpetually...could have no Tendency but to occasion a great Confusion of Ideas, and misled the more ignorant and injudicious Part of Christians, by causing them indistinctly and delusorily to conceive, of the Way and Manner & Terms, of our Salvation by Christ: that there was something of a secret Charm in this Business of coming to Christ; that they might have upon any Terms, and without any ado, or Difficulty; upon a mere instant Volition, proceeding from the...Effervescence of the Passions: that nothing more was necessary than some common natural Action; something like a running to, and immediately embracing a pictured, imaginary...Object; or receiving a chimerical, immensely valuable Present, a Something or Nothing, they themselves, nor none else could tell what:--or that Christ would be a Saviour to and save us, if we would only come to him, i.e. (as the certain Tendency of such Addresses among unthinking People is to bring them to imagine,) if we would, only in the Manner declared, have and desire him to do it (and who would not? what wicked Men would not be willing to come to him thus, to save them from a dreadful everlasting Misery?--which is the Salvation desired by such)...& if we can only quiet our Minds by thus
coming to Christ, and confidently cast our selves upon him, and hope and expect to be saved by him; every thing is at once done, that we need concern our selves about as to our salvation.

Likewise, when Loring preached that Christ is "engaged by his promise to save all that come to him of Life," the word "come" implied more than the mere "common natural Action" deplored by Smith. Loring explained that men needed to "be acquainted with their misery by nature," had to understand "the foundation of their Redemption," and should "be acquainted with God's Readiness and willingness to Save" them. Only at this juncture might they "be exhorted to work out their salvation in the way of God...with fear and trembling." Smith shared the conviction that only under a singular set of circumstances should the "come-to-Christ" exhortation be used, and that was when it was "directed to awaken'd, convinced Sinners." It encouraged them, and prevented their "fastning upon any Thing short of Christ for Righteousness and Salvation." 57

Moderate preachers were opposed to the preaching style of the radicals, and in comparison, were temperate and reserved. Bushman argued that in contrast to New Lights, Old Lights "organized their own religious feelings differently," and were therefore, hostile to "extremes in preaching style and content." They opposed the "violent style of preaching" that New Lights "cultivated," because to their way of thinking, "a sinner needed above all a clear understanding of Christ and of the gospel." But evidence
suggests that moderate New Lights preached with propriety in their efforts to bring man and God together. Emphasizing "a clear understanding of Christ and of the gospel," they were horrified by the excess of preachers like Gilman. Ward Cotton, for example, a moderate New Light minister who visited Durham from Hampton, New Hampshire, found Gilman's strident preaching unbearable. Gilman himself recalled that when he "preached from 1 Pet. 2.7. he was exceedingly fill'd and even Overcome with a Sense of divine things. Mr. John Rogers broke forth in a glorious rapture and Exhorted and the Glory of the Lord Seemed to Fill the House--Mr. Ward Cotton of Hampton could not bear it but got up and hastened out of the house."58

Samuel Chandler was no less appalled by his experience there. The attention he gave to the Durham dancers in his journal was, as Sibley's pointed out, a measure of the impression they made on him, and from that point on, there was a good deal less emotionalism in Chandler's preaching.59

Moderate New Lights opposed the haranguing, pleading, Billy-Sunday sort of evangelism typified by Rogers and Gilman because it clouded the intellect, encouraged the hearer to mistake elevated feeling states for the movement of the Spirit, and in general, tended to reduce the conversion process to something less than—it was. But they did not reject emotional preaching altogether. Edwards, who was the greatest among them, knew best how to use "raised
affections" to advantage. When moderate preachers did attempt to move the affections of their auditories, however, they did so within the strict Calvinistic context described above. Their preaching was not an effort to telescope the entire demanding process into a fleeting, euphoric moment of conversion in comparison to which the remainder of one's spiritual life paled.

Cotton, the Hampton pastor who fled from Gilman's preaching, was something of an emotional preacher himself. "Tradition relates that he was such an ardent preacher that he had to instruct one of his deacons to warn him when he was becoming too excited by kicking the pew." Cotton preached eight sermons from 1 Cor. 13. 1-8 and 13, and five from Gal. 5. 17-25, but from James 4:7--"Resist the devil and he will flee from you"--he preached no less than 31. This is certainly evidence of a fiery theological disposition. To Cotton it was "no small Matter or trifling Thing...to stand up on the Face of a Congregation, and deliver a Message of Salvation or Damnation, as from the Living God, and in the Name of our Great Lord and Master," and he behaved in the pulpit accordingly. The preacher was to bring man and God together, and Cotton expressed the hope "that Ministers have some, yea many, in the Course of their Ministry, coming to them with that important Enquiry, 'What shall we do to be saved?'"\textsuperscript{60}

Pike never hesitated to use terror to bring sinners to their knees. "He preached hell and the fear of God. Even
when he preached to the assembled clergymen of New Hampshire, he stressed the fact that man and God naturally hate each other. "The Hatred is mutual," Pike thundered to his colleagues. "God is Man's righteous Adversary and Man is God's unrighteous Enemy." It was the ministry's "great and important Work," it was its "momentous" duty, to bring "God and sinners together again."  

About the preaching style of another New Hampshire moderate, the Rev. Daniel Emerson of Hollis, one person wrote in his diary, "This was preaching! ... Oh that I might treasure up the truths." Emerson must have been an effective preacher because his church experienced revivals in 1766, 1772, 1781, and 1788-89, all years of spiritual sluggishness. Of him it was said that "his chief excellencies in preaching were sound doctrine, deep feeling and zeal at times overwhelming."  

McGregore was convinced that because the natural man was full of pride and conceit, evangelical preachers should "make use of the terrors of the Law: they use the Law, as God has appointed it to be used; viz. in a Subserviency to the gospel, or as a Schoolmaster to bring Men to Christ." But moderate preaching did not always thunder damnation in the manner of Shepard; just as often it melted congregations in the tradition of Sibbes, Preston, and John Cotton. McGregor explained that "the Law" was not the "only Topick on which they constantly insist, endeavouring to work on the lower Passions, and to drive Men with slavish Fear like
brute Creatures." Moderate New Lights also preached "the Consolations of the Gospel, the intrinsick beauty of Holiness, and the reasonableness of Christ's Service."^63

Even at the height of the Great Awakening, moderate sympathizers almost never stooped to the tactics of Gilman or Rogers. Smith, for example, who was profoundly moved by George Whitefield and his own experiences during the revival, warned that "there are Mistakes in both Extreams, both among Preachers and Hearers." Some ministers, Smith explained, neglected the practical duties of religion when they preached to new converts who were zealous, but not "according to knowledge—They do not sufficiently consider, that, Holiness is the Design of Christianity." Furthermore, congregations erred if they criticized their minister when he failed to arouse their affections, and they went "away from God's house disappointed." The preacher who constantly played on the emotions of his auditory, refusing, for example, to preach "against particular Vices," did his people a disservice, for merely because "their Affections are excited... they conclude that therefore they have reaped great good and benefit to themselves....Soul-ravishing Topics are...by no means to be the constant entertainment of a People."^64

Smith himself was not an emotional preacher. He was, however, a deeply emotional man who was profoundly moved by Whitefield's preaching. Eight years after the revival subsided, he applauded ministers who checked impulses to
promote exaggerated emotionalism in their congregations:

It is a great Instance of Self-denial in those Ministers, who have a Talent this Way, and yet upon Tho't and judgment, go upon the various Doctrinal and Moral Points of Religion, in order to influence and engage the Practice, and promote a Christian Conversation; when they are aforehand pretty sure, they shall not be generally liked: So, there is too much reason to think that some Ministers, have inconsiderately indulged themselves perpetually in this Way, drawn on by the Inducement of being popular, & admired and crowded after; hoping withal hereby, to reach and convert their Hearers, when they see them so much affected, and as they think, effectually wro't upon.

The evidence suggests that in general, the preaching style of moderate New Lights was not a departure from the "plain" style of the Puritans. William Shurtleff, for example, whose Portsmouth congregation welcomed the emotionalism of the revival, was a man who possessed genuine intellectual curiosity; he corresponded with Thomas Prince to ask him scientific questions about the periodic earthquakes that shook New England. But Shurtleff refused to incorporate what he learned in his sermons. His homiletics did not reflect "the latest European scientific thought only thinly clothed in theology." With reference to new discoveries in astronomy, Shurtleff explained:

And here you will none of you imagine, that I am going to amuse you with any new and curious Speculations, concerning these Celestial Luminaries. Should I attempt to give you a nice and philosophical Account of the Nature, Influences and motions of the Stars, it would argue a great deal of Vanity, especially, unless I was more a Master of the Science: and would perhaps be altogether as impertinent and unprofitable to the greater Part of those with whom I have to do, as it
would be vain and arrogant in my self. I shall not therefore soar so high, nor wander so far behind my proper Orb.

And the proper pastoral "Orb" was the effort to reconcile men to God. Any thing which obstructed this was unacceptable in the pulpit. On this the Puritans insisted.66

Moses Morrill, moderate pastor of the congregation in Biddeford, Maine, was of the same mind. "In his pulpit he never aimed to exhibit so much the flash of genius as of reason's rays. Nor did he strive to soar with an eagle's flight above the capacities of his hearers; he preached common sense to common minds."67

Out on the edge of the New Hampshire wilderness, the tiny, struggling congregation in Rochester under the Rev. Amos Main heard preaching whose "one great object was to lead sinners to repentance." Main and the sixty families under his spiritual charge knew too well the grim uncertainty of life, and Main strived to hurry men to repentance before their time was up. Therefore, "he was plain and logical, without the ranting common among frontier ministers." Main's sermons were distinguished by "earnestness of style, and by elaborate division and arrangement of subject." He entreated his congregation "with the most direct warnings" and, harping constantly "upon the danger and folly of impenitence, "he earned for himself "the epithet of Boanerges."68
There were however, moments when even moderate preachers were unable to resist the emotional momentum of the revival. At Newcastle, New Hampshire, the Rev. John Blunt, who in 1741 had instituted evening lectures, participated in prolonged meetings that resembled those of Rogers's. One observer recorded that Blunt "was Exceeding Laborious in Preaching and praying and Active among the Distress'd. Mr Blunt continued his Discourse till Midnight, and the people dwelt in the temple all night." Blunt, too, could preach "like a man Inspired." 69

Samuel Moody was famous for his flamboyant pulpit style and anecdotes about his tenure as "spiritual dictator of York" are legion. To little children he roared: "Poor hearts! you are all going to hell indeed: But will it not be a dreadful thing to go to hell from New England?" But Moody was exceptional, an eccentric, really. Most extant sermons of moderate New Light preachers are conservative in tenor and subdued in tone. Some of them were somewhat repetitious, belabored, dull and uninspiring. To have to listen to them in a frigid Maine meetinghouse must have been insufferable. 70

During periods of heightened despair and anxiety brought about by earthquake, pestilence and war, the people who sat under the moderate ministry listened to the message of the gospel "as for their Lives," and so, in a sense, the ministry's job was rendered a little easier. But in less troubled times, when men devoted more energy to worldly
concerns and were spiritually sleepy, the work of the ministry was more difficult. Yet its primary objective remained the same: conversion. With Pike the moderate clergy affirmed that, "Surely, 'tis a great Work, to bring Heaven and Earth, or God and Sinners together." And if the moderate clergy were critical of radical preachers who relied exclusively on emotional hyperbole to convert sinful men, it was primarily because these conversions, in Smith's words:

may be accounted for, as bro't about in the Mechanical Way: and therefore is usually but a present Heat and Movement of the Passions; which, as they cool and subside, all soon goes off again, and the Persons are just, what they were before: and as far distant from true Holiness and practical religion, as ever they were in their Lives. He must be a stranger to our religious Affairs, that has'nt, in former and later times, and indeed, at all Times, seen and known a great deal of this. The effect and Issue...of such Preaching, is, that the Preacher is admired...which while he finds, he is still encouraged in his Way, thinking he is successful: whereas his Success is the raising the Affections of People, by his passionate Addresses: and He and they, both placing too much of religion herein.

In conclusion then, moderate New Light clergymen in northern New England did not suggest anything new, different, or revolutionary to their flocks about the nature of conversion during the period of the Great Awakening. Nothing in either their understanding of conversion or the ministry's role in it can be construed as a departure from the Puritanism of the seventeenth century, or from Calvinist orthodoxy. It was in the "exaggerated Calvinism" of the New
Divinity that the equilibrium was lost and the Puritan "synthesis" shattered. Historians who seek to isolate the "revolutionaries" of the revival era must look elsewhere than among moderate New Lights who preached Puritan theology unswervingly. 72
Therefore if any man is in Christ, he is a new creature; the old things passed away; behold, new things have come.

II Cor. 5.17

On the basis of sermon literature, the previous chapter illustrated moderate New Light conservatism with respect to the nature of conversion and the relationship of the ministry to it. It proved that nothing in their understanding of either the new birth or the preacher's role in it represented a departure from earlier expressions of Puritan Calvinism; moderate New Lights were not "revolutionary" and did not undermine the Puritan "synthesis." Although, as we will see in the Conclusion, there were demonstrable differences in "temperament" among moderate New Lights, without exception, each embraced Calvinist ideas unreservedly.

This chapter continues to investigate the nature of moderate New Light conservatism through an examination of their understanding of sanctification, a logical concomitant to an analysis of their understanding of conversion. It illustrates that the moderate clergy inherited and preserved the ideas of Puritan Calvinist forebears on the nature and ingredients of the sanctified life and does for New Light Congregationalists in northern New England what Leonard J.
Trinterud did for New Side Presbyterians in the middle colonies. Trinterud "followed the logic of New Side preaching and found it ultimately all but indistinguishable from the rational Old Side." With their emphasis on the law, good works and a life lived in accordance with the golden rule, pro-revival clergymen in Maine and New Hampshire were also indistinguishable from "rational" Old Lights, who, in New Lights perceived--mistakenly--a threat to "gracious Actings, and sincere Obedience."¹

Incorrectly, historians have perpetuated this error. For example, Edwin S. Gaustad, as we mentioned earlier, saw in Old Lights and New Lights, respectively, "the forces of reason, clarity, humanism, logic, liberalism, naturalism, and modernity" versus "revelation, mystery, theism, emotion, conservatism, supernaturalism, and medievalism." In Modern Revivalism, William G. McLaughlin Jr. argued that the Great Awakening was the "first open conflict between the pietistic spirit and the eighteenth-century Enlightenment." According to him, New Lights were those who emphasized the "emotional, devotional, and ascetic qualities of religion" while Old Lights stressed "the intellectual, the ritualistic, and the ethical," or, in other words, the Old Lights emphasized good works and obedience while New Lights increasingly ignored that aspect of the Christian life. Within this framework Charles Chauncy is invariably heralded as the spokesperson for those who believed that "an enlightened Mind, not rais'd
Affections, ought always to be the Guide of those who call themselves Men;" they were the "hard-headed" and "dogmatic" rationalists in Perry Miller's view. As David Craig Harlan pointed out, "this interpretation is so typical as to make further examples superfluous; it shapes and colors virtually every interpretation of intellectual developments during and after the Great Awakening." Because Edwards and Chauncy did indeed "articulate the two strains of Puritan theology that have shaped American religious thought ever since," it has been easy for historians to trace a conservative evangelical piety from the one, and Arminianism, liberalism and ethical humanism from the other. Consequently, the prevailing interpretation has regarded the Great Awakening as a "conflict that drew the clergy into opposing armies, each bearing aloft the standard of one of the strains of thought that the Puritan synthesis had formerly held in precarious balance," i.e., head and heart, predestination and human effort, faith and works. To cite one more example of this historiographical disposition, Richard L. Bushman argued that it was Old Lights who understood that the "reformation of the total man" began "in the understanding. 'The more religious, the more rational are we.'" But this view fails to acknowledge the tough-minded and tenacious conservatism of pro-revival moderate New Lights. The following pages show that moderate New Lights were not a whit less "rational" and argued just as long and as loudly that "the reformation of the total man" issued from a conversion
experience that was (as chapter three demonstrated), initiated in the understanding. Chapter four explores the moderate New Light conception of this reformation. It illustrates their unimpeachable conservatism and will enable us to describe the various moderate New Light temperaments with more accuracy later.²

Specifically, this chapter compares Puritan thought on sanctification with that of eight moderate clergymen. It examines the relationship of sanctification to justification, the function of the moral law in the Christian life, and the role of love with reference to good works, spiritual "fruit" and a walk according to the golden rule. Finally, it looks at the variety of ways in which sin was "mortified"; i.e., it examines the "negative" side of sanctification.

The mid-eighteenth-century moderate evangelical clergy in Maine and New Hampshire emphatically rejected the radical New Light depreciation of good works, obedience to the moral law, and striving after holiness. The radicals ascribed little importance to good works, and accused pastors who preached good works and virtuous living of legalism, and even questioned their regeneracy. Radicals stressed
assurance and the interior witness of the Spirit. For them, the "overwhelming emphasis" was on the "intensity of the conversion experience and this brought a new intensity of emotion in the search of that experience." As Trinterud observed however, their "constant longing for the emotional aspects was a sign of immaturity," and was in stark contrast to Edwards who found evidence of conversion in the believer's contrite love for God and in resignation to His will through obedience to scriptural laws. According to the radicals, real assurance was possible, and derived only from an ability to relate the ecstatic moment of one's conversion. Evidence lay in the believer's "heart." Sanctification offered no evidence of justification.3

In contrast, moderate New Lights emphasized the holy life in the same way earlier Puritans did. In Calvinism, and in the Puritan expression of Calvinism, sanctification was critically important, and moderate pastors acknowledged that it was from their Calvinism that their view on sanctification were derived. McGregor said:

Now the Doctrines which the Promoters of this work teach, are the Doctrines of the gospel, the Doctrines of the Apostle's Creed, of the 39 Articles of the Church of England, and of the Westminster confession....they teach likewise...that Jesus Christ must be made to sinners Wisdom, Righteousness, sanctification, and Redemption....As also that this righteousness is apprehended and applied by Faith alone, without the Deeds of the Law...that though works have no Part in our Justification, yet the faith which justifies the Soul is lively and operative; that which justifies it self in the Sight of the world by works, which purifies the Soul from the Pollution of sin, and influences the Person who has it to bring
forth the Fruits of new Obedience.  

As we saw in the previous chapter, "presanctification" was essential to conversion in Puritan thought, reaching its consummately expression in Edwards, and moderate New Lights also affirmed its necessity. But following conversion, the walk with God was just beginning. Much was expected of the new Christian. In Calvin's words, the new believer could "not hereafter think, speak, meditate, or do anything but with a view to his glory." In his most famous treatise, Golden Chain, William Perkins explained that sanctification was that "whereby such as believe, being delivered from the tyranny of sin, are by little and little renewed in holiness and righteousness." In the same vein, Richard Elvins wrote that the "great Design of the Gospel is to make Persons holy, to bring them to the obedience of Faith." This, however, required a life-long commitment because sanctification was a never-ending process.

"Sanctification," Willard wrote, "is gradual and not completed at once." Complete transformation of the believer's life into conformity with that of the life of Christ was finished only when the Christian passed from death into new life and "glorification." Elvins explained that "justification is at once, by one single Act, whereas Sanctification...hath many parts in it; and is progressive.....the one a change of State, the other of Nature."  

^
Reformed Christianity never suggested that sanctification was painless or easy. The struggle against the Old Adam was a daily struggle, and the path to glorification was full of twists and turns and strewn with obstacles. The new Christian could expect false starts and battles with Satan and might easily go astray; to borrow Richard Lovelace's phrase, "the path of the growing Christian was...not a series of glittering achievements of a saintliness." Mortification was never finished. Men were to expect to wrestle with demons. "Alas," lamented Mather, "the Highest that we generally reach unto, is to have the Desires of what we who would reach unto....The Life of a Christian is Little other than a course of Holy Desires."  

Reformed thinking did not suggest that perfection was possible in this life. "Good men are ever Lamenting their Sins every Day," Loring preached, and he explained that every "true Christian" could admit that within him battled "two contrary principles...all gracious persons are a compound of Sin and holiness with one of which they Sense the Law of God and with the other...of sin." This, of course, was nothing new. The Puritans had always insisted that for the Christian sojourner "another law" contended with the new principle implanted in him. In the new creature the flesh continued to quarrel with the new law of love. Loring explained that in "the new Creature" nothing new was "add ed to the Soul, but the faculties were renewed and sanctified" and believers became "other manner of
persons than before." Christians were "to yield obedience to their new nature." One could never "be wholly freed from all sin," but, nevertheless, believers were "exhorted to order their Conversation agreeable to the new man." Life for the believer, then, implied continuous repentance. One continued to mourn at the thought of the crucified Christ, and faith was, in Elvins's words, a "penitential Faith" that caused a "godly Sorrow for Sin....true Repentance is with grief and Hatred of all Sin." 7

Even for those whose lives reached a high degree of holiness, whose sins were mortified and who were increasingly sanctified, real certainty about the state of one's soul was impossible. For example, the great Puritan divine, Thomas Shepard, never attained the "full, clear, and settled evidence" for which he yearned his entire life. And Richard Greenham and Paul Baynes, both eminent Puritan ministers, despaired of salvation to their deaths. John Cotton wrote that it was "not an easie matter to make such use of Sanctification, as by it to beare witnesse unto Justification: and it will be a very hard case and much more difficult, when men cannot feele the presence of spiritual gifts, but want spiritual light." In contrast to the radicals, who put so much stock in inner experience and feeling states, the Puritans and the moderate New Lights, who were far more cerebral, believed that one could never be certain of one's spiritual estate. Sanctification did not offer unimpeachable testimony of election. Cotton Mather
admitted that it was only the rare individual who enjoyed "a strong Testimony of the Holy Spirit unto their adoption of God." Samuel Willard was certain that no one could ever attain that spiritual mountaintop where his faith remained "unshaken and never faulters." He was convinced that there was a "mixture of doubting with the strongest faith," and that it might be "shaken in an hour of temptation." Ultimately, Willard considered that "the communion which saints have with God...is a secret thing." Believers could not be "known by externals." Edwards went beyond other Puritans in his conception of assurance and its relationship to the holy life. Even "those who are converted are not sure of it; and those who are sure, do not know that they shall be always so; and still seeking and serving God with the utmost diligence, is the way to have Assurance, and to have it maintained."8

Still seeking and serving God was a way of life for the Puritan. So it was for the moderate. But, although one could never be absolutely certain of his election, Calvinists assumed that a holy life offered some evidence of justification. Lives lived in accordance to Scripture yielded as much proof as men could expect of conversion, although, as John Cotton pointed out, there were hazards. In his earlier years, Edwards thought that the true convert might be discerned by men, but his final position was that only God can judge the heart. He described himself as having "ever been an Enemy to all Pretenses of knowing mens
spiritual estate," and insisted "that a certain judging of the hearts of the children of men is often spoken of as the great prerogative of God, and which belongs only to him; as in 1 Kings viii.39 'Forgive, and do, and give unto every man according to his ways, whose heart thou knowest: for thou, even thou only, knowest the hearts of all the children of men.'" Unqualified assurance was simply not possible. "Seeking and serving" characterized the true convert. The moderates exercised a similar caution. For example, Loring wrote that is was "probable" that a man's heart was "right with God" if what he did was "according to the Quality of the things" he pursued; it was "probable" that a man was saved if he was not "oversolicitous sic about the opinions and censures of men but simply aimed at God's glory as his end."9

To the question of "whether good Works are an Evidence of Faith; or whether our Sanctification is an Evidence of our Justification?" Elvins answered that he believed that they were, "i.e. that those Works which proceed from Faith are....It has been shewn that the Faith which justifies does also sanctify. Would we know then, whether we are justified, we must try it by our Sanctification."10

On the surface, it may appear that Elvins said that one could determine one's spiritual estate by the standard of one's behavior. He was not. Elvins argued that sanctification was evidence of justification if "those Works" proceeded from faith. To know if one had faith, one
had to look inward. And so the seeker was back at square one, required to examine himself to determine whether or not his faith was the genuine article, was indeed, saving faith. Elvins was really saying that it was not easy to determine justification by sanctification. He recognized that, as John Cotton had warned, "seeing therefore what easines of errour may befall Christians, whether this or that grace be of the right stampe or no, it will behove Christians to be wary, for even Eagle-eyed Christians will have much adoe so to discerne of sanctification in themselves, before they see their justification."  

Similarly, Elvins cautioned that there was a "Kind of outward Sanctification; or rather outward Reformation, which a Man under the Covenant of Works may attain unto, which is not an Evidence of Justification; but the Obedience which has been spoken of, all along in this Discourse, flowing from Faith must be an Evidence of that, and so of our Justification." In other words, sanctification offered evidence of justification only if it proceeded from a faith that manifested all of the properties of saving faith; i.e., if it was the kind of "faith which is the Principle and Parent of true evangelical Obedience." One had to "Try" one's "obedience by the Properties of that Obedience." A person's obedience was of the proper sort if he could respond positively to a series of questions about his faith. Elvins asked:
Dost thou believe on the Son of God?....Have you, under a conviction, that you were sinful guilty miserable Creatures, and utterly unable to help yourselves; and of the All-sufficiency...of Christ to help you...accepted him not only as a Saviour...but as a Lord to rule in you and over you?....Is it a penitential Faith? Does it work by Love? Do you yield the Obedience of Faith....Is is a willing chosen pleasant delightful Obedience....Is it an Obedience that aims at the glory of God? etc.

If one could "go back to these Heads and...meditate upon them...and impartially" judge himself according to them, and determine that his obedience was indeed an evangelical obedience wrought by faith, then, and only then, might he assume that his sanctification was evidence of his justification.12

What Elvins said was similar to what Cotton Mather believed--when one sought to determine one's justification from signs of sanctification, one did "well"--but "we cannot...see our sanctification, except a special operation of the spirit of God help our sight." In the final analysis, moderate New Lights believed that "the same faith that justifies will sanctify you," and that "only the Faith that produces Obedience...will stand us in Stead."13

Even if one could never be absolutely certain of his salvation, obedience to God's laws was the way of the pilgrim. "The end for which God pours out his Spirit, is to make men holy," and obedience to the law through the new principle implanted in the believer was the yardstick by which the new Christian began his walk with God, and, until his death and final glorification, the measure of his
progress toward holiness. Trinterud suggested that among the Puritans, "the element most stressed was obedience and not love, righteousness and not joy. The emotional aspects of communion with God were not of the essence of true communion, but obedience was." Willard's opinion certainly confirmed Trinterud's impression. According to him man existed "to glorify God; and in subordination thereto, to seek and obtain blessedness." To obtain blessedness one lived according to 'the rule,' and the rule was the "moral law....And by his obedience to it, he should have obtained everlasting felicity."\textsuperscript{14}

The "rule," the "moral law," was unchangeable. It showed all men "what is right and what is wrong," and although it was given its "classic statement" in the Decalogue, it was also inscribed on the very soul of man; "engraven on his heart...at the first." F. Ernest Stoeffler commented that it was "truly amazing what Richard Greenham and those who followed him could find in the Ten Commandments on the basis of interpretive principles established by Greenham." Richard Baxter's \textit{Christian Directory} represents the \textit{summa} of this sort of Reformed casuistry; Baxter attempted to cover "every imaginable condition of life and...every imaginable case of conscience" through the application of the moral law. William Ames, the English theologian who authored \textit{The Marrow of Sacred Divinity}, perhaps the most widely read of all theological treatises in America, was a Ramist whose "division of
theology into faith and observance (or obedience) appeared again and again in theological literature in England and New England. According to the "learned doctor," theology was the "doctrine of living to God," and how to live this life was found, in its entirety, in the Bible. Scripture offered "a perfect rule of faith and morals," and "a total, not a partial, rule of living." Edwards' thinking was in keeping with that of his Puritan ancestors, for according to him, faith was inseparable from obedience: "acceptance of Christ as a Saviour...does well secure universal obedience to the law of God."15

The moderate New Light position on obedience to the law was strictly orthodox. They opposed a "loose solifidianism" and Antinomianism, which they made quite clear in July of 1743, at the Boston conference called in response to the revival. Elvins, for example, like any seventeenth-century Calvinist, understood that before Christ, the covenant of works "required perfect and perpetual obedience; Do this and live." Then Christ's death and resurrection put an end to the Law, and under the condition of the covenant of grace, "the Condition of this Covenant on our part...is Faith, and not Works." But this faith was a "working Faith." To be sure, "although the Believer is deliver'd from the Law as a Covenant of Works; yet he is bound by it as a rule of Life. The Law sends us unto Christ for Justification; and Christ sends us back unto the Law, as a rule of Life. And as far as we come short in
our Obedience it is our Sin." Elvins neatly resolved the
Paul/James issue of faith versus works by saying that "Paul
shews that Faith only Justifies, and James shews what kind
of Faith it is, that does justify: That it is a Faith that
produces Works." That is, a working faith is manifested in
obedience to the whole moral law, and "those things that are
commanded are Duties, and are to be done. Those things that
are forbidden, are Sins, and by doing them we break God's
law." In Elvins's view, Antinomianism was a "dangerous
Doctrine that pulls up the Flood-Gates to let in all Manner
of Wickedness." Loring agreed. The freedom one found in
Christ did not give the believer "the Least Liberty to Sin"
for through God's grace he was "to deny all ungodliness and
every worldly Lust and to live Soberly Righteously and godly
in this present evil world--neither doth this Liberty
deliver us up from the Exaction of the moral Law as a Rule
of Life."\(^{16}\)

Perhaps the clearest expression against Antinomianism
came from the Rev. Joshua Tufts, of Litchfield, New
Hampshire:

We must know this, that the freedom wherewith Christ
has made us free, has nothing of licentiousness or
lawless liberty in it; we must by no means imagine
that it is a freedom from the obligation of the law of
nature, and right reason; as it is a rule of
obedience, none are born with a liberty to do what
they will, neither has our saviour purchased any such
liberty, for any to follow the dictates of their own
mind, in opposition either to scripture or reason; for
he tells us that he came not to destroy the law, but
to fulfill it.\(^{17}\)
Works, fruits, and obedience to the law were then, important, and Elvins added that "surely good works, such as flow from Faith, are of more Account than many make of them. These we shall be questioned about at the great Day....Faith is productive of an obedience well-pleasing unto God." If faith produced obedience it was an "evangelical obedience" that "sprang from that Faith which is of the right kind." By this, Elvins meant that it was "free and willing." The man of faith understood "how admirably fitted and qualified Christ is as a Saviour...and this makes the Soul love him; and this Love produces Obedience....Obedience to God is the natural Effect and Result of Love to him, and they are not grievous to such as have true Love." Believers saw the "Equity and Reasonableness of all God's commands," or, as Edwards put it, faith produced a "settled determination of mind, to walk in a way of universal and persevering obedience." It derived from "something more than merely the assent of the understanding." Evangelical obedience meant "obeying the doctrine from the heart." In other words, it sprang from love. If one loved God, one kept "his commandments and his commandments are not grievous, i.e., this is a good evidence that we have true love to God." The love that the believer felt toward God empowered him "to overcome the difficulties that attend keeping God's commands; which shows that love is the main thing in saving faith, the life and power of it, by
which it produces great effects....this is the true nature of justifying faith."

Elvins repeatedly affirmed that "Faith works by Love." Obedience was not forced. Neither was it activated from fear, although fear had its "proper Place and influence on a Christian." Loring explained that the purpose of a "holy Fear" was to produce a "holy regard" for God's "holy Laws." But what "principally" motivated the believer was love. One chose to obey because it was a delight to obey. In Elvins's estimation, overwhelmed by Christ's unfathomable love for him, the believer could not help but respond to God with a loving obedience. When he considered the cross and Christ's "suffering," this made "the Soul love him," and obedience followed naturally. "Obedience to God's Commands" was the inevitable fruit "of Love to him." Realizing that "Christ loved me and died for me," the believer knew he could not "love him enough," and asked, "How shall I express my Love unto him? What Love, what thanks, what Praise, what Obedience is due to him?" Love enabled the believer to "strive after the greatest Degrees of Grace, and the most exact conformity to the Law of God...aiming at the Honour and glory of God." Elvins knew that those who obeyed only from a sense of duty would soon falter, like the soldier forced to serve. But a "Voluntier" would "continue in the service." So evangelical obedience springing form faith and love remained "constant and persevering."}

In his discussion of Willard's ideas on the subject,
Ernest Benson Lowrie distinguished between the kinds of obedience unsaved and saved men rendered to the moral law. For the latter, "no longer is God's law of love viewed as an external imposition—from the inside out man can now lovingly serve." For Willard, the nature of the moral law could be summed in a sentence: "God required nothing in his law, but love," and this love transfigured one's relationship to the world.\textsuperscript{20}

Love was expressed as clearly in good works as it was in filial obedience to the law of God. To know Christ "Feelingly with a Knowledge that is Heart-Affecting and Operative," Samuel Moody wrote, was to know him "Practically." Practice according to such knowledge led to "Faith, Repentance,...New Obedience...and...good Works." Elvins agreed, noting that of course, the "Tree must be made good before the Fruit can be so." The sinner need first be broken off from the first Adam, and be grafted into Christ, in order to our bringing forth fruit unto God." Until one was reconciled to God through Christ, good works were meaningless, or "bastard Fruits." Sincere obedience meant nothing. Only with Christ's imputed righteousness was "sincere altho' imperfect Obedience...accepted...for Christ's sake." Elvins preached that there were "no Good works, but what proceed from Faith," and the good works of the unregenerate were "dead works." Because the works of believers sprang "from Faith," they brought "glory to God, Credit to Religion, Peace and Comfort to our Souls; and will
thro' free Grace and the Merits of Christ, have a glorious Reward in the heavenly World....if Preachers...preach... good works as flowing from Faith, they are Gospel-Preachers."²¹

The good works one did prior to conversion were ineffectual because, as every Calvinist knew, one performed them out of a wrong principle. McGregor stood squarely in Reformed tradition when he explained that "whatever good thing the unsaved person ...does to his neighbor, he is under the influence of some finiter motive....his best actions are destitute of the essence of virtue; have not real goodness in them." This was because if one did not keep the commandments of the "second table" according to the "first table of God's holy law," his obedience was "spurious." The only "true love to our neighbor" proceeded from "love to God." According to the Rev. Jabez Fitch, pastor of the church at Portsmouth, all that one did to one's neighbor had to be "done out of Love to him" and "out of Love to God, and as an Act of Obedience to the Divine Majesty," or one wronged God "when we do that which is right to our Neighbour."²²

If good works were ineffectual when "the heart is not right with God," then, in contrast, he whose heart was right not only did what God commanded, but, as McGregor wrote, he did it from "a gracious principle of religious honour...the person cleaves to God and his law with a cordial and cheerfal subjection of the whole soul, which no unregenerate
man ever experienced." Fitch, of course, agreed. "The one thing needful," he preached, was "serious Piety," and by that he intended "a conscientious Endeavour to discharge all the Duties of the first Table, from a Principle of Grace in the Heart."23

As we might expect, for Edwards, good works were "implied in the very nature of faith." To him it was implausible to posit a saving faith apart from "answerable practice." Faith without works was an incongruity. If the faith was saving, works followed logically. And this was Biblical:

If there were a difference in the effects of saving faith and common faith, but no difference in the faith itself, then no difference of faith could be showed by the effects. But that is contrary to Scripture....In James ii.18...the apostle can mean nothing else...than that I will show thee by my works that I have a right sort of faith....I will show thee the difference of the causes, by the difference of the effect. This the apostle thought good arguing....we argue an essential difference between a saving and common faith, by the works or effects produced.24

Precisely what were good works? Perhaps Fitch summarized it best in A Sermon on the Golden Rule of Justice. In it, he demonstrated how fit the golden rule ("that we should do as we would be done by") was to govern all aspects of life: it was comprehensive, and incorporated the notion of good works. Like Greenham and Baxter, Fitch believed that the interpretive potential implicit in the moral law was virtually limitless. Because "every commandment was exceedingly broad," he examined only "some
Particulars" to support his idea that the golden rule was
the "sum of the Second Table, the Substance and quintessence
of the Law and the Prophets respecting our duty towards our
Neighbour." What it meant to do good to one's neighbor was
"very plain and easy." The only thing persons need do was to
"consult the Oracle in our own breasts, by asking our
selves, what we would have done to us? And this will give
us a sure Direction, what to do to others; this is a
Standard, which can never fail us, till we desert our selves
and our Interests, which is impossible; for Interest will
not lie." Fitch's formula made the definition of good works
utterly simple. He who lived by it was "ready to do any Act
of Kindness to others," and was "as ready to do Good as to
receive good." Those persons who did, to some degree, walk
according to this rule were to "humbly bless God that has
enabled them hereunto."²⁵

For a variety of reasons, Christians were expected to
act "agreeably to this rule." Among them, was the fact that
"the Credit of Religion depends upon our observing this
rule. If all the Professors of religion were careful to
govern themselves by this rule in their Carriage towards
others, they would hereby adorn the doctrine of God their
Saviour and render it amiable in the Eyes of the world."
This argument was to assume particular importance during the
revival. About twenty years after Fitch published this
sermon, supporters of the Great Awakening were forced to
defend the revival in spite of the scandalous, antichristian
behavior of radical New Lights. It had become painfully obvious that without appropriate practice, religion was little more than an empty form, and every moderate New Light knew it. McGregor advised:

See that you Guard against a litigious wrangling Temper. Don't be forward upon all occasions to enter into Disputes with the Opposers of the present work....Rather then, choose to convince your Opposers by your Lives: Let your Light shine before Men, that they may see your good Works. If they say you are proud, convince them that tis false, by your Humility. If they say you are uncharitable, convince them by your Charity. If they say you are contentious, shew them that it is not so, by your peaceable Conduct. Shew by these Means that your Religion is more than an empty Name; having a powerful influence on your Practice; That the Grace of God...has taught you to deny Ungodliness...and to live soberly righteously and godly in the present World.

During the Great Awakening, the very defense of the genuineness of conversions rested on the new converts' "fruits." William Shurtleff, for example, described his Portsmouth parishioners before the revival as having been mere "Professors," satisfied with only an "empty Form of religion." Afterwards, however, he observed that there were a "considerable Number who are exhibiting all the Evidence that can be expected of a real conversion to God." For evidence, Shurtleff cited the reduction in profanity, greater observance of the Sabbath and attention to family worship, increased charity, confessions of wrongdoing and subsequent restitution, etc.

To live righteously, one had to be righteous. Joseph
Adams of Newington, New Hampshire, reminded those present at a funeral that the righteous man was "united to Christ by a genuine Faith." Because of his relationship to God through Christ, he was empowered to pay "due...Respect to those Commands of the great God. And he is for endeavouring to be honest in his dealings, and indeed is kind courteous and beneficent to his fellow Men." More than thirty years later, in the fashion of any orthodox divine, Adams was still playing the same tune, demanding of his congregation, "How can you justify yourselves? thus to profess to know God, and in works to deny him?" 28

One needed to live then, as one professed. Otherwise, one's life was a positive hindrance to the growth of Christianity. When McGregor asked, "What is the reason why Christianity makes so little progress in the world, notwithstanding of many excellent books, and much good preaching, and other precious means?" he answered that "the reason, or at least one main reason, is the bitter party spirit, the fierce tempers, the antichristian lives of many of its professors: these are the things which powerfully tend to harden the prophane in their evil ways, and to cast a stumbling block in the way of the blind." Failure to live according to the moral law, like failure to perform good works, caused the "Name of God and his Doctrine to be blasphemed," Fitch wrote. 29

More than the credit of religion rested on the good works of Christians; the very fabric of civil society did as
well. In a sermon Adams preached at Portsmouth in 1769, he said that "the threatening Growth of Impiety and Immorality...and Vice" might be checked by "all that are on the Lord's side." How? By Christians who chose to be individually responsible to "endeavour to convince the vicious and immoral of the evils" of which they were guilty "by leading strictly religious and virtuous lives before them." 30

No more powerful inducement existed than that of irreproachable Christian example and a readiness to do good. This was as much a truism in Reformed tradition as it was a biblical injunction. Fitch exhorted Christians to "seek to overcome" an enemy to the faith "by Kindness," and thereby "heap coals of fire upon his head, to melt him into good Nature." All who called themselves Christians should "shew themselves full of Humanity and Kindness towards all Men, that so they may be instrumental to win others over to the Love of Religion....When Christians are eminently kind and obliging in their Carriage towards all Men, it is of great force to draw others to love and embrace Christianity." 31

Conformity to the moral law, performance of good works and a walk according to the golden rule were important for other reasons as well. Fitch stressed that the Christian's "inward Peace and Comfort" depended upon it and so did his "outward Peace and our living in Comfort among our Neighbours." Elvins explained: "As you value the Honour of
God, the Credit of religion, your own Peace and Comfort now...and the glorious rewards of the heavenly world, abound in good Works." Ultimately, Fitch believed, "the general observation of the Golden Rule" would usher in the "Golden Age." 32

Obedience to the moral law and the performance of good works represented the positive side of sanctification and were the sacrifice that the believer offered to his fellow men in the name of God. But sanctification had a negative side, that to Puritan and moderate evangelicals was understood to be "mortification." "For all whom the Lord has chosen and honoured with admission into the society of his saints," Calvin wrote, "ought to prepare themselves for a life hard, laborious, unquiet, and replete with numerous and various calamities." Sin and lust were "mortified" by the difficulties and disasters of life that God's providence permitted in the lives of men. Through them believers learned to trust the Lord, became dead to sin, experienced a strengthened, more intimate relationship with God, and bore spiritual "fruit." "The sufferings themselves not only become blessings to us, but afford considerable assistance towards promoting our salvation," Calvin explained. "It was good that I was afflicted, so that I might learn thy statutes," the Psalmist reflected, and his words anticipated the New Testament lesson that "all discipline for the moment seems not to be joyful, but sorrowful; yet to those who have been trained by it, afterwards it yields the peaceful fruit
Mather was convinced that affliction was responsible for the greater part of sanctification. He described a "Moral Death," that was "a Death upon our Vitious Appetites; a Death wherein we shall be Dead with Christ, and have nothing but Christ left alive unto us, in regard of any strong Relish in our Souls." Mather believed that God "sends Killing things upon us; perhaps they are without a Metaphor so. He Loves us, when he kills us."  

In an important sermon, The Suitableness and Benefit of Prayer in Affliction, the Rev. Jeremiah Wise, of Berwick, Maine, preached that the believer needed to be patient under affliction because "taking up the cross" developed more of the character of Jesus in him. Through affliction, God, who is man's "Creator, Preserver, and Benefactor," quickened men to duty and to prayer, humbling them for their neglect. Affliction was to man's "benefit and interest" because ultimately it led to "sanctified improvement." Wise explained that Romans 8.28 ("All things shall work together for good to them that love God") did not mean that afflictions in themselves did "us good; tis not...from any...inherent Vertue, that they do us good, as from the sanctifying Grace of God, and therefore when Christians are under God's afflicting hand, they should pray for a sanctified Improvement thereof." Because only God can deliver, prayer needed to be fervent; one was expected to "wrestle with God as Jacob did, and not give over till he
hath obtained the blessing." Like Job, the believer was to pray through his affliction with perseverance, in "submission to the will of God." Prayer enabled the believer to "get and keep a good frame of heart, even a humble, resigned, composed frame...that brings glory to God." The Christian "must also leave it to him, when and how to deliver him; waiting for deliverance in God's time and way." Ultimately, affliction produced spiritual fruit. Wise explained that "when the Sanctifying Grace of God co-operates with Afflictions, they then turn to the Benefit of those that are Exercised with them. The grace of God can bring meat out of this poison; and turn the very Curse into a blessing." Affliction made believers "more humble, holy, watchful, prayerful, obedient." And however "grievous" afflictions were "at present, they will in the end, yield the quiet and peaceable fruits of righteousness."35

Loring also preached on the sanctifying influence of affliction. "Reproofs" could come in any form. "God often reproves men by their own consciences...by the ministry of his word and by the strivings of his holy Spirit," but "temporal Judgments" such as disease, drought, pestilence, the loss of loved ones, were also means of spiritual chastisement. In a sermon based on Proverbs 1.23, Loring preached that there was "a dreadfull bent to backslide from God by nature" in the Christian. When through affliction God called the rebellious believer to return to him, he should immediately reform his ways "so as to forsake all Sin
and Live up to our Duty in all things." Loring counselled that this "reformation must be universal we must not only reform in some but in all points....it must be hearty and real, in the whole man....all such as live in the omission of any known Duty have not turned at God's reproofs."  

Calvin explained the nature of the "hearty" duty about which Loring spoke. The "Christian philosophy" commanded the believer to "submit to the Holy Spirit, so that now the man himself lives not, but carries about Christ living and reigning with him." This indwelling of Christ was the ultimate meaning of sanctification.  

Once the Christian began to live to God, he himself, as well as others, could point to real changes, for change was implicit in the very notion of sanctification. In his rather protracted description of the sanctified Christian, Edwards noted that his wife was:

growing in grace, and rising, by very sensible degrees, to higher love to God, and weanedness from the world, and mastery over sin and temptation, through great trials and conflicts, and long continued struggling and fighting with sin, and earnest and onstant prayer and labor in religion, and engagedness of mind in the use of all means, attended with a great exactness of life: which growth has been attended, not only with a great increase of religious affections, but with a wonderful alteration of outward behavior, in many things, visible to those who are most intimately acquainted, so as lately to have become as it were a new person.

Persons could be fairly confident that their conversions were genuine if, in answer to McGregor's "close experimental Questions...with respect to the prevailing Bent
and Temper of your Souls," they could affirm that "upon the best self-examination...they had undergone a sensible Change....and were new Creatures."\textsuperscript{38}

In sum then, the moderate New Light mind ascribed as much—or more—importance to the sanctified life as the Puritan and the Old Light; if to him it assumed exaggerated importance, it was a defensive reaction to the radical New Light neglect and aspersion of it. Emphasis on holy living, on the performance of good works, and conformity to the moral law did not, however, mean that the moderate cleaved only to the more temporal and mundane aspects of his faith. He also aspired to and occasionally sensed the inexpressible joys of more empyrean experiences that the radicals attempted to make a way of life. This is the subject of the following chapter.
CHAPTER V

THE MODERATE ENCOUNTER WITH GOD

The spiritual life is as much its own proof as the natural life.

William Law

As we have seen, the distinguishing trait of radical revivalists was their overemphasis on inner experience and personal feelings. For moderate New Lights inner experience was also important, but in their thinking, as in Puritanism, "the locus of religious certainty" was in the law and the promises contained in Scripture and understood with the aid of the Spirit through one's reason. Both Puritan and moderate New Light rejected inclinations to condition determine one's spiritual estate according to one's "feelings." Certainly persons who wanted to know if they were accepted should look to their "consciences, and there make search whether we feel the spirit of Christ crying in us, Abba, Father." But, William Perkins cautioned, in the final analysis, "religion doth not stand in feeling but in faith."

Nevertheless, the Puritans understood "that really meaningful religious involvement must inevitably produce emotional overtones." Pietistic Puritans "agreed...that the essence of Christianity is to be found in the personally meaningful relationship of the individual to God." They and
the moderate ministry at the time of the Great Awakening assumed that the Christian faith was made "individually significant" only when it was "experiential."²

Moderate New Lights believed that the Christian could be aware of God's movement in his personal life; one might, in Jabez Fitch's words, be acquainted with the "power of serious godliness." Though they deplored the manner in which "feelings" were exploited by radical revivalists, they lived and acted upon the conviction that the Christian could, to use J. William T. Young's term, "encounter" God. With pietistic Puritans they affirmed that "a considerable degree of intimacy between God and the individual soul" was possible.³

Karl Barth, perhaps the twentieth-century's greatest theologian, defined evangelical theology as that "which treats of the God of the gospel...who himself speaks to men and acts among and upon them....Evangelical theology is concerned with Immanuel, God with us!" Evidence suggests that moderate pastors believed that they preached "Immanuel, God with us," and acted in accordance with a certainty that theirs was a living, personal God, the presence of Whom, on occasion, the individual believer might experience. The God of Nicholas Loring, Samuel Moody, William Shurtleff, Thomas Smith, David McGregor, Jeremiah Wise and others was concerned with the most minute aspects of a Christian's life. Their God was the God who "dost know when I sit down
and when I rise up...dost understand my thought from afar...And art intimately acquainted with all my ways." If this God, who governed the universe and presided over event and history, was one whose presence might on occasion be experienced and felt by the individual believer, how might such an experience be described or qualified?4

Youngs has suggested that there are clues to the nature of the Puritan experience of, or encounter with God, encounters that stood "as a psychological reality, an actual force in history." "Providential events," "walking with God," "meditative communion," and "spiritual dreams," were four different sets of circumstances that allowed the Puritan to glimpse a "felt" and "present God, a God who met with them, conversed with them, soothed their fears, excited their piety." To the Puritans, these occasional moments of surprising intimacy with a God who was as inscrutable and "wholly other" as he was ever-present, "were as real theologically and psychologically as their churches and schools, their roads and houses."5

I have borrowed Youngs's strategem and applied it to moderate New Light evangelical clergymen to illustrate the nature of their encounter with God. To Youngs's four categories, I have added devotional practice, which, as Charles E. Hambrick-Stowe demonstrated, provides insights into the nature of the Puritan spiritual experience; spiritual dullness, and lastly, guidance. This chapter will explore the nature of the moderate encounter with God.
through an examination of the variety of ways in which moderate New Light clergymen described and strived to achieve an intimacy with the Almighty.  

Puritan history is rich in accounts of "special providences," or relations of events that seemed to reflect God's tender regard for individuals. Whenever the Lord manifested himself in this fashion, the effect on the believer was incalcuable. It intensified the intimacy one had with his Creator and sanctified him by strengthening his affection for the divine. "Sometimes," Youngs wrote, "Puritans lived through events so startling that they felt the very hand of God upon them." Youngs cited the example of Thomas Shepard. When the ship on which he was sailing for New England was but seconds away from running aground in heavy seas, the winds ceased and the last anchor held "just when it was ready to be swallowed up of the sands." Shepard felt that "if ever the Lord did bring me to shore again, I should live like one come and risen from the dead." Youngs noted that although the accounts of special providences of which Puritan diaries are full may not be quite so dramatic as Shepard's deliverance, "most men and women could recount two or three times in their lives when the Lord had seemed
to reach out and shake them with his providence." If such experiences caused one to "live like one come and risen from the dead," if afterwards, one did indeed live a life of greater purity, then the fruit of the experience was a renewed and strengthened relationship with God.7

Thomas Smith commented on this theme when he preached a sermon to "sea-Faring Men" in Falmouth. When persons experienced "remarkable Preservations," or when God "graciously Interposes by a special Providence for their Relief and Preservation, and gives them to see and experience a memorable Salvation," praise and thankfulness was the appropriate response because, Smith explained, it was the "Duty and reasonable Service which all intelligent Creatures owe to their most gracious Creator and Sovereign...a Sacrifice always grateful and pleasing to him; the noblest exercise of their Powers."8

A remarkable providence was the sort of encounter that led to an emptying of self. When God's mercy was experienced directly, the praise that ensued had "nothing of Self in it: and is pure from any mercenary mixture....Praise has nothing in view, no other End to serve, but to do as is fit for a Creature endowed with such Faculties of Intelligence and Consciousness to do towards the most adorable, blessed and beneficent Being."9

Like his colleague down east, William Shurtleff thought it appropriate to use maritime illustrations to emphasize points he wished to make to his own sea-faring
congregation. Shurtleff preached "that when any are distress'd thro the Apprehensions of approaching death it is proper and common for them to call upon GOD, and to make their earnest Prayer to him to deliver their Souls." He addressed persons who, in life-and-death situations had cried out to God and begged for his deliverance. Unlike the infantryman in the Hemingway story who promised to "tell everybody in the world" that Christ was "the only thing that matters," but "never told anybody," persons were not to forget vows made to God in life-threatening moments. Those who grasped the hem of his garment, who experienced brushes with death and "signal deliverances," were obliged to "improve" them by giving God the glory, reflecting on his mercy, and living up to their promises. In other words, individuals who experienced encounters with the Arbiter of event were to be sanctified through them. Touched by the singular nature of God's providence, they in particular were called to new life in Him. Shurtleff wrote:

Those of us especially who have been the Subjects of signal deliverances, and have in a peculiar manner seen of his Salvations are obliged to exert ourselves in his Service, to lay out our Powers, and employ all our Talents for Him, and to endeavour in and by all the ways that possibly we can to glorify the GOD in whose hands our Breath is, and whose are all our ways. To this end we are to be ready upon all proper Occasions to communicate our Experiences of his Mercy and Power, and to declare what he hath done for our Souls. We are not only to meditate upon his Works; but to talk of his Doings.  

Few callings were as risky as that of seamen. But Shurtleff used the occasion to remind those who had not been
exposed to reefs and shoals, who had not encountered Him in perilous moments, that this, too, was only because of God's merciful providence. He warned that this could "well be Matter of deep abasement to us, that we have lived so unprofitably in the World. If there be any of us, that have not yet begun to live to GOD, let us do it NOW."¹¹

Some Christians might never be shaken by the Lord's hand in so prodigious a fashion. But there was a larger Providence that every believer recognized, the providence by which God created, continuously sustained and governed heaven and earth, and "regulates all things in such a manner that nothing happens but according to his counsel." For some Christians, God's providence might never intrude upon them in sensational fashion. Nevertheless, the believer was to live his life according to the continual acknowledgment that God was not, in Calvin's words, "idly beholding from heaven the transactions which happen in the world, but as holding the helm of the universe, and regulating all events." This permitted the Christian to "submit himself...with all becoming humility" and securely commit himself to God."¹²

The moderate New Light mind reasoned similarly. The inheritance of 200 years of Reformed thought on the subject was apparent in Loring's observation that "God governs the world and he may be said so to do...in that he upholds and preserves his Creatures." Saved and unsaved alike were "beholden to God for creating goodness so also for
preservation he is our Continual preserver....all things are mutable and depend on God for Continual preservation....By his providence he governs Every Individual he is not So tho'tfull of some as to forget some other. But is ever mindfulfull of all." McGregore also referred to God's rule over the world and event when he admitted that "infinite Power, Wisdom, Holiness, goodness and Truth are at the Helm, and that therefore all will be well in the End."13

Unlike Shepard's experience, that about which Loring and McGregore spoke was not the stuff of great drama. Rather, they were saying that in an unassuming, reverent and quiet way, the Christian could entrust his life to God's government. This daily "letting go and letting God" was not exactly an encounter. But certainly it was a continuous yielding, a continuous surrendering to Him that reflected a kind of uninterrupted and enduring "meeting" with the Holy. New Light moderates believed that Christians ought to have a mindfulness, an abiding awareness of, God's merciful providence and continued presence. Once the believer understood and accepted the idea of the all-encompassing nature of God's providence and embraced it with his whole being, he could be imperturbable, truly freed of every concern and anxiety. He could indeed cast all his cares upon God. What marked him now was a sensibility, a cognizance or consciousness of, God's perpetual, sustaining watchfulness over him. This disposition could excite him to have, as McGregore described it, "a practical Sense of
divine Providence. He sees that it is in God he lives and moves and has his being."  

Edwards described the sanctifying effect that this entrusting to God of all of one's cares had on his wife. It enabled Sarah to persist:

in an unmoved, untouched calm and rest under the changes and accidents of time. Formerly, in lower degrees of grace she had been subject to unsteadiness, and many ups and downs...but divine light has...wholly conquered these disadvantages, and carried the mind in a constant manner. Since that resignation of all things to God everything of that unsteady nature seems to be overcome and crushed by the power of faith and trust in God and resignation to him; the person has remained in a constant uninterrupted rest, and humble joy in God, and assurance of his favor, without one hour's melancholy or darkness. 

This sort of "perpetual encounter" with God that Edwards described was no small part of one's daily pilgrimage toward holiness. When the Christian gave his whole life into God's keeping, the result was a kind of permanent restfulness in Him, a consciousness of his "immediacy," to borrow Martin Buber's term. McGregor described the sensibility of one who gave all his concerns to God. Such an individual left "all his Concerns in his Hand, both with respect to this and the future world," resting "confidently" in Him and in "no Ways anxiously disquieted about the Event of things....a Person who knows what it is to trust in God, does confidently commit all his Concerns into his keeping He commits to his Keeper all his Affairs, publick and private, personal and relative, spiritual and secular...in a Word, all that he is or has, or
Accordingly, when the Christian rejoiced because of God's manifold blessings, he was never to congratulate himself. It was a gracious providence that had brought it to pass. Calvin counseled that:

He who shall repose himself...on the Divine blessing, will...not impute any prosperous event to himself and to his own diligence, industry, or good fortune; but will acknowledge God to be the author of it....He considers, that his affairs are ordered by the Lord in such a manner as is conducive to his salvation....the same tranquility and patience ought to be extended to all the events to which the present life is exposed. Therefore no man has rightly renounced himself to the Lord, so as to leave all the parts of his life to be governed by his will."

Conversely, when believers were disappointed when plans ran "counter to God's decrees," Loring asked them to "consider how often...He has br't to pass much good for us."17

With the idea that nothing came to pass except by God's providence, the believer might console himself in time of affliction as well. "The rule of piety," Calvin reiterated, "is that God alone is the arbiter and governor of all events, both prosperous and adverse, and that he does not proceed with inconsiderate impetuosity, but dispenses to us blessings and calamities with the most systematic justice." Calvin believed that Christians ought to be encouraged "in adversity" by the fact "that they suffer no affliction, but by the ordination and command of God, because they are under his hand." The suffering Christian was to resign himself to the will of God and graciously
accept his providence. Therefore, a disposition of gracious submission was an expression of the uninterrupted meeting with God described above.¹⁸

Like the Reformer, Loring taught that "every afflictive sorrowfull providence, is the Disposal of God's providence...much comfort and consolation may result to us from this Doctrine." "The sufferings themselves not only become blessings to us, but afford considerable assistance towards promoting our salvation," Calvin explained. Jeremiah Wise agreed. Afflictions did "no good in themselves," but they might be "improved by God's Grace for...our benefit." The net result of a gracious acquiescence to God's providence, whether in affliction or prosperity, was heightened intimacy with Him. Wise described the sustained sense of communion with God that was possible for believers in times of darkness and despair: "when it's all stormy and tempestuous round about," the Christian could enjoy "an Halcyon calm within."¹⁹

Their assumption that the Lord ordained events led moderate New Lights to attribute even the most indeterminate and seemingly inconsequential occurrences to His providence. For example, when Whitefield passed through Portsmouth, Shurtleff, elated, believed it was no incidental happening, but an act of God. Someday, he thought, the saints would see and understand the entire tapestry of history. In heaven they would "hear and see how some Events that are seemingly insignificant, and appear perfectly
casual, have been order'd out of infinite Wisdom, and made subservient to very great, and excellent Designs."\textsuperscript{20}

Thomas Smith was also confident that the extraordinary circumstances of Whitefield's visit to Falmouth were no accident. Some of the most influential persons in the seaport were "violently" opposed to Whitefield's coming. Apparently the "leading men" went so far as "to prejudice the people against him" so that Smith feared a "quarrel as would be fatal to me." But Whitefield came anyway. "Stand still and see the providence of God," were the words Smith jubilantly entered into his journal: "the wonderful providence of God is to be observed with respect to Mr. Whitefield, that he should come just as he did when the opposers were all gone out of town, so that there was no uneasiness, but all well, and general reception." He concluded the entry, "Thanks to God." Smith's was no rote utterance of thanks. Clearly he was awed by an encounter with a Deity that could arrange things so remarkably. Smith's offering of heartfelt gratitude was triumphant.\textsuperscript{21}

Reverence for the divine power that Smith experienced was something that, according to Loring, the Christian should cultivate all the time. "If we would worship God aright we must always bear upon our minds a realizing Sense of his Divine Attributes," Loring preached. Youngs explained that this mindfulness, this realizing sense about which Loring wrote, was a necessary ingredient in the Christian's daily walk with God. "Walking with God" was
another "religious activity" by which Youngs referred to Puritan efforts "to lead their lives as if they were in God's presence," and "through which they experienced an occasional intense spiritual encounter." In this vein, Smith wrote that believers "desire to live as those who look upon themselves not their own, but as such who have stricken hands with thee and given up our names unto God." What one did daily was ordained by God, and God strengthened the Christian, "nourishing his or her virtuous acts" as he or she went about daily tasks that were "stimulated by faith."22

Faithfulness to one's calling was critical in one's walk with God. "A true believing Christian, a justified person, hee lives in his vocation by his faith," John Cotton wrote in 1641. "Faith drawes the heart of a Christian to live in some warrantable calling....wherein he may bring in God any service...and offer it up to God as a free-will Offering." Any one of the moderate pastors about whom we have talked could serve as an example of faithfulness in a calling--James Pike, who made the rounds of his parish well into old age, and literally fainted of exhaustion in his pulpit; Amos Main, whose life as physician of body and soul on the New Hampshire frontier was fraught with almost constant danger; Samuel Chandler, who, in spite of almost insurmountable domestic difficulties, exerted himself in the cause of the kingdom. But perhaps Thomas Smith provides the best illustration of a man who gave his life to God as a
"free-will Offering." "We are the first church that ever was settled to the eastward of Wells. May the gates of Hell be never able to prevail against us," Smith wrote on the first page of the Falmouth church record book on the day of his ordination. His pastorate in the raw settlement where life for the sixty-four families who settled there was a constant struggle, was never easy. Some of the townspeople were "mean animals," but Smith spent himself ministering to them and shared with them all of the adversities and privations of life on the frontier. He suffered the miseries of the French and Indian War and the Revolution, and even relinquished his salary for several years after Falmouth was burned by the French so as not to make life even more unbearable for his people. "God is weakening us exceedingly, and grievously thinning our small numbers in this country," Smith noted in his journal. "Every thing in God's Providence looks dark and distressing."23

Smith's journal reflects a man who was entirely devoted to his calling. At times his life consisted of round-the-clock prayer vigils and visitations with the sick, despite his own predisposition to whooping cough, rheumatism, prolonged colds and stomach problems. He confessed at one point, "I am entirely worn out with extraordinary service, at prayer continually and for want of sleep."24

What makes Smith's service even more heroic, was the fact that periodically he suffered acute anxieties about his
effectiveness as a pastor. At one point he prayed that God would replace him with a minister "that would do the people service," a self-disparagement that is the more remarkable when we read in Smith's journal that he was never "so hurried in the ministry, so constantly praying with the sick and at funerals." About one month after this entry he noted, "I have not been in my study this week, only yesterday P.M. I am out all day visiting and praying with the sick." 25

Smith exhausted himself serving God. But he enjoyed moments of epiphany, instances when he was keenly aware of God's sustaining hand. John Cotton emphasized that "when faith hath made choyce of a warrantable calling," the Christian "depends upon God for the quickning, and sharpning of his gifts in that calling." The believer did not rest on his own abilities "but upon God that gave him those gifts." Smith's life embodied Cotton's admonition that faith did not say, "Give me such a calling and turne me loose to it." Smith understood perfectly that "faith lookes up to heaven for skill and ability, though strong and able, yet it looks at all its abilities but as a dead work...unlesse God refresh and reneue breath in them. And then if God doe breathe in his gifts, hee depends...upon God's blessing." Into his journal Smith recorded his confidence that God effectually breathed through his labors and undergirded his efforts: "I am hurried perpetually with the sick; the whole practice rests on me, and God gives me reputation with
satisfaction of mind, as being a successful instrument in his hands." Smith lived out his determination to live as one of "those who look upon themselves not their own," and exalted God who enabled him to "Sacrifice Reputation, ease, Health, and every Interest of an earthly Nature" in his ministry.  

There were seasons, however, when Smith relied over-much on his own strength and abilities. Doubting, paradoxically, his effectiveness in the ministry, he was apt to remind himself that "faith lookes up to heaven for skill and ability." And on occasion, he expressed a sensible awareness of God's supporting presence. On the calling of a "Publick Fast" that was a "very full meeting," Smith recalled that he "was as much enlarged, and had the most extraordinary assistances that ever (I think) I found. I was longer much, and prayed with greater freedom, distinctness and propriety, than ever I did on a Fast day; and I here record it to encourage myself to depend and rely upon God, having been enabled to pray for assistance more than usual, being out of order, and much concerned about it." It is clear that Smith's life of sacrifice reflected his effort to live as if he were in God's presence.

Believers who, like Smith, exerted themselves in their callings were to do so motivated by the glory of God, "because," Moody explained, "God has given Man his Being and made him for Himself....He is our Lord and has entrusted us
as Stewards with Means and Talents, of which we are not the Owners but are accountable to him." Others might be "sollicitous how they shall gain the world," Fitch preached. But Christians were to "be sollicitous how we may serve and glorify God in the world." In contrast to his life before conversion, the believer was to strive to do all to the glory of God. "Nothing does a true Christian desire more than the glory of God," Loring wrote, and because "God requires that we have an eye to his glory in all that we do," Loring offered certain guidelines that would be conducive to that end. First, one ought to meditate on the nature of God, who "fills heaven and Earth and all places with his presence"—then one behaved accordingly: "Let this be always in our th'ts that God is ever present....address God as ever present...Let everything you are bring to your mind the presence of God....often represent to your mind that God is to be feared and Lov'd above all." 28

As a person went about daily tasks, he could be singularly aware of God's hand, and this put the believer on a higher spiritual plane. Besides, it was the Christian's "Duty" to entrust God with "all our Concerns." Loring reminded his listeners that even the most trivial thing was important to a God who numbered the hairs of believers' heads. In this light, it is understandable that Smith would take time to thank God that he "never experienced more" of His "goodness" than on a journey he took: "Met with no difficulty, no disappointment; but with great civility and
kindness in every place." 29

When the believer maintained this holy and humble watchfulness, in a frame that was expectant and willing, it followed that he conducted himself in a Christian manner. Loring counseled that "in every action" on his daily walk with God, the Christian ought to "reflect on God." He should begin every action prayerfully, "in the name of the father Son and holy Spirit." If sin and temptation chanced "to spoil our Intentions" then prayer was the remedy to "Strengthen ourselves"--and he emphasized that "every important action be begun with prayer." Prayer was the lifeline between man and God. If in his walk with God, the believer occasionally experienced a peculiarly intense encounter with Him, prayer was the means by which a more quotidian communion with Him might be sustained. To Richard Sibbes, "Prayer,...constant, unceasing prayer, was...the very essence of the Christian life." 30

Prayer formed the basis for the third sort of encounter with God that Youngs described, encounter that was mental and meditative. "Through meditation and prayer, Puritans attempted to converse with their Lord." It was through "meditative communion" that "the devout man who has truly learned the art of heavenly meditation will find himself so acting in all things, as if God did them by him; so using all things, as one, that enjoys God in them; and in the meantime, so walking on earth, that he doth in a sort carry his heaven with him." Richard Sibbes said that "the
end of the Christian's striving was communion with God," and moderate New Lights expressed the same objective. In a sermon in which he described the disposition of a believer, or "Israelite," ("a good man, a real Christian; one who has been the happy subject of a work of effectual grace"), McGregor wrote that "to contemplate the perfections of God...is his favourite subject...he would give the created universe...to know more of God and sees the stamp of divine authority on the Lord's precepts....perfection is his goal and he is by no means...satisfied with himself." Persons who enjoyed communion with God had "a Happiness in Religion, infinitely sweeter and more solid than ever they found in any Enjoyment of Things Temporal."³¹

As his relationship with his Creator deepened in perhaps imperceptible degrees, the believer was gradually weaned from love for the world and his affections were drawn to things above. Edwards described the new creature as experiencing "delight in conversing of things of religion, and in seeing Christians together, talking of the most spiritual and heavenly things in religion." McGregor preached that the believer might find great solace and joy in communion with the Lord and other believers. Christians discovered "a Sweetness in the Bible, a delight in secret Prayer, and Christian Conference, and Meditation, that before they were Strangers to."³²

About Christians who, through the grace of God, had attained to advanced degrees of holiness and whose communion
with Him had reached great heights, Edwards wrote that they had "a most vehement and passionate desire of the honor and glory of God's name; a sensible, clear and constant preference of it...a great lamenting of ingratitude, and the lowness of the degree of love to God,...and very often vehement longings...after more love to Christ, and greater conformity to him...especially longing...to be more perfect in humility, and adoration....and longing that this present life may be, as it were, one continued song of praise to God."  

Loring also preached that the realization of ever-increasing degrees of sanctity and communion with God were possible in this life. He asked, "By what are we helped to Increase our Love to God?" And he answered that Christian meditation was most fruitful when one made an effort to subdue an "Inordinate Love of the World," when one restrained his "fancies" and removed "all solicitude and multiplicity of worldly business leading to an anxiety of thots and cares." He reiterated how essential it was that the pilgrim "come frequently to God in humble earnest prayr," and, finally, he counselled that one ought to meditate on "the Immensity and vastness of God's Love to you."  

Certainly, Loring added, one was to fear the awesome power of a Being that was "able to cast both Soul and Body in hell." But it was on the vastness of God's love that he had more to say. God's love for man was apparent "in the
works of Creation," in his "Providence," and "in his preservation of us. God is alone fountain of all our supports." Greatest of all proofs of God's unbounded love for man was in His "giving his only Son to Save us." The mere act of meditation on these themes disposed one to greater holiness and sanctified living. Edwards agreed. The consideration of these points imparted to the believer "an extraordinary sense of the awful majesty, and greatness of God....a very great sense of the certain truth of the great things revealed in the gospel; an overwhelming sense of the glory of the work of redemption, and the way of salvation by Jesus Christ....a sense of the glorious, unsearchable, unerring wisdom of God in his works, both of creation and providence."35

Reformed thought then, as it was articulated by both Puritans and New Light moderates held that "the one ultimate desire must be that of having 'communion with God.'" Sibbes emphasized that there was "nothing that characteriseth...a Christian so much as desires. All other things may be counterfeit. Words and actions may be counterfeit, but the desires and affections cannot, because they are the immediate issues...of the soul; they are that that comes immediately from the soul, as fire cannot be counterfeit." If at times that sweet communion lapsed, the best remedy was conversation between the soul and God, as a "bellows," Paul Baynes explained in Holy Soliloquies, "to blow up our affections, when...devotion cooleth." Prayer was the key to
meditative communion; it was the very best means to "practice...the presence of God," in Jeremy Taylor's words. He counselled: "Let this actual thought often return, that God is omnipresent, filling every place." Whenever he felt the need, one might approach the throne of grace. The Christian was free to seek the Lord's face even for but a moment. Jeremiah Wise reminded his hearers that "a person may by Ejaculatory Prayer, or prayer in the heart, dart up his desires to God many times in a day; yea, in the midst of his Worldly Business, or in company." Encounter with the Holy was possible anytime, anywhere.36

In times of affliction, prayer assumed even greater importance. "When a Christian is under the Smiles of Divine Providence, then it is suitable for him to Rejoyce...and thereby express and give vent to his Spiritual and Religious Joy," Wise said. But when he is under a dark Cloud...that deprives him of all present Comfort; it becomes him then to cast himself down & Worship God." Charles E. Hambrick-Stowe made it clear that the Puritan "devotional cycle" was, like Puritan theology in general, "experiential in nature, designed to promote the encounter of the self with the divine." The devotional routine of the Puritans, that is, Bible-study, prayer, and meditation, particularly in times of crisis, "had a spiritual and psychological impact of great power." Encompassed by this routine was a "cycle of anxiety and assurance" that was sanctifying because, "enacted devotionally through confession of sin and
thanksgiving for grace," it encouraged "mortification and vivification." 37

Several moderate New Light clergymen preached on affliction and their sermons provide a window through which we might understand the nature of the moderate evangelical spiritual routine. Through their devotional cycle, they, too, anticipated encounters with the divine, and ultimately it was, as it was for the Puritans, a "constant preparation for the full injoyment of him in glory." 38

Hambrick-Stowe wrote that the "Bible was for the Puritans above all a devotional book." To illustrate that meditation on a particular text could cause "religious experience to flow freely from a scriptural fountain," he looked at an experience of Thomas Shepard. Shepard recalled that on one occasion, while reading his Bible, his "heart was sweetly ravished" and he "began to long to die and think of being with him." Aware of the reality of this kind of spiritual experience, Fitch made it a point to comfort mourners at a funeral with the reminder that for the deceased, devotional practice had been attended with the consolations of the Spirit: "It was her great Delight to attend on the Ministry of the Word; And as the Word was the Solace of her Life, so she found the Comfort of it in a dying Hour...she expressed a profound Resignation to the Will of God." Exhorting his hearers "to be seriously Godly... and to labour to be acquainted with, and subject to the Power of Godliness," Fitch fell into step with a
tradition that assumed that in daily routines and in a crisis, the Lord might be met, and one's anxieties be resolved through the practice of "certain specific spiritual exercises." 39

"Anxiety," Hambrick-Stowe wrote, "was a motivating force in the devotional practice of Puritans throughout their lives." Wise inquired, "What shall we do, that we may have a well grounded Hope in God, as our Saviour in all our times of Trouble?" For the Puritans, a "release of the tension," and even an "ecstatic resolution" might attend devotional practice, and for some, Hambrick-Stowe said, "an intense" experience could occur weekly. First, Fitch explained, in a time of crisis a particular attitude, a certain posture, was essential. Christians were to humble themselves before the Lord; they were to "reflect on our selves, as the procuring Cause of all our Troubles, and let us humble our souls under the mighty Hand of God....We must...put our Mouth in the Dust in Token of Sorrow and Shame and Self-loathing, at the Remembrance of our Sins." Fitch told his congregation that "if there be any way to acquire and secure a good Hope under Affliction, 'tis this Way." This reflected a "holy Fear of God." A holy fear of God did not, however, preclude a hope in God. In a fashion reminiscent of Edwards, Fitch said that "they must concur and go together...even in the same Heart, and at the same time, there must be a reverence of his Majesty, and a reliance on his Mercy." If the Christian was seeking a
resolution of his trouble, his fear should prevent his "Hope from swelling into Presumption," and his "Hope must save his Fear from sinking into Despair." The sufferer should continue in obedience to God's commands, cast all his cares upon the Lord, and not, Wise warned, "venture upon any unlawful means for help, nor escape at some back-door of sin; he should stand still and see the Salvation of God." He was to assure himself that "whatever Trouble befalls us, there shall be no real Evil in it, but it shall be over-ruled for our Good." Wise reminded his hearers that the story of Job ended well, reflecting God's merciful goodness. By this Christians ought to be encouraged to trust the Lord, "to expect and hope for a good end to all their troubles, whatever they be, and therefore to wait with patience for it."  

Prayer was as fundamental to the devotional routine of moderate New Lights, as it was to the spiritual regimen of any Puritan. There was simply no spiritual exercise like it. It was, as we have seen above in a different context, a duty in affliction. God's purpose in affliction was "that they may be thereby stirr'd up to prayer; they should...pray and seek his face at such a time." Furthermore, prayer was comforting. It was to the sufferer's own "benefit" and "interest" because only through prayer could afflicted persons "expect support under, a sanctify'd improvement of, and deliverance out of their afflictions, for God only can do this for them."
In other words, Wise was saying that something of the burden might be borne by the Lord; to a degree some anxiety might be assuaged if one prayed his affliction through and "gave" it to God. Hambrick-Stowe described this as "anxiety...about one's part in the drama followed by a feeling of assurance through renewed experience of the drama of salvation and of God's grace." "God only is able to support a Christian under affliction," Wise continued. "The least Evil being too heavy for him to bear up cheerfully under, unless the Everlasting Arms be underneath him; Otherwise a Christian will soon grow impatient and discontented, or sink under discouragement." Besides, there was nothing else a Christian could do "when he...meets with great and sore Trials...unless his hands be made strong by the hands of the Mighty God...Surely God's Grace only is sufficient for him, and therefore he must call to God for his help, that he may...not faint under his rebukes."  

Although Wise emphasized that prayer must be fervent and frequent, that "troubles should send them often to the Throne of Grace," he clarified Paul's exhortation to pray unceasingly. There were other important devotional exercises, or routines "of great consequence" to which the believer needed to give attention: "Some time must be spent in reading, Hearing, Meditating; & not only our General, but our Particular Calling must be attended in their season." Each of these spiritual duties, then, was cathartic but "one Duty must not...thrust out another." Each should help the
Christian to determine "what it is that God aims at in afflicting them."^43

If devotional routines, like the ones Hambrick-Stowe described, offered a means through which the Puritan might encounter the divine, how could one know "whether God's End hath been attained" in a particular situation? How could one be sure that God really had heard his cries and supplications, that any comfort and solace he enjoyed was unmistakeably of the Lord's doing? In other words, how could the believer determine whether or not his encounter with God was genuine?^44

Wise advised the afflicted to "go...to God in the Name of Christ, and tell him, how hard thou art put to it, what a grievous burden lieth upon thee, how weak thou art in thy self; that thou dost not desire ease & release so much as Faith and Patience to bear what he is pleas'd to lay upon thee; and wait thus upon him, and surely it will not be in vain." Wise was confident that those who prayed in this manner would "find on experience that their hearts go out to God, for his Presence and Grace." Accordingly, one could determine by one's inner experience and subsequent behavior if God's purposes were achieved. Indeed, one could be certain that the Lord was with him: if sins were mortified, if he were humbled, and if he performed duties that hitherto, he had been "remiss or negligent" in, then he could "know by these things" that "God is with you, and will never leave nor forsake you." Wise summarized:
If then you feel your hearts begin to move Godward, and Christ-ward in the way of Duty; or to move more lively than ever: If your troubles cause you to look up in good earnest, to the Throne of Grace, 'tis a sign that God is present with you...and what a comfortable Consideration is this. We count it a great privilege to have our Friends near us when we are Sick, or under any other Affliction; but what is this to the having GOD present with us, at such a time, enlivening, quickening and comforting us?

Like the pietistic Puritan who "had to engage in a given set of devotional exercises calculated to keep him responsive to the divine will," so also moderate New Lights relied on prayer, Scripture-reading and meditation to keep the lines of communication open between themselves and God. "They were the psychologically necessary means for the Christian to keep himself responsive to God."46

There were seasons, however, when God hid his face, when he withdrew the "comfortable sense of his Presence and Love." If this occurred in a time of crisis, it put "an edge upon Affliction." "Tis a great aggravation of trouble for the Lord to withdraw the comfortable sense of his Presence and Love," Wise observed, but he added that "his favourable, gracious, comforting, quickening Presence, is a great alleviation thereof." This offers another clue to the nature of the encounter that was possible between God and man: it is found in the seasons of darkness that were experienced by most, if not all, believers. Feelings of spiritual dullness offered such a strong contrast to periods of communion with God, that these complaints offer
indisputable proof that New Light moderates assumed that intimacy with God was normal and attainable. Seasons of darkness were disquieting precisely because they were a disruption in the communion to which they were accustomed. Breakdowns in this communication were, therefore, distressing.47

Reformed thought acknowledged that the believer did not always carry about with him "an extraordinary sense" of God's presence; this would prove exhausting to even the most conditioned spiritual athlete. Sanctified believers were to expect times of spiritual barrenness, periods of famine and drought when it seemed that the Lord withdrew. Out of love for Him however, the Christian was to manifest, in Edwards's phrase, "a willingness to suffer the hidings of God's face, and to live and die in darkness and horror if God's honor should require it, and to have no other reward for it but that God's name should be glorified, although so much of the sweetness of the light of God's countenance had been experienced."48

That intimacy with God was the norm, was reflected in Cotton Mather's assumption that it would return. Spiritual deadness was a common malady: "very good people have Cause for a very sad Complaint, that the glorious GOD hides his face from them." Convinced that vicissitudes were an integral part of the Christian life, McGregor suspected that the person who never experienced them might not even be regenerate. Only the hypocrite was cocksure:
His whole Life is of a Piece. He has no Changes, Psal.55.19. He's a Stranger to those vicissitudes that the Godly experience: He don't know what they mean, when he hears them talk of God's hiding his Face and again shewing them the light of his Countenance; when he hears them talk of an hard Heart, a weak Faith, or some other spiritual Disease; he imagines that these Things are owing to a distemper'd Body; that they are only the Effects of a troubled Brain and heated Imagination: So that he looks down upon them with an Eye of proud Disdain.

Wise also acknowledged that true believers might have to endure the withdrawal of that comfortable sense of God's presence. "The Godly sometimes meet with inward as well as outward Trouble. God sometimes hides his face from them, and they are troubled, as it was with the Psalmist, Psal. 30.7." Though "sometimes they suffer his terours," Wise went on to say, Christians should seek relief and help from "the Author of their troubles; for he that sends trouble, can remove it again." God hid his face for but "a moment...With great mercies will he gather them."50

If occasional terrors darkened the life of the believer, nevertheless, the pilgrim continued to walk in the faith. One could begin anew to deny himself, one might always "be more perfect in humility and adoration," one could, in McGregor's words, continue to "labour after a higher Acquaintance with him." Encounter with the Deity was possible. One might strive toward even greater intimacy with Him.51

The "higher Acquaintance" about which McGregor spoke was not the mystical rapture of an almost erotic quality
that Gilman and Rogers experienced. While there is little
evidence to suggest that any within our group of moderate
New Light clergymen enjoyed spiritual ecstasies of the kind
that Mather and Edwards knew, there is some evidence that
they may have longed for such blissful experiences. Smith,
for example, who throughout his life was "wont to hold
solemn days of fasting and secret devotion," complained that
he never "experienced such ineffable joys of assurance as
some Christians are said to have enjoyed." Of the group of
moderate clergymen we are examining, it would have to be
said that although their encounters with God were, by their
own accounts, such that they could feel his presence, they
were not of the same rhapsodic stuff as the mystical
raptures of Edward Taylor or Sarah Pierrepont Edwards.
Their was more, to repeat what McGregor described, a
"practical Sense of divine Providence. He sees that it is
in God he lives and moves and has his Being."52

No small part of this "practical Sense was the idea of
divine guidance. "If I dwell in the remotest part of the
sea, Even there Thy hand will lead me," wrote the Psalmist,
and to David's conviction, moderate New Light minds wholly
subscribed. It was Christian duty to pray for guidance,
because although a man planned his way, it was the Lord who
mapped the highways of his life. Prayer was necessary
because "man's steps are ordained by the Lord, but how else
can man understand his way?" McGregor emphasized that the
believer committed:
his soul to Christ for Guidance or Conduct. He is deeply sensible that he is of himself a poor blind ignorant Creature...so that of himself he is ever liable to err...He does therefore from this Sense of things commit his Soul to Christ for divine conduct: He pleads with the wonderful Counsellor that he would guide him with his Eye....and lead him in a plain Path....In particular, that when at any Time he is much straitned about what Course to take, and greatly in the Dark with Regard to Duty; that he would send his Holy Spirit to teach him...and guide Him."53

As a pastor, McGregor acted on the assumption that the Lord would "instruct him in the way he should choose." This was apparent in the way he handled a congregation bereaved of its minister. In his funeral address to them, McGregor advised that they choose a new minister prayerfully, reminding them that "with His counsel God wilt guide." He assured them that Christ "knows perfectly what qualifications the minister must have, that will suit you; and also where to find one so qualified, and to send him to you; I say, if you believe these things concerning Christ, (all of which you must believe if you are Christians,) there can be no more powerful motives to prayer."54

Implicit in moderate thinking on divine guidance then, was the biblical admonition that the believer "not lean on your own understanding," but rather, "in all your ways acknowledge Him, And He will make your paths straight." The Christian might very well plan his future, but "the Lord directs his steps." Encounter took place at that crossroads where a man stood to listen to the still, small voice that whispered, "'This is the way, walk in it,' whenever you turn to the right or to the left."55
CHAPTER VI

WORKERS TOGETHER WITH GOD

They are Lights that must waste themselves, and burn out in giving Light to Others.

Jeremiah Wise

In the previous chapter we explored the nature of the moderate encounter with God; in this chapter we will focus on the more prosaic concerns of the New Light ministry and consider it as a professional group. Maine and New Hampshire moderate New Light pastors generally conform to the spate of recent findings about the nature of the clergy as a professional class. For example, what J. William T. Youngs, Jr. learned about the clergy in general, with reference to the importance of learning, the desirability of conversion, the imperative of sanctification, and the need for both an internal and an external call, holds true for northern New England moderate New Lights.¹

Much has also been written of late about clerical concern with declining prestige, financial difficulties, and fears of division and discord. Youngs wrote that the ministry's obsession with its own importance--what he termed "Congregational clericalism"--underscored its inability "to command widespread public esteem." More important, James Schmotter pointed out that this "professionalism" had the
ironic effect of undermining the clergy's own position; by alienating parishioners it made the laity more receptive to the likes of George Whitefield and Gilbert Tennent. Elsewhere, Schmotter showed that "widespread disaffection with the entire profession" led talented young men to seek careers outside the ministry, particularly in law and medicine. Disturbed by the poor financial prospects of clergymen, Shurtleff wrote that "it must needs discourage proper Persons from engaging in the Ministry." And the situation worsened. Schmotter argued that as the eighteenth century progressed, "pastors' ability to get along with parishioners seemed to decrease at an even sharper pace," that there was "a growing disrespect for clerical authority," and that the Great Awakening produced a significant increase in the number of controversies between pastor and parishioner over doctrine." In his study of clerical dismissals in seventeenth and eighteenth-century New Hampshire, George B. Kirsch was also led to conclude that the clergy suffered a decline in prestige "as an elite order" and increasingly, pastors "found themselves more dependent upon their parishioners and less secure in office." Significantly, "no single issue lay behind these controversies but rather a general discontent with the style and message of the professionalized ministry." 2

However, there is evidence that these findings are not entirely accurate, or at least, are not the whole story.
Although New Light moderates in northern New England conceptualized themselves as a professional class in a manner that was hardly distinguishable from their colleagues to the south, they fitted peculiarly into the mid eighteenth-century culture of Maine and New Hampshire in ways that were different. This chapter shows first how moderate pastors in northern New England square with the findings of historians about the clergy in general. Specifically, it examines the moderate New Light understanding of the role of education, grace, sanctification and prayer in the work of the ministry, and describes its increasingly defensive posture in the face of a rising tide of lay indifference and restiveness. Secondly, through a close look at the particular situations of a number of moderate pastors, it demonstrates that the picture scholars have drawn of a ministry obsessed with declining prestige and beset by financial difficulties is misleading. For one thing, it fails to consider the unique opportunities that life on the eastern frontier presented any venturesome individual, be he churchman or layman, and ignores evidence that the adroit clergyman was not only indispensable to, but especially beloved in rough-hewn, backcountry settlements. For another, it does not acknowledge that Maine and New Hampshire "remained a kind of theological backwater into which the currents of controversy seldom reached," and so they were "aloof from the debate and discord in which the rest of New England was caught up."
Unburdened by the "historical baggage" of the Massachusetts and Connecticut churches, "if they claimed none of the crusading fervor of their seventeenth-century counterparts in Massachusetts, neither did they share their inherited troubles." As Elizabeth Currier Nordbeck pointed out, northern New England "witnessed no rumblings amongst a discontented laity, no attempts to divest its ministers of their decision-making authority."^3

To the Puritans it was unthinkable that an uneducated man could minister with any success. Though the clergy might "suggest that any man with a good mind and a pious heart could become a minister," they almost never put this assertion into practice. The prerequisite for entrance into clerical ranks was not "superior spiritual qualities," but diligent study; "in essence the minister was established through proper training." To persons who objected that Christ appointed the unlearned to be his disciples, Jabez Fitch replied that "those illiterate Fishermen...were by Christ miraculously gifted for it: Hence this will not justify the presumptuous Intrusion of ignorant and unqualified men upon this sacred Work; for extraordinary Gifts are not now to be expected, but suitable gifts for the
Ministry must be obtain'd in an ordinary way, and without a competent measure of ministerial Gifts, none should be admitted to the Office of a Minister.4

Fitch was not claiming that mere study was sufficient either. The Puritans believed that it was a "glaring impudence and daring presumption to dream of immediate irradiation from above." Great spiritual truths needed to "be digg'd out, and fetch'd up from the mine in the common way of study, reading, and converse." But, like Fitch, the Puritans also believed that God blessed individuals with particular talents, and empowered them to pursue particular callings: "Tis by his Blessing on their Studies, that ordinary Ministers are furnished with Knowledge, and those Gifts that are necessary to capacitate them for the instruction of a People." While Fitch acknowledged that the Lord gave a man talents that fitted him for the ministry, he emphasized that "to neglect our Studies, and yet to depend on Christ for Assistance, is not a trusting in Christ, but a presumptuous tempting of Him." (Therefore, the sort of "immediate" assistance for which Daniel Rogers prayed was sinful.) In Ward Cotton's estimation, a preacher should never "depend upon immediate Assistance and so neglect previous Preparations." Moderate New Lights believed that ministers should not offer to God or to His people "that which costs them nothing; but should be studious and industrious in making preparation...for the publick service of God's House." In the words of the Rev. John Tucke,
minister to the church at Gosport, an isolated fishing outpost on the Isles of Shoals, off the coast of New Hampshire, "his publick performances will smell of the lamp." "A Minister's Life is a Studious Life; and Study, much of it, is a Weariness to the Flesh," Wise observed, and though the work demanded "the Labour of his Body," "especially" did it demand that "of his Mind." "Wisdom, Fidelity, Courage, Compassion, and true Grace and Experience" were essential, but so was education. Ministers needed "Knowledge and substantial Learning....They that are to instruct others must be well taught themselves....they must have a Treasure of Knowledge in their Minds."^5

This treasure of knowledge, William Shurtleff explained, included "the knowledge, not only of the Learned Languages, but of the whole Circle of Arts and Sciences," adding that "sound divinity is what Men must not expect to be inspired with, in the present Age." David McGregor felt that clergymen should be "vers'd in all the various Parts of solid, useful Learning... and expert in the whole Compass of Science." In his view, ministers should be "universal Scholars." He admitted that his ideal was wishful thinking, especially in "an infant State" where things were in "Embrio." Nevertheless, McGregor thought it was "at least highly expedient" that a minister:

understood so much of Grammar and Rhetoric, as to know somewhat of the Congruity and Elegancy of Language: That he have such an Insight into Logick and Metaphysicks, as that he be capable of making proper
Distinctions of knowing when an Argument is, or is not conclusive; of reasoning with some Pertinency and Clearenness of detecting Sophisms, and of Abstracting: that he did at least know so much of Mathematicks, as to render him capable of reading Books of natural Philosophy, with Understanding: That he be well acquainted with moral Philosophy, and with History, ancient and modern, civil and ecclesiastic; especially, it is needful that he be acquainted with Divinity, Polemick and Systematick, as well as Practical.

Given its Faustian demands, no wonder that this profession "brought on Disease, and hastened Death in the Meridian of Life!" 6

To the Rev. Daniel Emerson, who from his seat in Hollis, New Hampshire, was prominent in the ministerial association and "served the new towns around him like a bishop," education was paramount. The Hollis Association rejected any candidate not blessed by "a liberal education as well as piety," and certainly Emerson's life refuted "liberals who accused the New Lights of being foes to education." He taught Hollis's Latin pupils, sent the astonishing number of twelve on to Harvard, and trained no less than thirty for the ministry. Even the Anglican governor, John Wentworth, sent a son to be educated under his guidance. 7

With three exceptions, northern New England's moderate clergymen were Harvard graduates. In Londonderry, McGregor read literature and theology under the Rev. Matthew Clark, his father's successor in the small New Hampshire settlement (the elder McGregor enjoyed a thorough classical and
theological education in Scotland), and in 1764 was awarded an honorary M.A. from Princeton. The Rev. Benjamin Allen, of Falmouth, Maine, was a graduate of Yale. Only Richard Elvins was not "favored with the Advantages of an academical Education," and owing to this and the fact that he was the son of a baker, he was excoriated in his day. Since then, he has been ignored by most historians who have not credited him with the spirited determination it took for him to leave his trade and master—proficiently—the vocabulary of the ministry. Greenleaf wrote that he was "a man of good understanding, some reading, and possessing ardent piety...in the end he proved a useful Minister." Writing in 1892, William D. Williamson suggested that in spite of the lack of any "traditional report of his abilities and learning," Elvins's one published sermon was sufficient evidence of his "sound mind, evangelical sentiments, and preaching talents....In this man of God was evinced what the inspiration of the spirit could wonderfully achieve without the aid and embellishments of formal erudition and philosophy." Opponents described him as a "fellow of consummate ignorance...followed by great multitudes and much cried up," but Nordbeck argued that this reputation was "undeserved." Elvins's "single published sermon reveals him to have been a man of sound orthodox mind and no little talent for clear doctrinal exposition." 8

If Elvins's sermon reflected a dextrous facility for wielding the "sword of the spirit," it was because, like his
formally educated colleagues, he agreed that knowledge of
the Bible was critically important. "The bible is his
favorite book," McGregore asserted of the gospel minister,
and Shurtleff spoke for all New Light clergymen when he said
that it was "the Holy Bible... with which every Christian
but especially every Minister should endeavour daily to get
more and more acquainted." He who was a "good Soldier of
Jesus Christ," McGregore added:

should be so well acquainted with the Doctrines, the
Precepts, the Promises and Threatnings of God's
Word, as that he may have a ready Recourse to it in
every Time of Need; and know how to use this spiritual
Sword, either to defend himself and his Flock, or
offend the Enemy, as Need shall require: And if he has
such a Knowledge as this, of the Sword of the Spirit
he shall be enabled to stand in the evil Day, able to
master every Difficulty, to overcome every Temptation:
He shall be an overmatch for all the Power of the
Enemy; he shall both do great things, and shall still
prevail.

The effective minister "should love not only to study it as
a science, but to feed upon it: they receive it in the Love
of it, and derive Nourishment & Delight from it."9

The knowledge the minister gained from study of the
Scriptures, exegetical works, and books on sound divinity
was, then, singularly important. However, though the
Puritans and moderate New Lights believed that "superior
spiritual qualities" were secondary to, and never a
substitute for learning, most were convinced that an
unconverted minister was a contradiction in terms. "See to
it that you have a heartfelt sense of the power of that
gospel which you preach," admonished Samuel Chandler. "If we would rightly discharge the Work of the Ministry," Fitch counseled, "we must set our selves to be followers of Christ." Men that preached Christ "must first learn Christ." It was impossible to "expect to bring others to the knowledge of Christ, if we are unacquainted with Him our selves." Like Chandler and Fitch, Jeremiah Wise was also adamant about the need for grace in the minister. It was not enough for a pastor to be "naturally tender-hearted and morally sincere...prudent...and zealous according to knowledge...from a good natural Constitution; from Education; from Precept and Example." He might be all of these, but if he were "destitute of Grace," he could not "aim at the Glory of God." How could anyone "do this without Grace?....They that have tasted, have experienced that the Lord is gracious... and with the greater Advantage recommend the Grace of God to others." It was Wise's final judgment that "he is best prepared to preach Christ, who has had him revealed to him....As there is no knowledge like that of Experience, so there is no preaching like experimental Preaching."¹⁰

In Puritanism however, there was room for the idea that God could make use of the unconverted minister, and among New Light moderates there were also those who agreed that God might work through the unregenerate. James Pike for instance, quoted William Perkins: "God may make use of the Ministry of unconverted Men...to shew that the Efficacy
is not in the Person of Man, but in the Ordinance of God." Ward Cotton also allowed that God might reach sinners through an unregenerate pastor. According to him, the "Efficacy of Preaching or Ordinances does not depend on Men, their Grace or Goodness, for God acts as a Sovereign in the Dispensations of his Grace in this Matter, and worketh by what Means or Instruments he pleaseth. He sometimes no doubt gives Success to his Word and Ordinances where he does not give true Grace to the Dispensers of them." But, Cotton added, "how can a Minister with any Face offer that Christ to others, which he has not accepted of himself?" As far as he was concerned, pastors would "be unable to make Full Proof of their ministries "unless...God...shine'd into our Hearts, to give us the Light of the Knowledge of Glory of God in the Face of Jesus Christ." In the final analysis, James Pike agreed. It was "best that the Minister have the Knowledge of divine Things...engraven in his Heart."¹¹

Thomas Smith was bolder and questioned "how far special sanctifying Grace is necessary, either to capacitate a Man for, or to give him Success in his Ministry." The power of God was such that even those ministers who had "only a rational, Argumentative, Theoretical Conviction and Belief" could be effective. Their "Education, and common Grace," their "natural Probity and Disposition to a laudable Decorum and a Concern for the Order and Peace of the World, and the good of Mankind" could be used of God, and their "regular, virtuous and conscientious" behavior would
"promote the same among others." Smith believed that "they are best prepared to preach Christ who have had him revealed to them, by an internal work of the Spirit in their Hearts," but as far as he was concerned, this did not preclude the pastoral effectiveness of the unconverted. For him, the learned and converted minister was an ideal.12

Nevertheless, genuine faith sustained a minister. Smith believed that the personal knowledge of God afforded added courage and devotion to the pastor and offset "whatever other Qualifications are wanting." McGregor was convinced that conversion was necessary for practical reasons. Tremendous difficulties and discouragements attended the ministry. Like Smith, McGregor believed that faith emboldened a pastor to "fight the good Fight, and steadily adhere to his Master's Interest." Grace enabled him "to face and surmount Difficulties" and "so fortifies the Soul, that he is at Times carried in a Manner quite above Discouragement."13

According to New Light thinking, conversion was an essential qualification for the ministry. And sanctification, so important in the life of any lay believer, was doubly important for a pastor because the eyes of the entire community were upon him. McGregor stressed that the man who sought clerical office ought to "have made some considerable Advances in Mortification" and sanctification. He explained that "if a minister have an inordinate Love to his carnal Ease, he'll hardly be willing
to follow his Master in a thorny Path, or to engage in great Difficulties in the Cause of Christ." The minister who loved the things of the world was likely to be distracted "from the Cause of Christ....He...who would behave himself as a good Soldier of Jesus Christ, should be one who has made some Progress in the difficult, but necessary Duty of Self-denial; one who has learned to make Poverty welcome, if it should fall to his Lot; who knows how to be abased, as well as how to abound; one who can deny his Appetites and Passions." 14

In other words, the minister was obliged to practice what he preached. "'Be ye doers of the Word, and not hearers only,'" Fitch admonished a young candidate; "be careful to abstain from the Sins, which you are told from the Word, must be abstained from; and to perform the Duties, which you are told from the Word, must be performed by you." The minister was to "make it his very great care...to be a pattern of holiness, and a living example of every virtue, and of every thing that is praise worthy." "We must be sure to take Heed to Ourselves, to our own Lives and Conversations, that we may be...Followers of Christ, in the careful Practice of that Holy Religion in which we are to instruct others," Cotton observed. "He who preaches the Gospel is under the strongest Obligations to live according to the excellent Rules prescrib'd in the Gospel....Much is expected from them." "While we should teach with our lips, we should also teach by our good example," Tucke concluded.
"Keep thyself pure," was Chandler's advice at an ordination. "Remember that you bear the ark of God, and take care that your feet don't stumble. Be a minister of Jesus Christ in the pulpit, and out of it, and also in character all the week. 'In all things shew thyself a pattern of good works. --Be thou an example of believers, in word, in conversation, in charity, in spirit, in faith, in purity. --Adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things.' Keep up the reputation of the sacred office, 'giving no offence in any thing, that the ministry be not blamed.'"

Sanctification, conversion, and a considerable degree of learning were not the only requirements for the ministry. It was important that a candidate be reasonably certain that God wanted him in the ministry. This "internal call" did not come by way of any extraordinary operation of the Spirit. "The ordinary Ministers of the Gospel are called mediately, in the way that Christ has directed to, in the Gospel," Fitch explained. "Christ...inclin'd their Hearts, to engage in the work of the Ministry, and open'd a door of opportunity for them, to be employ'd in this Work." Wise said that the internal call meant that "it is He that gives Men a Genius for the Ministry." The external call came by way of congregational election. When the candidate was ordained, Wise explained that he was "solemnly set apart there to, by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery, in the name of Jesus Christ;
whereby they are impowered to act as Ambassadors for Christ, having authority to preach the everlasting Gospel in his Name, and to govern in the Church, according to his mind and will: and the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven are committed to them; the key of Doctrine, and the key of Discipline." As we shall see, Wise retreated from this position in the turbulent years of the Great Awakening, when what constituted God's order for ordination became an issue, and he was embroiled in the controversial ordination of Daniel Rogers. Years before the startling events of 1741-1743, he asserted that the man who "climbs up over the Wall, or enters some other way, is ordinarily a Thief and a Robber." He cautioned the laity to "Lay Hands suddenly on no Man, for the Honour of Religion, the Salvation of Mens Souls depends much, very much upon those who are admitted into the sacred Function; and therefore Care should be taken to prevent unqualified Persons from entering into the Ministry."

Once a young graduate received a call from a congregation on the eastern frontier, he embarked on a life certainly more trying than that which he had known in Cambridge. Seasoned veterans of the pulpit readily acknowledged that discouragement and difficulty lay ahead for him. "The Ministry is a Work, an arduous and laborious Work," Wise warned Pike at the latter's ordination; and "neither Angels, nor Men are, of themselves, sufficient for it, without proportionable Assistance from God." If trial and trouble were the lot of the minister, he was not
expected to bear it alone, however, but to rely on the help of God who called him to it. Tucke explained that "Christ that has set us our work, knows our weakness, our difficulties, trials and temptations; and he knows how to pity and succour us; how to direct and assist us; and how to bless, comfort, and reward us." A pastor was not expected to trust in his own strength, but that "of God." He needed "the presence of God, his direction, and assistance."\textsuperscript{18}

Moderate New Lights were unanimous in their conviction that ministerial strength and effectiveness came entirely from God. As a result, they assumed it was a minister's duty to cast all their pastoral cares upon Him. Ministers were "under Christ's Management," and their yoke was made lighter by reliance on Christ's help. McGregor assured a candidate for the ministry that "you are to have your Master's Presence with you in the whole of your Ministerial Work." Though he might consider himself "weak and very unequal to it," McGregor reminded him that he had "a strong Lord to depend upon." On Him he could "with a humble confidence depend, for all the Assistance you have need of." The young man was told that Christ would give him "the Christian Temper in all its lovely Branches, so that you shall be Able to contend for the Faith of Christ, with the Spirit of Christ." With the newly ordained minister, McGregor shared his confidence that "the more you do in your Station, and the more Hardness you are called to suffer in the Cause of your glorious Captain; it is
likely the more you'll enjoy of his gracious spiritual Presence." Fitch counselled another young man similarly, telling him he should be "very sensible, where you must go for Assistance in your Work, and that there is a sufficiency of Grace in Christ, to render you an able Minister of the New Testament; and to strengthen you to a faithful discharge of your Duty on all accounts; and to support you under all the difficulties you may meet withal in your work.\textsuperscript{19}

In keeping with the biblical premise that "power is perfected in weakness," experienced ministers also encouraged men who "have many awful Tho'ts" about the ministry "and fear to engage in it" on grounds of inadequacy. Wise assured those present at an ordination, that "whoever engage in it with right Views, have the promise of Christ's gracious Presence...to uphold them...and carry them thro' it. They are sent into his Field, about his Work, and may hope to have him working with them."\textsuperscript{20}

The primary means by which a pastor was to seek Christ's assistance was prayer. The strength, guidance, and succour he gained "on his knees, in his closet," was inestimable, and every moderate New Light pastor in northern New England was resolute about the central role of prayer in the conduct of his ministry. It was the very foundation of a gospel preacher.\textsuperscript{21}

"More things are wrought by prayer, Than this world dreams of," Tennyson wrote, and the pastor who failed to approach his Master frequently in prayer "can't expect to be
successful in his Ministry." Cotton was convinced that "the whole Efficacy of our Ministry depends entirely on the Divine Blessing... and the Way to secure this is Prayer." New Light clergymen affirmed that "those who have undertaken to be fishers of men had need be men of Prayer, that they may be endued with Power from on high, rightly to discharge the great Work incumbent on them." To a degree greater than others, ministers needed to be men of prayer. Shurtleff concluded an ordination sermon with the admonition that ministers "above all Men are concerned to be continually at the Throne of Grace; and earnestly, fervently, and incessantly to be breathing out the wishes and desires of our souls to GOD, to assist and prosper us in our work." Earnest, fervent and incessant prayer was not easy. "Praying Work, if done with due Intention of Mind, and Vigour of Affection, is hard Work." Smith exhausted himself in prayer, "frequent closeting himself to meet with his Maker."

Because, in Richard Baxter's words, it was "no small Matter or trifling Thing to stand up in the Face of a Congregation, and deliver a Message of Salvation or Damnation, as from the Living God," prayer was necessary to infuse life into one's sermon preparations. It was from the "Father of Lights" that a pastor sought "acceptable Words," guidance insofar as "seasonable Subjects" on which to preach, and the most profitable Way of prosecuting" them. "Be daily waiting upon God," Tucke exhorted his son at his
ordination, for "direction, what subjects you should preach upon, and how you should handle them." Perhaps Chandler expressed it best: "Fetch fire from heaven to kindle your sacrifices."²³

Ministers who were faithful and prayerful could expect heavenly support, and, as a result, were likely to be more effective instruments of God. Whatever "successes" resulted came from Him: "All the Good they do, is to be ascrib'd to his hand that is with them, or to his Power, that accompanies their Labours," Shurtleff observed. The minister "may be an instrument of turning Men from Darkness to Light, but that is all; the Excellency of the Power is of Christ; it is his omnipotent Hand that effects the Change; and upon this...Success entirely depends." Among Maine and New Hampshire moderate pastors it was a truism that "success is from him....The word is, or is not successful, just as GOD pleaseth; not as Ministers, not as People please....Ministers can do nothing to purpose, without the presence of GOD with them, to make the Word effectual." Fitch wrote that "success...absolutely depends on Jesus Christ, without whom his Ministers labour in vain, and spend their strength for naught....The best of Ministers...can do nothing to any saving purpose, without the concurrence of Christ."²⁴

There was a caveat in all of this, however. Just because a minister was faithful and permitted himself to be poured out in the service of Christ, there were no
guarantees. One might labor diligently and not convert a single soul. There was always the possibility that "God should not presently give you the desired Success of your Labours." Nevertheless, Fitch preached, "you must still hold on in the faithful discharge of your duty." Like the apostles who "toil'd all Night, and caught nothing," gospel ministers were still obliged to "continue to let down the Gospel net, in obedience to the word and command of Christ, who would not have them weary in well-doing, tho' they see not the success of their Labours." Heavenly reward for the minister was not like a sales contest, commensurate with the number of souls saved. Rather, it was in proportion to "their faithful Endeavours, whatever their success be." The minister was to expect reward "according to his fidelity and industry, not according to the fruit of his Ministry. If he labours faithfully, God will reward him proportionabley, tho' few or none have believed his report." Patience was vital. In situations where one's efforts failed miserably, the gospel minister "must continue unweariied in his labours." Even McGregor, who was doubtful that a minister could labour long and hard and not lead any to Christ, reminded the young man before him that "your Judgment is with the Lord, and your Work with your God; and ...your faithful Endeavours will be well accepted." 25

Real failure was a thing altogether different. Real failure came when a minister preached against certain sins and practiced them himself; if he veered from "right Views,"
and did not "act from pure and proper principles;" if he were "idle, slothful, careless and negligent," and failed to "exert his Powers and employ all his Talents in it." Real failure was unfaithfulness.  

He who was faithful could expect to sacrifice his youth, his strength, his health; the ministry cost a man dearly. To "preach the word with all your might," to "reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all long-suffering" was an exhausting business, and the "Work that required one of a Thousand to do it" might cause "the best of them... to well crie out with the Holy Apostle, who is sufficient for these things?" But pastors took pains to inform their contemporaries that the faithful service of Jesus Christ was not servitude. If it was exhausting, it was also exalting, work: "It's no small Honour, that they are workers together with God," Wise wrote. Clerical service was "of a spiritual Nature intirely," Smith took pains to emphasize. Ministers were "the servants of our Brethren, for the furthering the Salvation of their Souls only." "They may...call and account themselves Servants in Respect of the Laboriousness and great Difficulty of their Walk, tho' not upon the Account of any servile Relation that they sustain to the Persons, whom they freely minister to," he concluded.  

If Smith sounded defensive here, well he ought to have, because throughout the century, as a number of scholars have argued, the prestige of the ministry gradually but steadily declined. Smith's was but one protest raised
in a chorus of clerical protest in Maine and New Hampshire. He lamented that "there never was the Time, when it was so difficult a Thing, for a Preacher to give Satisfaction, and gain Acceptance among People....there is no Minister gives universal content: We are either too zealous and searching for some, or too lifeless and cold for others....And in general there appears a Disposition to find Fault with and censure Ministers." McGregore was also aware of crankiness in the laity as well, for he found a need to express the hope that congregations would "not by any Part of their conduct, wilfully add to his Difficulties: On the contrary, that they would yield to him that limited Subjection and Obedience in the Lord, which they...solemnly promised in their Call; regarding and obeying him as having the Rule over them." At an ordination he was compelled to exhort the congregation to "remember whose Name he comes in, and whose Message he is charged with; and would esteem him very highly for his Master's Sake, and for his Work's Sake."^28

A seventeenth-century pastor would hardly have found it necessary to inform a congregation to "be tender as to the exposing any Frailties they may see in their Minister; especially such Things as they have Reason to think are no more than Indiscretions, proceeding from meer Inadvertency, without any criminal Intention." McGregore did. While assuring himself that "ours is a station of high Honour,...of high Trust and Importance," he spoke of "the Neglect, and practical Contempt" they suffered. He reminded
his hearers that "ministers are engaged in difficult Posts, and they much need your Sympathy and Prayers, and friendly Assistance: If you knew how hardly tested they often are, while without are Fighting, and within are Fears; you would surely pity them, and do all you could to lighten their burden." By implication, of course, McGregore was aware of a refractory laity unwilling to "pity them" and "lighten their burden."29

In an ordination sermon in which he compared gospel ministers to stars, Shurtleff seized the opportunity to speak of the "eminency and Dignity" of the pastoral "Station" and to assert that ministers "are great in their office." Professionals confident of their place in society would not have to belabor the point repeatedly, like Shurtleff did, that "they are raised above the common Level, and plac'd in a superiour Rank among Men." This special pleading was evident in his assertion that gospel ministers moved in more "advanc'd Orbs, and are plac'd so much nearer to God than others," a feeble effort to assume spiritual superiority. Shurtleff's remark that without "such an Order of Men Ignorance and vice would soon grow to a prodigious Heighth" was a thinly veiled objection to a society that more and more needed to be wheedled and goaded to reverence, respect, and honor its ministry.30

Schmotter wrote that clear evidence of lay disaffection with the ministry was in the poor salaries afforded clergymen by their congregations. If complaints by
ministers themselves are a valid measure of it, the problem was epidemical. Nordbeck learned that one out of four sermons published by Maine and New Hampshire ministers before 1741 made reference to the salary problem. "How often do the Clouds of Poverty that cover them, obscure a great deal of their Lustre?" Shurtleff asked. Fitch responded to the problem with *A Plea for the Gospel Ministers of New England*, a plucky essay unashamedly devoted to the issue of temporal support.  

Fitch began his "plea" with the observation that "the Ministers of this Land have generally so approved themselves to be the Ministers of Christ, in the Consciences of their People." They have done so silently, "under a very heavy Grievance." But "they ought to be silent no longer; they are obliged to let the world know how hardly they have been treated." Fitch then took aim: it was a biblical injunction that "a Liberal maintenance...be afforded to the Ministers of the Gospel," and a liberal Maintenance was money sufficient to permit ministers to have "not only for necessity, but also for Delight;" to "lay up for their Children;" and to furnish "themselves with a suitable Collection of Books;" to set "a good example of Charity;" and to provide hospitality. "How many Men Preach the Gospel, and yet can scarce find the first, and meanest of these Supplies?" Fitch was aghast at the degree to which "the People of New England" were "defective...as to the discharge of their Duty to their Ministers....Instead of
affording them a Liberal Maintenance, all...that many Ministers receive from their People is scarce sufficient to supply them with Necessaries." In the long run this hurt the laity because clergymen, "encumbered with the world" and "much distracted with worldly cares in their Studies" were unable to do justice to their flocks. It was impossible that a man "give up himself wholly" to his ministry when he was overwhelmed with financial worries.\textsuperscript{32}

To Fitch, the pecuniary issue was tied inextricably to the layman's increasing disregard for the clergy—a disregard that was spiritual at its roots. They had "a mean Esteem of the Word. Having long enjoy'd the Ministry of the Word in Plenty (like the Manna which was rained from Heaven for the Israelites) and not profiting by the Word; they have as little value for it, as the Israelites had for manna; and then 'tis no wonder, that they care not to be at any expense about it." New economic and cultural winds were blowing across the land, rapidly shaping Puritan into Yankee, and the writing was on the wall. It was painfully obvious that New Englanders had "an excessive Love to the World. They so love it, that they are loath to part with any thing of it, if they can possibly help it; and hence they are ready to take any occasion to excuse themselves from paying their dues." And it was not that his niggardly countrymen could not afford it. A century before, proper support for the ministry may have been burdensome, "but 'tis far otherwise now; the Country is great, and greatly increased in wealth,
as well as numbers; and tis an easy thing for them (if they had but an heart) to support their Ministers Honourably." It was "Ingratitude, for a People to deny their Ministers a Liberal Maintenance." Practically speaking, "a Scandalous Maintenance" was apt to create a "Scandalous Ministry." ³³

While few were so bold as to confront their countrymen with their parsimoniousness in full-length essays, many moderate New Lights addressed the problem in their sermons, particularly at ordinations when they were wont to hold up the dignity and importance of clerical office. "On account of their elevated Station...they are more peculiarly conspicuous, have a great many Eyes upon them, and are liable to the most strict and critical Observations," Shurtleff preached at an ordination. Because of this fact, moneys "suitable to their Rank" must be granted them: "If we devote ourselves faithfully to the service of your Souls, and spend our whole Time...and Labours therein; is't it equal and just as well as necessary, that we should be supported while so doing?" Smith asked. Shurtleff agreed. If pastors were "poor and low in the World, though it be your own Fault, you'll be apt to despise them for it, and consequently will not be likely to receive much Benefit by them: Or at least by this Means, you'll cramp and contract their Powers, sink their Spirits, and discourage them in their Work." Holding out the threat that their "own Souls will in many Ways be Sufferers by it in the End," Shurtleff blamed "that niggardly Spirit that seems at present too much
to prevail through the Land among a great many." It was keeping ministers "low" and would "be found but a very costly Frugality in the issue." At another ordination, Shurtleff again hammered away at his hearers. The ministry was not easy. Ministers were worthy of decent temporal support "as will enable them to live answerable to their high and honorable Station." And alms and charity were unacceptable. A pastor laboured for his money "and may challenge it as his just Due." A minister could not afford to appear penurious lest he be despised and held in contempt. This would "abate the force of his doctrine."

Like Fitch, Shurtleff emphasized that the ministry should not concern itself with secular work of any kind--"they should wholly devote themselves to it" and not divert energies to "their Farms, or their Merchandize, or any other Calling whatsoever." This was self-aggrandizement on Shurtleff's part when we consider that from 1620, the work every minister did on his farm was not an onus but simply a vital part of daily life--although, "being both a farmer and a clergyman often complicated a minister's relations with his fellow-men." (That his pastorate was in Portsmouth may explain Shurtleff's aversion to farm work).

Curiously, all of these vigorous remonstrances against miserly congregations make little sense in the light of the actual pecuniary condition of the northern New England ministry. Of twenty-five Maine and New Hampshire moderate
clergymen, only four were poorly paid: John Blunt left only five pounds to his eldest son and on his meager sixty pound salary, Joseph Adams of Stratham was unable to send any offspring to Harvard; Chandler never received more than eighty pounds annually. Thomas Smith's seventy pound salary was approximately fifteen pounds below the average. (Nordbeck asserted that Smith was "always liberally recompensed," but as she herself pointed out, when Smith arrived in Falmouth, there were only "forty-five families in the whole town...most of them poor, and some of them miserably so.") Furthermore, his church began small, with seventeen founders, and grew slowly, increasing by less than five members each year. Despite low salaries however, the latter two ministers were well off personally, as we will see.36

Joseph Adams of Newington suffered a real grievance with his people over money, no small disgrace when one considers that he served his people longer than any other clergyman of his generation. Adams recalled that he "met with Troubles with my people In my old Age when almost 91 Years old & have preacht almost 66 years among Them and That Upon the Account of my Salleery Under the Depreciation of Paper Money & as some of our Covetous People Wont come to hear me: & though I am conscious to my Self that my Demands are Just & have not yet been Complyed with I have Determined to overcome Evil with Good." The old man continued to overcome evil with good and served his stingy congregation
for two more years. It should be noted however, that
Adams's eighty-six pound salary was average, if not slightly
above average in 1715. In 1722 the average annual salary of
a minister was eighty-seven pounds. 37

Three other men disputed with their congregations over
money matters, but in Fitch's case it was tied to a larger
dispute that evolved into a lawsuit for one year's salary
illegally withheld on his resignation from his first post.
In Jeremiah Wise's case, the inflation that resulted from
chronic Indian wars moved him to declare at a Berwick town
meeting that he could not "live upon the eighty pounds per
annum without...Infringing upon his own estate and will hurt
his family for the future." Though the townspeople
encouraged him to "wait," Wise was not forced to quibble
over salary when the parish divided in 1748. The nature of
the protracted and bitter dispute John Hovey carried on with
his Arundel (now Kennebunkport, Maine) congregation was more
complicated, but it is enough to mention that he had to sue
for his salary, and collected it thirty-two years after his
dismissal. 38

Of these eight men then, two quarreled seriously with
their congregations over money (the other two incidences may
be dismissed), and two were living examples of Smith's
complaint that "ministers were getting the same daily wage
as washer-women, which was a quarter as much as laborers
enjoyed." (Ironically, there is no evidence that either
Blunt or Adams of Stratham ever aired their financial
grievances.) What of the majority remaining? 39

Six in this group were exceptionally well treated. Sibley's said it was "preposterous," but John Tucke was paid a salary of 400 quineas yearly, more than five times the average clerical salary. Nicholas Loring received "liberal treatment," liberal enough apparently, to speculate in wild lands. Fitch, Smith, Cotton, and Emerson also speculated, and this, it should be noted, was hardly "work" but a thing a gentleman and a clergyman might do with equanimity. Fitch, who of all his colleagues made the most noise about salary, received "excellent" pay--above average, in fact--and Smith's "Grievances and discouragements, God knows, have been of another Nature than want of Maintenance or Salary." He went so far as to thank his Falmouth congregation for their generosity, and told them that their "Care...hath...abounded unto the Riches of Liberality...and...the Way and Manner in which you have done it, so decently, so generously, and with so cheerful a Unanimity...without my seeking or scarcely knowing what you were about...is extremely obliging and endearing." Indeed they were generous. Smith's salary, though small, took one-third of the town budget and Falmouth built an "elegant parsonage" for him, the "only one with wallpaper" in the area. To his parishioners Smith contributed medical services gratis and to those persons against whom he won land claims (awkwardly enough, some were members of his congregation), he exercised "lenity" and "tenderheartedness"
that won him repute as "ever charitable." It was in land speculation that Smith did very well for himself, amassing, in Nordbeck's words, "a substantial fortune." He relinquished "just debts and claims," however, a mercy one might expect "from one who placed his trust in the care of Divine Providence, and did not consider his treasure as lying this side of heaven." 40

If the salaries of a few Maine and New Hampshire parsons were mediocre, often it was not because of lay closefistedness. Despite the fact that it was an isolated outpost, Kittery Point kept John Rogers ahead of inflation and paid him "well," more than most towns on the frontier for that matter. Wells treated Samuel Jefferds with equal generosity, raising his salary to keep up with inflation also. We have already mentioned that Smith's salary took one-third of Falmouth's budget. Similarly, Amos Main was granted all but five pounds from a magnanimous Rochester, the annual budget of which amounted to 165 pounds. And Hampton, New Hampshire did not fail to extend its hand to Ward Cotton when inflation ate into his pay. 41

Sometimes a minister returned the favor. As mentioned above, during the Revolution when inflation made life on the frontier even more burdensome, Smith did not collect his salary. James Pike could afford the same, and with no little panache. Through a propitious marriage to Sarah Gilman, a member of a leading provincial family, and sister of Nicholas Gilman, he came into money and built himself a
mansion on the very edge of the wilderness. Not every one was impressed, however. When encomiums from Pike's people reverberated through other flocks, congregations whined that their pastors did not follow Pike's example. Ministers complained. Without their salaries they would starve; they had not married so well. Except for Samuel Jefferds. Having married Sarah Wheelwright, daughter of the distinguished Colonel John Wheelwright, the Wells minister also enriched his assets and at his death left 2100 pounds to nine blessed children.42

If Pike, Smith and Jefferds were quite comfortable in their crude outposts, Amos Main, inaccurately described as a "poor frontier parson," did amazingly well for himself under the worst of circumstances. Rochester was a country so wild that once Main had to summon neighbors to help him kill the bear that menaced his household. In a town where the danger of Indian attack was constant, Main was "lawyer, schoolmaster and physician," and doctored scores of patients for miles around. During the debilitating Indian wars, currency depreciation was so extreme that at a town meeting Main brought before his flock the fact that he was not being paid what was due him. They responded immediately, and built the parsonage for which his family had hoped for twelve years. In spite of these hardships, however, Main was able to amass a whopping 5580 pound estate--more than enough to provide farms for each of his seven children. Samuel Chandler, who as we mentioned, was never paid more
than eighty pounds annually, must have been extraordinarily thrifty, for he left a 2100 pound estate, and Shurtleff's 433 pound estate was considerably above the average.  

Marrying well was one thing. Leaving a poorer church to wed a richer one was another, and although it was a rare step indeed, Shurtleff took it. Dismissed from his post at Newcastle, he took the helm at Portsmouth where he hobnobbed with the likes of Sir William Pepperrell, prayed frequently before the House, and was awarded the sinecure of the Fort William and Mary chaplaincy.

It was across the Piscataqua, on the Maine side, on the sea, that the most extraordinary financial wizardry was worked, although "Old Mister Moody" would not have it understood as such. He consistently refused a settled salary because York, devastated by Indian attack in 1692, was unable to support him anyway. So Moody lived on small provincial subsidies and the voluntary contributions of the town. His was "a serene faith in the immediate presence of God and the manifestation of His hand in everyday affairs." The Lord provided for Samuel Moody.

None of this is intended to paint a Panglossian picture of the financial condition of this particular group of ministers; certainly it is not an effort to misconstrue that of clergymen in general. Ministers were on fixed incomes during a period of chronic inflation, and although, between 1650-1750 they were second only to commercial people in personal wealth, from 1755 "their economic position seems
to have declined dramatically," and they slipped behind other professionals such as lawyers, public officials and doctors. If as a group, Maine and New Hampshire New Light clergymen did not generally experience overwhelming financial woes, "the salary problem created an atmosphere of clerical anxiety that extended even to" them. Money was a problem and increasingly, a serious problem for the ministry. For almost thirty years Jonathan Edwards quarreled continually over money with his Northampton flock and "felt so underpaid that he threatened to leave."46

Nevertheless, Youngs pointed out that "despite their complaints, the ministers still received better incomes than most New Englanders." There is some evidence that suggests that what historians have been telling us about the deplorable financial condition of the ministry may be a bit overdrawn, at least as far as the northern New England ministry is concerned. More precisely, studies to date fail to suggest that the phenomenon of professionalism or "Congregational clericalism" served to contribute--at least to some degree--to the abject financial misery of which the ministry complained so vociferously.47

Youngs informed us that in the seventeenth century, "farming was the most time-consuming secular employment of most clergymen," but he emphasized that a considerable variety of other work "occupied many of the ministers" as well. For the enterprising parson who was no loath to serve God by enlarging his ministerial calling to include the
practice of medicine (like Main and Smith), or schooling (like Emerson and Tucke), or through the handling of legal documents (like Hovey and Pike), the New England frontier held out as much economic promise and possibility as it did to any preacher's neighbor. And there certainly were other opportunities as well. Youngs found "many examples of nonreligious activities that engaged individual ministers," and he cited clergymen who were surveyors and booksellers, ran sawmills and cidermills, kept shops, and even boasted so marketable a skill as blacksmithing. In some cases their legal duties led to public office. What was said for the seventeenth-century laity might apply equally to the mid eighteenth-century ministry on the eastern frontier: "no one that can and will be diligent in this place need fear poverty nor the want of food and Rayment." Why then, did many pastors fear poverty and want?  

No little part of the answer lies in Shurtleff's vehement assertion that men who entered the ministry "should wholly devote themselves to it" and not divert energies to "their Farms, or their Merchandize, or any other Calling whatsoever." Shurtleff's was a querulous pronouncement in view of the fact that without any compunction whatsoever seventeenth-century clergymen took up secular responsibilities. Shurtleff's proscriptions were self-imposed, another manifestation of an effort to preserve the professional dignity about which he was so anxious.  

Seventeenth-century society neither demanded nor
expected the ministry to keep its nose out of other enterprises. But in that society ministerial status was secure. There was no question that prestige, reverence and respect was due first to the clergy, and in that environment a man of God was not threatened by a loss of status if he blacksmithed or did the work of a scrivenor. In the eighteenth century the ministry was aggrieved by its slipping status. Assumption of other responsibilities to earn more money accentuated the decline; this helps to explain Shurtleff's rancor. He was defensive. "The minister's sense of being underpaid was as much a cultural as an economic phenomenon," Youngs wrote. Blacksmithing, merchandising, surveying, bookselling, even farming (if the reader will recall Shurtleff's aversion to that), were not appropriate to so honorable a profession as the "high and honorable Station" of the ministry in a century when ministerial status was insecure. Clearly, if the position of the eighteenth-century clergy were high and honorable, Shurtleff would not have been hostile to secular employment. And so, what was perfectly acceptable to pastors of the seventeenth century, became impropriety in the next.50

Proof of the idea that the calling of a pastor need not be incongruent with vigorous secular employments is in the life of Solomon "Pope" Stoddard, grandfather of Jonathan Edwards and the most powerful churchman in the Connecticut valley in his day. An aristocrat by any standard, Stoddard
was the thirteenth largest landowner (of 103) in 1700. Shrewd as any Robert Keayne, seventeenth-century Boston's wealthiest merchant, Stoddard jumped at the chance to invest in a sawmill and to advise that good land be made profitable. And it was Stoddard who stood at the epicenter of revival "harvests" a generation before the Great Awakening. No one could complain that his secular interests interfered with his ministry. But Stoddard's status was unquestioned.51

Besides, Youngs wrote of the seventeenth-century clergy, being involved in the secular world "probably contributed greatly to the strength of the New England clergy....Men of God they might be, but they participated in the common domestic and worldly concerns of their fellow Christians." Through their secular pursuits "they found practical application for their religious beliefs, and, equally important, they shared common experiences with their fellow-Christians. In their pastoral work and in their preaching they frequently used these valuable resources."52

If Shurtleff and Fitch did not think of this, perhaps it was because, as we have seen, they devoted altogether too much energy fretting over their status as a professional elite. Meanwhile, out on the fringes of the frontier, in the settlement of Wells, in Maine, Samuel Jefferds ran a sawmill and collected fees from young men who studied theology with him. On the Isles of Shoals, John Tucke (who also acquired some property through marriage), industriously
taught school, ran a store and practiced medicine. Samuel Chandler used his skills in carpentry and masonry, was a joiner, did legal work, and "kept every clock in his parish in repair." Daniel Emerson enterprisingly taught Latin, and James Pike and John Hovey prepared legal documents for paying customers. Amos Main had a "very extensive" medical practice that took him from Berwick, Maine, to "Durham, Barrington, Lebanon, Somersworth, Dover and occasionally Greenland, Rye, Wells, Maine, and Stratham" in New Hampshire. Keeping school and writing contracts, as well as meeting all of the demands of this ministry, "he was a son of consolation to his people in all their afflictions, and he was with them through all their most trying scenes."

Main must have been a man of truly extraordinary physical energy, very advantageous to life in a wild country. Smith did not possess Main's endurance. In fact, he suffered from a variety of debilitating ailments. But he enjoyed a keen mental energy and adventuresomeness that animated him and so he was able to practice medicine with as much aplomb as he did a hospitality that was famous throughout the region. As Nordbeck pointed out, ministers who did not wield much political power but had energy and personality "invariably wielded significant authority in their own locales," and it was perhaps owing to this that by the time of Whitefield's first visit, Smith was the "most influential" clergyman in Maine.

Youngs observed that "the grand period of the
minister-as-physician was the seventeenth century" and by
the mid eighteenth century, "the age of the amateur
clergyman-physician was passing." If "it was uncommon for a
minister in the eighteenth-century to practice as a doctor;"
it was very necessary on the eastern frontier. In the
hinterlands, the situation was more fluid. Perhaps this
fact helps to explain Smith's imperturbability in bringing
his claims for land into court and that Main charged
patients for medical services, even if they could pay him
only in "wool, flax, meat and labor." To neither was the
idea of secular pursuits contradictory to their commitments
as pastors because it was simply how a man got on in the
world. It is impossible to believe that the likes of Smith,
Chandler, Main, Emerson, Jefferds, Tucke, or Pike for one
moment entertained any notion that they were losing status.
And if ministers on the frontier were not paid quite as
handsomely as their colleagues in more well-to-do city
churches, they were treated more generously, with greater
courtesy, loyalty and respect. This helps to explain why
McGregore was not enticed by a more lucrative offer from a
Presbyterian congregation in New York City—the New
Hampshireman was satisfied where he was. (McGregore was
probably paid well anyway. The number of communicants in
his Londonderry congregation was "extraordinarily high;"
Nordbeck learned.) These men were prized in a frontier
society that was less stratified and specialized. Wells,
for example, built a "two-story house" for Jefferds that was
the "finest in the region." Frontier communities were proud of their learned ministers. Men such as they were important not only because of their ministries, but because of the variety of the services they rendered, with the result that "their general usefulness gave them a broad base of authority and power." Furthermore, "in a kind of natural selective process, men whose talents and temperaments were fundamentally practical and organizational...gravitated northward." They proved an enterprising lot. In the straggling settlements of, for example, Rochester, Wells, the Isles of Shoals and Hollis, there were no prohibitions against what any man might do with the talents the Lord had given him. It was Christian duty to maximize them! One out of four clergymen in northern New England kept school and tutored; many took up medicine and other useful skills, as we have seen. So then, in mid eighteenth-century Maine and New Hampshire, "ministerial prestige was not only a function of the sacred calling, but also of competence and usefulness in a variety of essential public roles."

When the relationship between himself and his Arundel congregation worsened, John Hovey, out of necessity, became a farmer par excellence, earning a substantial reputation as a horticulturalist. Shurtleff would have found this disagreeable. But that it was he and Fitch who made the most of the salary and status issues makes more sense when we consider that their ministries were in Portsmouth, which, by the 1730's "rivalled Boston in volume of commercial
activity," and was more stratified, less fluid, more hardened socially than the backcountry where Jefferds, Main, Elvins, Moody, Loring, Pike and others had their pastorates. Fitch and Shurtleff were confronted daily by merchants and professionals of increasing property; the latter rubbed shoulders with Pepperrell. No wonder they voiced concerns about status—their "sense of being underpaid was as much a cultural as an economic phenomenon."

For one thing, they were simply less visible, less conspicuous, than Main was in Rochester or McGregore was in Londonderry. And for another, in an expansive seaport town like Portsmouth, no doubt their expectations were equally expansive. Even if, as Shurtleff preached, ministers were closer to God than ordinary mortals, they undoubtedly shared with their congregations effusive hopes for greater temporal comforts. "Pastors, believing themselves members of the provincial elite, wanted to be able to live like the wealthiest members of the community," Youngs observed. Shurtleff may have railed against the fashionable vices of Portsmouth citizens, but he, too, was upwardly mobile. With his exit from a poor church at Newcastle, Shurtleff climbed more than a few rungs on the socio-economic ladder himself. 55

It is true then, that in northern New England ministers shared concerns about status and maintenance, and their concerns no doubt led some of the laity to regard them somewhat cynically. But if some clergymen (particularly in
rapidly developing areas like Portsmouth) resented the ebb of professional prestige and worried about financial problems, they did not, in general, doubt their influence and importance within their congregations or their own communities. What is striking about this group of twenty-five ministers is its remarkable stability and the harmonious relationships most enjoyed with their flocks. Certainly they are a contrast to the picture most historians have drawn of a quarrelsome, troubled clergy. Schmotter's assertion that eighteenth-century ministers "found it increasingly difficult to get along with their congregations" is simply not accurate for the vast majority of Maine and New Hampshire New Light pastors. "Between 1700 and 1740," he wrote, "the average minister's chances of having a serious dispute sometime during his career rose from 22 to 47 percent." Schmotter's statistics are contrary to the longstanding, extraordinary rapport with their congregations that the northern evangelical clergy cultivated. Evidence points in the opposite direction.\textsuperscript{56}

Nordbeck suggested that one reason for this rapport was the lack of "historical baggage," as was mentioned above. "Fully half" of Maine and New-Hampshire's forty or more churches were founded not more than twenty years before the Great Awakening, and so there were no bitter memories of disputes and quarrels. Secondly, because New Hampshire and Massachusetts law determined that public worship was a function of land ownership, pastors were called to churches
in settlements that were hardly more than clearings. "And
the delayed growth of many of them," Nordbeck observed,
"meant that a Harvard-trained cleric might remain for years
his community's only educated resident." This meant that a
minister had the potential to exercise a clerical authority
commensurate to the force of his personality; in fact,
"charismatic figures like...Samuel Moody, and Daniel Emerson
of Hollis were moral, spiritual, and even political leaders
of regional importance."\(^{57}\)

The most telling proof of the auspicious marriages
these men made to their churches lies in their length of
service to them. In seventeenth-century New England, a
minister expected to remain with his church until his death.
Dismissals were major disturbances. "They must not be
rashly attempted but with much Consideration, Supplication,
and sincere Desire to follow the Conduct of heaven in it,"
Cotton Mather wrote. But in the eighteenth-century the
dismissals that "were to be avoided if at all possible"
became more common.\(^{58}\)

"A Minister's Life and Work must, ordinarily, cease
together. They are Lights that must waste themselves, and
burn out in giving Light to Others," Wise preached at an
ordination. Of twenty-five New Light clergymen in northern
New England, it is significant that with only two
exceptions, these pastors remained wedded to the churches
they led from the time of the Great Awakening until their
deaths or debilitating illness. James Pike literally
fainted in his pulpit and Ward Cotton collapsed within yards of the Plymouth meetinghouse where he was to preach as visiting pastor. Just as remarkable is the longevity of their service when it it considered as a whole. The average tenure for a settled minister in new England from 1730-1749 was twenty-seven to thirty years. Eight in our group served less than the average length of time, but among these eight, Gilman and Blunt died quite young; Benjamin Allen died after having served twenty years in his South Portland pulpit; Joshua Tufts was dismissed in 1744 because of the opposition of Scotch-Irish Presbyterians. Four pastors fell within the average. The tenures of the remaining thirteen--more than half of the group--were substantially above the average, and six pastors within the above-average category served the same church for more than half a century. They were "Lights that wasted themselves in giving Light to others," indeed. 59

A variety of evidence suggests that shepherd and flock found great mutual satisfaction in northern New England pastures. Not only was there no financial squabbling during Emerson's fifty-eight year pastorate, as we pointed out; when the parsonage burned to the ground only a short time after it was completed, neighbors rebuilt it immediately. "Not a ripple of dissatisfaction" marred the twenty-four years Amos Main served the church of Rochester. Down east in North Yarmouth the church was almost destroyed over the Arminian views of Nicholas Loring's predecessor and Loring
was forced to go to court to recover the ministerial lot from him. But he "dwelt in great harmony with his people through his whole ministry of twenty-seven years....His long stay with a people who dismissed his predecessor, and successor too, through their dissatisfaction with them over doctrine shows that he satisfied them."^60

Even in the congregations of the radicals there was tranquility. "A new generation which did not remember the hot young New-Light esteemed Joseph Adams, the venerable old minister." In his Stratham church there were only "normal disputes such as that over singing, in which the deacon who lined the psalms and naturally regarded the introduction of a bass viol as a personal reflection complained that the singers had 'got a fiddle into the church as big as a hogstrough,' but Parson Adams was now willing to swallow even a bass viol in the interest of peace." Nor during Daniel Rogers's twenty-seven year pastorate in Exeter were there any serious disputes.61

Thomas Smith was frequently troubled by dark moods in which he questioned his suitability as a pastor and several times he considered resignation because of persistent hoarseness. For some time he suffered "Rheumatick complaints" that made it difficult for him to preach. His voice "almost gone," with great emotion Smith confessed to his congregation that he thought they would be "so sensible of it, as to be ready to advise me to be done Preaching'....But now you have given me such an
Evidence—that I was so far mistaken, as to your being indifferent about me...that I look upon it, to be a new call of God and You to make a further Trial, if haply my State of Health will admit me to proceed on in the Ministry." Smith proceeded on for another forty years. He was never a man willing to seek his people's "smiles" above their "souls"; the fact that he was not a popularity seeker and yet maintained the affectionate regard of his people is eloquent testimony of their relationship. Into his old age his people were loyal to him and "despite its great length, his pastorate...was unusually trouble-free."62

There can be no doubt that Moody was beloved of his congregation. On the matter of support he once told them: "I have been maintained by you these twenty Years in a Way that was most pleasing to me, and have had no Necessity to spend one Hour in a Week in Care for the World."63

Out on the Isles of Shoals, John Tucke, who was "the first Minister that was ever Ordain'd in that place, tho' for above an Hundred Years the Fishery had been carried on there," had a difficult task before him. In his ordination sermon, Jabez Fitch expressed skepticism about Tucke's mission there, among a dubious muster of "fishermen, seal hunters, sailors, and smugglers," and warned them "against a special Vice, namely that of Excess in Drinking, which has shamefully prevailed among too many of your Calling." Fitch may not have endeared himself to the Gosport citizenry with his bluntness, but in his forty-one years of ministering to
them, Tucke did. Whether or not he alone was the means to "a general Reformation" in drinking, "apparently he did much to bring their conduct up to the standards of the mainland towns." He was regarded with affection by parishioners who "more than fulfill ed their contract with him," and between them was a spirit of compromise. 64

This spirit may have characterized relations between the laity and the clergy in northern New England in general. There is very little evidence of an adversary relationship between ministry and laity in Maine and New Hampshire; very little evidence that, as the eighteenth century progressed, laymen increasingly sought to undermine clerical authority, as various scholars have suggested. In fact, "ministers actually promoted increased lay participation," Nordbeck wrote, doubtlessly because their own responsibilities were so burdensome. Busy pastors, overwhelmed by clerical, secular, and domestic responsibilities, resurrected the office of ruling elder themselves; it was not given new life by fractious laymen who were jealous of their own power and in Youngs's words, "had to force the ministerial candidates to allow the office to exist as a condition of their settlement." Youngs offered evidence that pastors "increasingly disparaged the office," but in northern New England it proved a useful tool. Jeremiah Wise for example, encouraged his Berwick church "to revive this antient office" and the congregation continued to choose elders up to 1755. 65
Growth in this region, especially east of the Merrimack, was slow, "generally a fitful, family-by-family affair, hardly conducive to the development of religious institutions," and northern New England suffered some degree of "cultural isolation." In the inhospitable environment of the eastern frontier, give and take was very necessary. Irascibility accomplished little. In this light, the persecution of the choleric John Hovey by the congregation of Cape Porpoise, in Arundel, was exceptional. They refused him his salary which was "in arrears from the first," turned out his cows, and finally, committed the consummate crime: they burned the meetinghouse.⁶⁶
CHAPTER VII

THE GREAT AWAKENING

Who that saw the state of things in New England a few years ago, the state that it was settled in, and the way that we had been so long going on in, would have thought that in so little a time there would be such a change?

Jonathan Edwards

Dawn. He rode along the narrow stretch of beach alone as the sun lifted from the edge of the ocean and the tide ran out. "O Lord, Thy sea is so great, and my boat so small," the man mused. Herring gulls mewed and screamed; sandpipers skittered in the white froth. To the west he could see an osprey circling above her nest in an ancient elm.

The man removed his thin coat. It was going to be hot. The mare seemed to be favoring her right foreleg and the man dismounted. A small pebble was lodged in the tender frog of her hoof, and gently he picked it out. Loosening the girth, the man permitted the horse to rest. They had been walking since four, when a man could begin to see shapes through the greys of a new day. How quickly the sun climbed!

There was sudden movement out on the calm water. Porpoises. He watched them, two of them, with keen interest. He was a man who loved to hunt and loved to fish.
and the life that he lived by an immense ocean wilderness
had not diminished its marvelousness, its terribleness, for
him. The works and wonders of the Lord are afforded those
who go down to the sea in ships, Smith once told his
people. In its "infinite Variety of curious things...the
huge bulk of some of them, as of the Wales; the surprising
minuteness of others, such particularly as make the green
scum we see on the Waters; together with the incomparable
Contrivance and Structure of the Bodies of all of 'em; the
Provisions and supplies of Food, afforded to such an
innumerable Company of Eaters....All of these Things are a
beautious, glorious and inexhaustible Scene of Wonders."
Because of "these works of GOD," seafaring men ought to let
their "thoughts...be raised to him, our Minds and Hearts
enlarged, our Belief of him firmer, our conceptions of him
higher, holier, more frequent and pleasant." Man's thoughts
were "too low and gross and earthy," Smith complained. When
one stood before the vast cipher of ocean "with a devout
Eye," it became something overwhelmingly spiritual. "If we
can put this method of Piety, this Religion of the
Sea...this spirit of Marine Devotion, and converse with the
Deity, into practice, we can never be alone at Sea," he had
preached.¹

These things echoed through his mind as he stood
there, a man beside a bay horse on a lonesome slip of pebbly
beach, watching a crimson disk of sun rise; an endless pine
and hemlock forest at his back. "It will marevelously tend
to awaken every pious sensation in the Mind, every holy disposition towards God, and influence and stir up in us a Love to him, a Care to obey, and a Fear to offend him, while we have such a lively and affecting view of his Glories and Perfections." Smith rubbed the neck of his mare affectionately, adjusted the girth, mounted and rode on. He was going to Boston, to a conference, to testify to "the late happy Revival of Religion in many parts of the Land." Perhaps he called on Samuel Moody and Samuel Chandler and the three of them rode together.²

New Light supporters came to Boston from as far north as Falmouth, Maine, and from every settled corner of Connecticut and Massachusetts. From New Hampshire they came from Londonderry, Somersworth, Newington, Hampton, and Rochester. "We...think it our indispensable duty, (without judging or censuring such of our brethren as cannot at present see things in the same light with us)," the New Light testimony read, "to declare, to the glory of sovereign grace, our full persuasion, either from what we have seen ourselves, or received upon credible testimony, that there has been a happy and remarkable revival of religion in many parts of this land, through an uncommon divine influence; after a long time of great decay and deadness, and a sensible and very awful withdrawal of the Holy Spirit from his sanctuary among us." Samuel Moody, Joseph Adams of Newington, Thomas Smith, James Pike, Ward Cotton, Amos Main and Samuel Chandler put their names to the "Testimony and
Advice" after "solemn repeated prayer, free inquiry and
debate, and serious deliberation." Forty-five clergymen who
were unable to attend forwarded their attestations of
support, including twelve from northern New England.3

With what specific issues were supporters of the
revival concerned? What distinguished them from opponents of
the "work," since both groups objected to the disorders and
errors engendered by it? Opponents of the revival had met
in May. "There was a sad division in the convention of
Massachusetts Ministers at Boston," Smith recorded in his
journal. Charles Chauncy led Old Lights who opposed "the
late work of God in the land and obtained a vote against the
disorders, &c, thereby expressly disowning the work, which
puts the ministers on the other side into a great ferment;
the people through the country are universally divided, and
in the most unhappy temper. The opposition is exceeding
virulent and mad."4

C.C. Goen wrote that it was "apparent that the
reluctance of the antirevival party to admit that there was
any good mixed with the error was the real point of
dispute." Edwin S. Gaustad made the same point: "By the end
of 1743, it was evident that the New England clergy was
divided not on the question of whether there were errors in
doctrine and disorders in practice attending the revival,
but on the question of whether, notwithstanding these errors
and disorders, the revival was a work of God." The
opposition was convinced that it was not.5
In Maine and New Hampshire the clergy favored the revival "by a ratio of better than two to one," but their support can by no means be interpreted to mean agreement in all the particulars. With respect to these particulars, moderate New Lights differed substantially. They had decidedly disparate opinions on itineracy, lay exhorting, emotional excess, censoriousness, separation, and also, on the opponents of the revival; they responded to George Whitefield differently as well. Furthermore, what they said they believed about these things was not infrequently contradicted by what they did. This chapter examines each of these matters in turn, and shall permit us to establish the parameters of five distinct New Light temperaments.  

Old Lights closed ranks over the issue of itineracy. It was disruptive and a breach of clerical conduct: the Cambridge Platform permitted no ordinations apart from a particular church. "Itineracy,...by which either ordained ministers or young candidates go from place to place, and without the knowledge... or permission of the stated pastors in such places" arose from "too great an opinion of themselves, and an uncharitable opinion of those pastors." Signers of the testimony in support of the revivals agreed.
Ministers were not to "invade the province of others, and in ordinary cases preach in another's parish without his knowledge, and against his consent; nor encourage raw and indiscreet young candidates, in rushing into particular places, and preaching publicly or privately, as some have done, to the no small disrepute and damage of the work in places where it once promised to flourish."  

The first to put his name to this was Samuel Moody. But in 1741 the intrepid old man did some itinerant preaching of his own, penetrating as far into Massachusetts as Hopkinton, a feat that was the more remarkable in that the year before, Whitefield had described Moody as "much impair'd by old Age." Furthermore, though he would go on record as opposed to the role of radicals in unlawful separations, he maintained a warm and supportive relationship with Daniel Rogers who was not only "Massachusetts's most widely traveled itinerant," but played the key role in the division of the Rev. John Odlin's church at Exeter in 1744. Rogers was ordained as minister at large on July 13, 1742. Horrified Old Lights described the "ordination" of the "vagrant preacher" by an "unlawful assembly" to be "contrary to the peace of our Lord...and to the good order and constitution of the churches in New England." Moody had declared his opposition to itineracy by his signature on the testimony, but this was belied by his assiduous support of an itinerant like Rogers. The ordination took place at York under his very nose: "We hear
that the Rev. Mr. M---y, W--e, J. R----s and G---n resolutely proceeded, although some others of the neighbouring ministers justly bore their testimony against such an irregular action." 8

Smith also itinerated. After having heard Whitefield at Portsmouth in 1742, "he preached at Stroudwater, Scarborough, and Gorhamtowm, and in the spring of the following year even found 'extraordinary acceptance' at Portsmouth." There is no evidence that either Smith or Moody preached at any of these places without permission from local pastors, but Moody's encouragement of Rogers and Smith's preaching tour were novel and distinguished them. Encouraged by the Rogers family from Ipswich, Elvins also itinerated. 9

Lay exhorting was equally distasteful to opponents of the revival. In their testimony against it Old Lights said that "private persons of no education and but low attainments in knowledge...without any regular call, under a pretence of exhorting, taking upon themselves to be preachers of the word of God, we judge to be a heinous invasion of the ministerial office, offensive to God, and destructive to these churches; contrary to Scripture...and testified against in a 'Faithful Advice to the Churches of New England,' by several of our venerable fathers." 10

New Lights also had something to say about lay exhorting. In their testimony, they asserted that laymen ought not to "invade the ministerial office, and, under a
pretense of exhorting, set up preaching; which is very
contrary to gospel order, and tends to introduce errors and
confusion into the church." But Moses Morrill permitted it,
and one might suspect that John Blunt did, as well. One
sympathetic observer reported that in Shurtleff's
meetinghouse, "soon after the Service was over the Cries
began and Increased so fast that there was no Such thing as
taking notice of or observing who where and how." Shurtleff
and Blunt left the meetinghouse "before the Cry was So
General but in a little time Somebody proposed Singing which
they did,...but then the Cry Seemd to be Strength ened ...in
a Little time Mr Shurtleff and Mr Blunt came in, talk'd Sung
Pray'd...Mr Blunt Preachd a Sermon and the Exercise ended
about midnight . But the People most of them tarried till 3
or More." The fact that the emotional distress increased
with the departure of the two ministers, together with the
fact that "the people" had three hours in which to cry out,
pray, and sing suggests that this was the sort of
environment that readily disposed people to engage in lay
exhorting. Besides, on other occasions Daniel Rogers and
Gilbert Tennent, both of whom encouraged lay exhorting, had
preached to Blunt's people. The following day "there was
preaching and Praying from Morning to nine o'clock": one
might speculate that among those "preaching" were lay
persons." 11

The above scenes took place in Shurtleff's
meetinghouse. He claimed to have asserted a high degree of
control over the emotions of his people, but he was not averse to the lay exhorting and itinerant preaching that so often led to the loss of it. Portsmouth did not suffer disturbances from lay exhorters and itinerants, he noted, and "whilst I should gladly bear Testimony against these Things wheresoever they prevail, I should be for using a becoming Care that the Disorders...might not be magnified in an undue Measure." Shurtleff wanted to protect pulpits from "bold and ignorant Intruders, and such as may unjustly pretend to an extraordinary Call & Warrant from GOD." But he did not want to exclude those who were genuine. Shurtleff was even willing to tolerate the occasional itinerant exhorter who might preach in his parish without his permission—not out of character for a man who feared that people often "quenched the Spirit":

I should be careful that none of the zealous and faithful Preachers of the everlasting Gospel, and the important Doctrines of it might be excluded, being perswaded that GOD has bless'd the Labours of Strangers and even of Itinerants among the People with whom I am concern'd. And I can't forbear saying, that as it appears to me that it would be of ill Consequence, if none might upon any Occasion whatsoever preach within the Limits of any Congregation without the Leave of its...Pastor, I desire that neither mySelf nor any of my Brethren should be Possess'd of such an absolute and despotick Power.

Shurtleff's willingness to slough off a century of ministerial tradition regarding itineracy was unique. His unwillingness to assume "absolute and despotick Power" made him extraordinary, and distinguishes him from clergymen
(particularly in southern New England) who were so concerned with the loss of power.  

Jeremiah Wise sympathized with Shurtleff's position. "With Respect to the ordaining of Missionaries, which has been practiced for some Time in the Country, and has been lately voted a Disorder," Wise refused to "join in censuring it as such, or in condemning the Practice of separating some of the Fraternity, that are qualified for it, to the sacred Ministry, when there is manifest occasion for it." Wise and Shurtleff should be distinguished from New Lights who were intransigent in their opposition to itineracy and exhorting, such as Daniel Emerson, Benjamin Allen, Samuel Jefferds, John Hovey, Nicholas Loring and Moses Morrill. The latter agreed that "private Persons of no Education, without any regular Call taking upon them to preach the Word of God; the ordaining and separating any Person to the Work of the evangelical Ministry at Large, and without a special Relation to any particular Charge to enter the regular Districts of settled Ministers" were "Disorders in practice." Significantly, McGregor and John Rogers never mentioned itineracy. Like Shurtleff, they were more concerned with other aspects of the revival and virtually ignored or downplayed the problem.  

Shurtleff was among those who attested to the genuineness of the emotional distress that often accompanied the "New Light." Emotional excess was a serious matter. To Old Lights it was not only offensive; Chauncy, for example,
was convinced that extreme emotionalism was satanic. Though they asserted in their testimony that "extraordinary outward symptoms are not an argument that the work is delusive, or from the influence and agency of the evil spirit," New Lights were defensive. They felt constrained to explain their position on bodily effects. "We do not think them inconsistent with a work of God upon the soul....Those terrors and consolations of which he is the author, may, according to the natural frame and constitution which some persons are of, occasion such bodily effects." New Lights granted that emotional distress was a conundrum, but they insisted that persons who had experienced "extraordinary outward distress" remained rational. Proof of this was that they "were able to give a rational account of what so affected their minds...they would often mention the passages in the sermons they heard, or particular texts of Scripture, which were set home upon them with such a powerful impression. And as to such whose joys have carried them into transports and extasies, they...have accounted for them, from a lively sense of the danger they hoped they were freed from, and the happiness they were now possessed of." They were careful to add that "instances were very few in which we had reason to think these affections were produced by visionary or sensible representations, or by any other images than such as the Scripture itself presents unto us." 14

John Blunt assented to these principles. In the heat
of revival, however, his actions belied his principles. On the afternoon when Mr. Shurtleff's people thought that the judgement day had come, Blunt was there, and one observer, William Parker, recorded that "Mr. Blunt Pray'd and Preach'd like a man Inspired." Blunt had agreed that "bodily effects" were not "signs that persons who have been so affected, were then under a saving work of the Spirit of God. No, we never...called these bodily seizures, convictions; or spake of them as the immediate work of the Holy Spirit." But, like Rogers, Blunt preached, at least on this occasion, until his hearers found it unbearable to listen quietly. He preached to engender bodily distress. Parker described what followed upon Blunt's "inspired" preaching:

At Mr. Shurtleff's Meeting House...all was Calm and Still Insomuch I thot we should See nothing Extraordinary, but near the Close of the Exercise, I heard a Groan of a Mans Voice in the Gallery as Deep and Dismal as I ever heard from a Dying Man and in three Minutes after the Blessing another and another and so on as fast as you could count almost till the whole Gallery was in Motion, yet Nobody Stirring out of his place there, but lifting up of hands, clapping wringing their hands (and So below) till all together made Such a Sigh of Distress as no words will Convey....It Seemd in Some Respects like the Ranks of two armies Ingaged the People keep dropping one after another by a cause imperceptible as the flying Bullet tho no less visible in the Effects the Ministers took turns so that there was continuous Preaching and Praying....Mr. Blunt was Exceeding Laborious and Active among the Distress'd.

With a few well-placed verbal volleys Blunt and Shurtleff rendered their people defenseless against the
assaults of the Holy Spirit. "When I consider the whole Assembly together it seems something like the Great day...considering the different States of the People—the Lord only knows what is coming," Parker enthused. "There is a multitude (tis endless to speak of particulars) that experience d what Job complains of viz The Arrows of the Almighty are within me."\(^{16}\)

Like Rogers, Shurtleff also attributed outcries and bodily distress to the action of the Holy Spirit. He was surprised that people thought it "strange" and "incredible" when convicted sinners were "put under such a commotion of soul under the Ministry of the Word," that they could not "forbear making a publick Discovery of it." Even lay persons who objected specifically to outcries and bodily distress were eventually unable to resist the power of the Holy Spirit. For example, Shurtleff related the experience of one member of his own congregation, "a person of good capacity, and of considerable reading and knowledge in divine things, who for some time entertain'd latent prejudices against the late religious commotions,...particularly on account of persons speaking out in publick, and could not be persuaded but that they might easily avoid it, till experience taught him to the contrary." Following a communion service, he too "could no longer forbear speaking in the grief and bitterness of his soul, and breath'd out his complaints to God in such a manner as drew tears from almost every person present; and
has sometimes since been constrain'd to break out into some short Expressions."¹⁷

Into 1743 and 1744 as the revival waned, persons continued to be visibly "wrought upon." Shurtleff told of "one Woman who ...was so far affected, and had her bodily Frame so far weaken'd, that she could not come down (to the Lord's Supper)....But she sweetly fed upon the Bread of Life, and told me afterwards, that it was the most blessed Sacrament she ever enjoy'd." Others present attested to similar experiences, "so as soon as it was over, they could not forbear expressing it, in the most sweet and cheerful Praises." In sum, Shurtleff was certain that "a divine Power was then so plainly to be seen in what had come to pass among us."¹⁸

Nevertheless, Shurtleff maintained an appropriate decorum in his meetinghouse. He was pleased that meetings at which he was not present were "carried on with a becoming Solemnity and Devotion." With the situation in Durham at the back of his mind, Shurtleff effectively drew a boundary beyond which outcries and distress became impropriety. And, importantly (in contrast to Daniel Rogers, it should be noted), he recognized that "persons might be effectually wrought upon by the Word, without any Thing of this Nature; so they may be put into an uncommon Degree of Terror, and fill'd with a great deal of Joy, under the hearing of it, and yet continue Strangers to a real, and saving Change." Furthermore, there were persons who feigned distress. That
he acknowledged this reflected Shurtleff's awareness that the novelty of the revival itself would have an effect. But he warned people that for such "wickedness" they might be "suddenly made Monuments of divine Vengeance."\textsuperscript{19}

Old Lights complained of extreme emotional display early in the revival. They did not "deny...that the human mind, under the operations of the Divine Spirit, may be overborne with terrors and joys, but the revival had led to so "many confusions," so much "vanity of mind" and "ungoverned passions" expressed in excessive "sorrow or joy," and had been accompanied by so much "disorderly tumult" and "indecent behaviour" that to them it was ludicrous to regard it as an "indication of the special presence of God." They attributed the unbridled emotionalism to preachers who "industriously excited and countenanced" it. Indecorous behavior was "plain evidence of the weakness of human nature."\textsuperscript{20}

Thomas Smith had sharp words for congregations who expected to be titillated by emotional preaching. If a congregation was aroused by a preacher they might "conclude that therefore they have reaped great good and Benefit to themselves." But this was nonsense. People left the meetinghouse in great heat, but then they cooled, becoming "just what they were before." Passions subsided. Therefore it was necessary that a preacher discuss "various doctrinal and moral Points of Religion," and target the "Vices" of his people. This was unexciting stuff, but the minister's job
was not to entertain, but to "influence and engage the Practice, and promote a Christian Conversation."21

Ultimately, as we saw in chapter four, it was in Christian practice and conversation, that is, in spiritual fruits, or in sanctification, that the best evidence of a real and saving change lay. The Antinomianism of Nicholas Gilman's congregation and others discredited the revival and made it necessary that more moderate pro-revivalists disavow it. Clergymen who rushed to give spiritual aid to the "distressed," were to be "careful to inform them, that the nature of conversion does not consist in these passionate feelings;" and to warn them "not to look upon their state safe, because they have passed out of deep distress, into high joys, unless they experience a renovation of nature, followed with a course of vital holiness." "External fruits of holiness in their lives" attested to the genuine nature of conversions, so that new converts appeared "as so many epistles of Christ, written, not with ink, but by the Spirit of the living God." The best evidence of "the genuineness of the present operation," and the "excellency of it" was sanctified lives.22

When he described the revival in Portsmouth, Shurtleff included extensive comment on the changed behavior of its converts. "There is a considerable Number who are exhibiting all the Evidence that can be expected, of a real conversion to God." The convention testified that the "face of religion is lately changed much for the better in many of
our towns," and so dramatic were the changes in the newly converted of Portsmouth, that (as mentioned above), there was an "Alteration" in the "Place in general...for the better." The "Cursing and Swearing" for which seaport towns were infamous diminished noticeably; Sabbath day worship was "strictly observ'd," and "Family Worship" was established in many homes. Hitherto niggardly souls suddenly became magnanimous, and persons who had "dealt dishonestly, have not only acknowledg'd the Wrongs they have done, but made Restitution for them." Formerly, one "heard...profane and obscene Songs," but now one heard "Psalms and Hymns of Praise."\(^23\)

About Newcastle Blunt reported a similar miracle. Although he feared "the Impressions are in a great Measure worn off from some; yet the lasting good Effects on many I think very considerable." The new members of his church "appear to have their Conversation as becometh the Gospel."\(^24\)

McGregore also described the Christ-like lives of the "great number of those who have been the Subjects of religious concern." The nature of their conversions "together with a happy consequent Change they experience in the will and Affections" and the "Correspondency of their Lives with their Profess'd Experiences" led him "unavoidably to conclude...that they have really undergone a saving Change." Londonderry, he assured his readers, was a town where "the eternal Obligation of the Law as a Rule of Life,
is strongly maintained in Practice as well as Profession."25

New Light clergymen pointed to the improved lives of new converts, but they were aghast at the censoriousness that often characterized them. The quarreling, bitterness, and judgmental dispositions of new converts was unbecoming to persons leading new lives in Christ, and this "disputatious spirit" rendered the helpless victims of it understandably defensive. New converts were not to "discover a spirit of censoriousness, uncharitableness, and rash judgings the state of others," New Lights asserted at the Convention. More than anything else it "blemished the work of God amongst us." Old Lights were especially horrified because they were attacked as "Pharisees, Arminians, blind, unconverted, &c." They claimed that though their "doctrines were agreeable to the gospel and their lives to their Christian profession," neophyte proselytes, "assuming to themselves the prerogatives of God, to look into and judge the hearts of their neighbours," branded them as hypocrites. In response, pro-revival ministers implored new converts to "beware of entertaining prejudices against their own pastors." It was not "an easy thing" to judge whether men are in a state of grace or not, Nathaniel Appleton had preached at the Old Light convention, a principle Edwards corroborated and that Maine and New Hampshire evangelicals indefatigably affirmed. "It is not surprising that the established clergy used every cannon in its arsenal to explode this 'enthusiastic' notion."
Judgement of this sort led to separations and even more bitterness. 26

Separations had much to do with a sermon that Gilbert Tennent preached in Nottingham, New Hampshire on March 8, 1740. In The Danger of an Unconverted Ministry, he launched an attack upon clergymen who were "Orthodox, Letter-learned and regular Pharisees;" "Natural Men" who were not called by God "to the Ministerial Work" were "blind Guides;" "dead Dogs, that can't bark," and their ministries were "for the most part unprofitable." The unconverted minister was like "a Man who would learn others to swim, before he has learn'd it himself, and so is drowned in the Act, and dies like a Fool." Tennent did not stop at mere vituperation. He called for persons who sat under "dead" ministers to "repair to the Living," or to "Godly" ministers. The inevitable result was schism. With James Davenport's attack on individual ministers the atmosphere rapidly degenerated into one of suspicion and hostility. There were no separations in Boston for over a year and a half following Whitefield's departure in June of 1742, Thomas Prince recalled. But Davenport's arrival led immediately "to an unhappy Period." Though Whitefield was a convenient scapegoat, neither in Maine nor New Hampshire did a separation divide a church until long after he had returned to England. Remarkably enough in fact, there were no separations in the churches of moderate New Light ministers in northern New England.

Nevertheless, the proximity of separations at Exeter and in
particular, the unpleasant situation in Durham, gave proponents of the revival cause for concern.\textsuperscript{27}

Old Lights did not mince words on the subject of separation. In their view it was "subversive of the churches of Christ, opposite to the rule of the gospel...and utterly condemned by the Cambridge platform." Predictably, New Lights warned against "unscriptural separations," and suggested that the Bible offered guidelines for legal separations.\textsuperscript{28}

Among northern moderates, there were clergy who seemed unconcerned with the issue of separation, perhaps because it did not affect them directly; perhaps because other issues were more pressing. Blunt prayed that "in Mercy" God would "put an End" to congregational division, but this might have been more an obligatory utterance than a heartfelt conviction that such was possible, or even desireable. Wise was far more concerned with doctrinal error and never mentioned separation in his letter of attestation to the committee; in his very lengthy report on the course of the revival in Portsmouth, neither did Shurtleff. John Rogers, who took part in the ordination ceremonies of both itinerants and separate pastors, made it quiet clear where he stood on the matter; after all, Daniel Rogers was his brother. Only David McGregor gave it detailed attention.\textsuperscript{29}

"Be on your guard against a separating spirit," he preached more than twenty years after the revival in his
Sermon, Christian Unity and Peace recommended; "this is an antichristian spirit. Separates often talk much of the spirit, and make high pretenses to it; but let them pretend what they will, it will be found on enquiry, that want of the spirit of Christ is at the bottom of their conduct."

The Presbyterian pastor was not opposed to all separations, however. "Some are no doubt lawful, and matter of duty."

Certain conditions made separation necessary, and in his outline of them, McGregor delineated the elements of "true religion:"

If a professing church is gone off from the gospel of Christ, to another gospel; if the gospel way of sinner's justification is not taught; if men's supposed sincere obedience, is put in the room of Christ's righteousness; if the necessity of faith and regeneration, are not insisted upon, or if the true nature of them is explained away; if the special influences of the divine spirit are derided and denied; if the general strain of teaching in a church is evidently legal, such as in the nature of it tends to settle sinners on the covenant of works, instead of disposing them to renounce all confidence in the flesh; in a word, if a church corrupt the word of God...in this case, the Lord seems to call for a separation....'Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing, and I will receive you.'"

Under any other circumstances separation was not lawful.

If no "unscriptural or sinful terms of communion" were imposed, and correct doctrine and "the true way of salvation" were taught, it was wrong for persons to press for separation. Especially was it unlawful for people to withdraw merely because they thought a "minister's gifts are not quite so edifying, that he is not so zealous, so lively,
so spiritual, so evangelical as some others, or that he has not so happy a talent in distinguishing...between the law and the gospel." Neither was it lawful to separate because "there are some corrupt members in a church," or because discipline was not administered as strictly and impartially as some would have it. According to McGregor then, there were "separations to which heaven will not give its sanction."  

By his own experiences McGregor understood what quarreling could do to a church, to a pastor, to a whole town, even. Within his congregation there was peace, but Londonderry was bitterly divided over the placement of parish lines, the location of meetinghouses and ministerial support. Though McGregor's congregation supported the revival, that of the Rev. William Davidson emphatically did not. This aggravated the animosities that already existed between the two men. The division persisted for forty years--until the deaths of every one involved--and prevented even casual commerce between the two pastors. Finally, the protracted and painful sermonic dispute that McGregor carried on with John Caldwell added fuel to an atmosphere crackling with petty hatreds. Years later McGregor was regretful. He admitted that though "debating a point fairly, had often a good tendency to the investigation of truth, but as disputes are managed, there is seldom much good comes of them, and often a good deal of mischief." Enduring more than two decades of this had taken its toll.
"It has been observed of some eminently godly men, that in proportion as they grew in years, in knowledge, in experience and sanctification, so they have been more and more tender of the churches peace, and fearful of division." Such, ultimately, appears to have been his position. McGregor maintained the lawfulness of separation for doctrinal reasons, but he was weary of continual bickering and despaired the damage it did. Tired of the "ecclesiastical anarchy of this day," and of the "spiritual giddiness" of so many, he wondered if the ministry and the laity together might "enter into a serious enquiry, whether a common fence about the churches, might not be likely to prevent many of these bad things, and to keep out the boar of the forest, from entering in to taste the vineyard at his pleasure."31

McGregor was too much the dyed-in-the-wool Calvinist to entertain any latitudinarian sympathies. Yet his experiences during the Great Awakening taught him the need for a degree of magnanimity toward opponents whose doctrines were also Calvinist. Divisions and separations for any other reason apart from doctrinal ones were unacceptable. Years later McGregor understood more clearly why ministers like Jeremiah Wise, John Hovey, Benjamin Allen and Nicholas Loring concerned themselves with the Antinomianism and Arminianism spawned by the revival. "Practical" disorders and irregularities paled behind doctrinal error. Against it, northern evangelicals closed ranks. Hindsight led McGregor
to exhort his flock to

"avoid any conduct, which tends to render each other odious. This is a shameful behaviour in the disciples of Christ... I appeal to facts, whether it be not too common among professors, especially when a party spirit runs high. We should carefully shun every practice of this kind. We should beware of party names, such as new lights, old lights, new schemers, opposers, &c. These things tend to irritate and inflame men's spirits, and by this means to widen divisions." 32

McGregore's memories were vivid. In his old age he grew more conciliatory, more forbearing, forgiving; he was more indulgent of the ideas of others than he had been during the heyday of revival. In 1765 the man who remembered the upheaval of the 1740's was irenic, like Daniel Rogers and Joseph Adams (of Stratham). Better than any other clergyman in northern New England, McGregor in his younger years illustrates the close mindedness and intolerance that frequently accompanied the "New Light." McGregor had a jaundiced view of the opposition and was purblind about the revival itself.

While Edwards was charitable to opponents of the revival because he thought it impossible to determine "how far opposing this work is consistent with a state of grace," McGregor was not so charitable. In his view the revival was a battlefield between absolute good and evil that featured only "Promoters" and "Opposers." Those who were the most violent opponents were "men of Arminian, Pelagian, and Deistical Principles... who scoff at the Imputation of
Original sin, ... deny the Doctrine of Justification by Faith alone... likewise that of Predestination: And do... assert Man's natural Powers in things spiritual." In eighteenth-century New England this was as good as asserting that they were on the way to hell. Furthermore, by singling out Old Lights, he "delineated and sharpened differences of opinion," the folly of which he recognized only years later. Unlike John Hancock, the pastor of Lexington, Massachusetts's First Church who sought not to attack opposers, thereby "exposing their nakedness," and who thought it more Christian "to have silently covered it with a Mantle of Charity," McGregor wrote that opponents of the revival were obstacles to the advancement of the Kingdom of God. He denounced them with a vengeance: "if ever Hell seem'd to be broken loose in horrid Lies and Calumny, now appears to be the time. I would not say that all who oppose the present work are wilful Liars because I would be as charitable as possible: but this seems to be the Case; viz. some hatch the Lies, and others labouring under the malignant Influence of a prejudiced Mind do too easily believe them." Overlooking the vagaries of Davenport, he asserted that opponents of the revival were of a "profane mocking spirit," and used sarcasm to fill "the Minds of poor People with groundless Prejudices against the Work of God." McGregor's exhortation to "lay aside all Prejudice of every Kind,... hang out the Balance fairly and let the Word of God be Judge," was ironic in the light of his own biases.
McGregore turned on persons who soured on the revival. "Have the Promoters...vented any false doctrine, or been guilty of any wicked Practice?" he inquired of them. So certain was he that the revival was in toto the work of God, that he was equally certain that reticence about it derived from an unsaved estate. "Don't you feel he was sure they must! somewhat within you saying at Times, possibly I am mistaken, perhaps this Work is from Heaven....Consider that if the Work be of God, as you do not know but it is; then by this there is hope in Israel concerning you: You will with Saul the Persecutor obtain Mercy, because you did it ignorantly and in Unbelief." McGregor could not allow for the person whose "conscience duly informed" told him it was not a work of God. He exhorted the reader to "take Care, if you be in Doubt about the Work to...Try both Sides, and then you'd be the More capable to form an impartial Judgment." Heedless of irregularities, he prejudiced this statement by asking, "What should make any of you to doubt concerning the work's being of God?" McGregor's position was an affront to any believer troubled by disorder and error; he assumed that any man in a state of grace would inevitably support it: "for certainly, if I see Men violently opposing a Work which their professed Principles would lead them to love and promote; either I must conclude that they are weak or wicked." He ignored whatever irregularities befell the revival and would not accept any criticisms of it. This
pigheadedness proved exasperating to opponents. The Rev. John Caldwell tried to make McGregore acknowledge the serious disorders but he finally threw up his hands in frustration. The problems the revival brought were so obvious, and McGregore's incredulity so irksome, that he asked:

How can this Gentleman expect People will believe his word contrary to the Testimony of their own Eyes?"

McGregore talked "as if he had seen Hell in an Uproar, was acquainted with the Devil's privy Council, and knew the Colour of incorporeal Substances; and in the whole of it would endeavour to persuade unthinking People that all...who oppose this Work (i.e. the Peculiarities of our Days, for nothing else can with any Propriety be called by that Name) are Members of the Devil's Convocation, and part of his black Divan."

McGregore's uncharitableness toward opponents in large part stemmed from his unsupportable position that the conduct of new converts was unassailable. In his attestation to the Convention he was barely willing to concede that any disorder accompanied the revival at all. About "Errors in Doctrine or Disorders in Practice," McGregore said not only that "if such there be" they should not be magnified, but that "God's work" should not be "obscured under a Cloud of imaginary italics mine Errors and Disorders." Proof that errors and disorders were "imaginary" lay in his own experience. "For my own Part I have seen little or no Appearance of the Growth of Antinomian Errors, or any Thing visionary or enthusiastick, either in mine own congregation or among the People in the
Neighbourhood where I live." Durham was roughly thirty miles from Londonderry, and though it was not in his immediate "Neighbourhood," it is likely that the New Hampshireman knew all about Gilman and the "enthusiastick" disorders there. He chose to disregard them.35

It was a lie, McGregor protested, when opposers contended that Whitefield and others held "it as a Principle, that a few Tears and some Convulsion-like Fits are of themselves sufficient Evidences of a Work of God--That they pretend to the Gifts of discerning spirits to such a Degree as to know whether a Person be converted or not by looking in his Face, or by a few Words Discourse with him--that all converted Persons behoove to be able to give Account of their Conversion with Respect to its time, manner, and other Circumstances." But McGregor ignored the uproar in southern New England over precisely these issues. Months before Davenport had invaded Connecticut, and pronounced upon the spiritual estates of ministers there. Pastors who refused to answer Davenport's questions were immediately branded imposters and hypocrites. Even before he had left his Southold parish on the eastern end of Long Island, Davenport claimed to be able to distinguish between saved and unsaved and excluded the latter from communion. In New Haven, barred from the pulpit at the First Church, he took to the streets, and under his spell, "some...reported trances and visions." Following the first sermon that he preached in New London, Connecticut, "he went off singing
through the streets." It was after his book-burning that the Connecticut Assembly declared him to be "under the influences of enthusiastic impressions and impulses, and thereby disturbed in the rational faculties of his mind" and deported him. Acknowledging none of this, McGregor complained that opponents "constantly pore upon the dark Side of the revival: whatever they can hear of that,...they greedily lay hold of, and magnify with all their Art and Eloquence." But he pored upon the bright side of the revival. Insofar as the error and disorder it spawned, he was like an ostrich.36

In contrast, William Shurtleff, who proved himself to be fairminded about the controversial Whitefield, acknowledged the problems. The revival was not all sweetness and light. Though he was convinced that it was indeed a work of God, Shurtleff admitted that in Portsmouth, there were those tho fell away, there was "Pride and Vanity" among new converts, there were some who censured others, there was some "Quarrelling, though...there has not been so much of it here, as in other Places." To his credit, Shurtleff was too honest to "pretend to affirm that we have been wholly free from it." On the whole, Shurtleff considered that "tho' this Work thro' the Corruptions of Men may have accidentally been the Occasion of dissension as to some," the bad that was provoked by the revival was outweighed by the good. Between persons who had long clung to deep animosities, a "sweet and agreeable Harmony" arose,
and "such as before did not care for the sight of one another, upon their casual meeting under this divine influence, have receiv'd one another with the tenderest affection, and discover'd an uncommon complacency in each other."\(^\text{37}\)

Shurtleff's position was not sullied by a conviction that only the opposition was partial. McGregor, on the other hand, was even oblivious to the sins of his own people. Caldwell wrote:

But while many have been enquiring where this boasted Utopia was to be found, 'tis at last discovered to be among the People under Mr. McGregor's care....their freedom from pride is visible in their calling their neighboring congregation an unconverted and starved people, and glorying in taverns of their having the spirit. Their regard to the sabbath, let their roarings and tumblings prove; their reformation from drinking let the tavern-keepers who know this very well, speak for 'em....wherefore I conclude...this boasted reformation is a mere fiction; the boasts of such as write their own or friend's praises."\(^\text{38}\)

If McGregor brushed all of this aside, Caldwell was not about to let him bury his head in the sand with respect to the doctrinal error spawned by the great awakening. Caldwell, along with most new light clergymen, recognized that there were:

Numbers of false doctrines about conversion taught by the friends of this new scheme, such as...that all converts are as sensibly assured of their converted state as they would be of a wound or stab, that all who are not thus assured are in a damnable state, that a true convert may by conversing with another person know whether he be converted or not, (an instance of which we have in Mr. D—n—p—t's declaring a man unconverted who would not say he had hated god from
his Heart &c.) that the Principle Criterion to judge of Men's spiritual State by, is inward Exercise or feelings; that an unconverted Minister cannot be supposed to be instrumental in converting others, but by chance...as the Devil may."

Caldwell put to McGregore his own pointed question: "Have you Sir, no hesitating and doubting in your Mind about this Work....Do you not feel somewhat within you saying at times, possibly I am mistaken, perhaps this work is not from God?"

Many were convinced the work was "not from God." By 1745, two years after the revival began, the opposition to Whitefield on the part of "leading men" was virulent. In Falmouth, the most influential people met any suggestions of a visit by the evangelist with undisguised hostility. Smith understood that it "arose partly from a disapprobation of the system of Mr. Whitefield, and partly from a dread of seeing transacted here the scenes of extravagance, confusion and disorder, which had taken place in other towns."

Whitefield had preached on several occasions for Moses Morrill, a man about whose thirty-five year pastorate in Biddeford, Maine, we know little. But we do know that Whitefield "met with considerable opposition" there. Disputes mushroomed in his path. Not long after Whitefield's visit to Morrill's church, one member, a James Clark, refused communion. Apparently, Morrill was so agitated by the evangelist's visit that he encouraged lay exhorting. Clark objected, refusing to countenance "any
Brother...exhort and alter materially the word of the gospel." A counsel of New Light ministers was unable to change Clark's mind.⁴⁰

In Londonderry the quarreling assumed a different nature and the dispute was among the most protracted in New Hampshire ecclesiastical history. As we saw above, Londonderry's two ministers, McGregore and the Rev. William Davidson, dared not even speak to one another, and there the revival led to particularly sharp division between New and Old Lights. On one occasion, when the Rev. John Caldwell attempted to speak, one of McGregore's people "upon whom McGregore had seen the blessed Effects of this Work; cry'd 'tis a Lie, he is a Rogue, strike him; one of 'em lifted his Staff and threatened me, & another threatened Mr. Davidson."⁴¹

Disagreement over the revival and hostility to Whitefield grew so bitter that Thomas Smith suffered great anxieties about his visit to Falmouth, and Nicholas Loring would have to beg him to come to North Yarmouth.

It was dreadfully cold. It was the season in between the bitterness of midwinter and the torture of mosquitoes, when March winds ripped across Casco Bay and cut into a man's very marrow. It must have been a miserable ride. Of
the two men on horseback, one was noticeably frail. Tall, thin and gaunt, it was only purposefulness that kept Nicholas Loring in the saddle, for he was a man who ate raisins for strength while his congregation sang the hymn before his sermon. He and his friend, the Rev. Benjamin Allen, of Falmouth, had miles to ride before they reached Dunstan. Loring gathered his cloak more snugly about him and urged his gelding on. His feet were numb with the cold.

Later that day, in a farmhouse somewhere in or near Dunstan, the two ministers cheered themselves by a hot fire. With them sat a man of no mean reputation: the illustrious George Whitefield. Allen and Loring pleaded with him, urging him to ignore the hostility of Thomas Smith's parishioners. Only a few opposed his coming, Loring assured him, and the evangelist listened. Because of the opposition, Whitefield had decided to go no further into Maine, but these two men begged him. "Come down into our Macedonia," Loring entreated him. No doubt the three men prayed.

On Sunday, March 24, 1745, George Whitefield preached all day from Nicholas Loring's "pulpit in the Old Meeting house below the Ledge: much to the delight of the people....Crowds came from far and near to hear him, and the greatest fervor prevailed." There were "many Reasons to...urge me to seek his coming among us," Loring recalled. "I took no small pains to bring him to my People; who
unanimously receiv'd him as an Angel of God." All of Loring's expectations of the evangelist were fulfilled; all of his doubts and fears were assuaged: "By a nearer Acquaintance with him, he more than answers my Expectations, which were high and rais'd; and I cannot but esteem him a Person wonderfully qualified as well as spirited to pull down the Devil's Kingdom, and build up the Redeemer's; One, whom I am bound to believe God is with in an extraordinary Manner, to bless and prosper his Ministrations to saving Good to Multitudes of poor souls." Loring was convinced that "God's Presence went with him." He was "more than ever confirmed, that he is an extraordinary Instrument raised up by GOD to awaken and reform a secure wicked World, and to bring to Repentance, a backsliding Lukewarm People, and make them zealous of Love and good Works."44

Loring was not alone in his convictions. Smith, who endured "great and prevailing clamors every where against Mr. Whitefield," also had the satisfaction of seeing him preach from his own pulpit. So did Fitch, Morrill, Hovey, Shurtleff, and the Rev. Benjamin Allen, and in their deep affection for Whitefield they were typical of all evangelical New Lights.45

In McGregor's parish Whitefield preached "to multitudes in an open field." "What Lambs are they in their own Cause, and yet what Lions in Christ's," McGregor was moved to say of him (and Charles Wesley). Whitefield willingly exposed himself to "prodigious Fatigue of Body and
Mind," and yet was "wonderfully supported" in all his effort. 46

Shurtleff was completely taken with him. He had "frequent Opportunities of being with him, and there always appears in him such a Concern for the Advancement of the Redeemer's Kingdom and the good of Souls; such a Care to employ his whole Time to these Purposes; such a Sweetness of Disposition, and so much of the Temper of his great Lord and Master; that every Time I see him, I find my Heart further drawn out towards him." Shurtleff saw much of Christ in the evangelist. He exhibited "a Pattern of Love to God and Man, of Meekness, Humility and Self-denial...of Zeal for...promoting...the Kingdom of God... a great...Example of Diligence, and a careful redeeming of Time." 47

It was because of these convictions that Shurtleff defended Whitefield when irregularities in doctrine and practice discredited the revival. He wrote a long letter to "those of his Brethren In the Ministry who refuse to admit The Reverend Mr. Whitefield Into their Pulpits." Though he did not publish it until 1745, the clamor against Whitefield began not long after his first tour. In 1744 Whitefield accused Harvard and Yale of spiritual deadness—"their "Light" is become Darkness," he said. In response, Harvard's president and faculty outlined their objections to the evangelist's thought and conduct and barred his return there. Yale followed suit.

Shurtleff was indignant. It was outrageous to blame
Whitefield for "all the Disorders" when it was he who "raised in a great Number a deep and lasting Concern as to their spiritual...Interests." Besides, how could it "be expected we should be perfectly free from every Thing of this kind?" "Amidst all the Disorders...there has been a deep...concern among great Numbers as to their Salvation." If Whitefield had a role in it, Shurtleff felt "he ought to be highly valued and regarded by us." Like Edwards, he pointed out that it would be remarkable indeed if the change had occurred without disorder: "if a whole People were to partake of the saving Influences of the Holy Spirit, and every Individual to be really and effectually chang'd, unless they...had arriv'd to such a Perfection in Knowledge and Holiness as is not to be expected in the present State; it is not likely, tho' they were of one Heart, they would be all of one Mind." And as far as the separations that his enemies "confidently ascrib'd" to him, Shurtleff reminded his readers that "there was not an Instance of one of them till more than a year after he went from us." Nor was Shurtleff "chargeable" with the "ill design s of itinerants." 48

Shurtleff did not, however, whitewash the evangelist's errors. Whitefield's accusations against the ministry and New England's colleges were "rash and unwarrantable," and proved that he was not "free from all Manner of Imperfections." Nevertheless, these were outweighed by his "excellencies," and many, the Portsmouth pastor believed,
objected to Whitefield out of envy. Jeremiah Wise, John Rogers, James Pike, and Samuel Chandler agreed, and signed Shurtleff's letter. 49

Loring had such strong feelings about the man that he wrote to Smith to give "him his Opinion of Whitefield's Preaching and Conduct." He admitted that he wavered in his support for him after "seeing the Testimonies of so many Reverend Gentlemen...against him, refusing him their Pulpits, and warning the world of him as a dangerous Man." Confessing that he felt his "Regard for him and his Conduct, sensibly to abate," he looked carefully into the matter and found him innocent of all charges of enthusiasm, deceitful behavior, and efforts "to undermine the Faith, Peace, and order of these Churches." Loring "grieved" at the violent opposition to Whitefield, and thought that Whitefield's "friends" should "appear as openly for him as his Enemies do against him." As for himself, he would not deny him his pulpit "for my House full of Silver and gold; least I should be found at the great Day to be guilty of hindering souls." 50

Other Maine and New Hampshire clergymen shared equally strong feelings about the evangelist. As we saw above, Whitefield converted both Richard Elvins and Daniel Emerson. In the winter of 1740-1741, during Whitefield's first tour, Emerson was among the many Harvard students who was active in the campus revival; like Rogers, he left Cambridge to follow him across New England. It colored the
remainder of his career. His experiences with Whitefield disposed him to a lifelong commitment to revival and his Hollis congregation enjoyed repeated harvests long after the Great Awakening had subsided and only spiritual detritus remained. Whitefield's influence also helps to explain Emerson's insistence on extempore preaching, a practice that was controversial during the Great Awakening. The New Hampshire Association disapproved of extemporaneous preaching, and demanded that Emerson write out what he was to preach before them. He did. But he "laid the manuscript bottom up on the pulpit and preached without the use of it."

Whitefield proved a life-long inspiration to Emerson. For Smith he was as much a source of life-long suffering. Smith heard Whitefield speak during the latter's whirlwind tour through New Hampshire and Maine in the fall of 1740; perhaps he was among the thousands who heard him preach at Hampstead. When Smith listened to the evangelist preach to Moody's congregation at York, he was moved profoundly. Two days later he preached "extempore A.M. about Mr. Whitefield" to his own people.

After this initial contact with him, Smith waited years to see the evangelist again. During his later tour, when Whitefield preached from Smith's own pulpit, the Falmouth pastor was ecstatic. He recalled that "for several Sabbaths and the lecture I have been all in a blaze; never in such a flame, and what I would attend to is that it was
not only involuntary, but actually determined against. I went to meeting resolving to be calm and moderate, lest people should think it was wildness, and affectation to ape Mr. Whitefield; but God (I see) makes what use of me he pleases, and I am only a machine in his hands."\(^{53}\)

Smith's ecstasy was shortlived. With Whitefield's departure he was haunted by the memory of a spiritual standard against which he would always measure himself and find himself wanting. Five short months after he wrote the above journal entry he thought himself a "dead minister." Disparaging his own efforts as pastor and preacher, he wished for a replacement "that would do the people service." (He had been to Boston where he heard Whitefield preach twice.) As inspiring as he was, Whitefield proved a grief to a man like Smith, who, lacking the fiery constitution of Emerson, was simply not molded to live his entire life at a fever pitch of spirituality. The revival left Smith elated, then exhausted.\(^{54}\)

All of this suggests the incalculable emotional effect of the Great Awakening. Contact with Whitefield and the momentum of the revival itself was thrilling, exhilarating; it left men intoxicated. Individual responses to the Great Awakening were however, different, as we have seen. Precisely what these differences implied will help to establish the nature of the five temperaments that are described in the Conclusion.
CHAPTER VIII
CONCLUSION

The divine can mean no single quality, it must mean a group of qualities, by being champions of which in alternation, different men all find worthy missions. Each attitude being a syllable in human nature's total message, it takes the whole of us to spell the meaning out completely.

William James

"Do I contradict myself? Very well, I contradict myself; I am large, I contain multitudes." Whitman's lines serve well as a caveat to any effort to categorize those who peopled the past according to any given set of criteria. In The Protestant Temperament, Phillip Greven explained the nature of the Protestant temperament according to nodes of upbringing and thought, but he was criticized on the grounds that "there is no key which enables the historian to pigeonhole people." In spite of its shortcomings however, the work afforded insights into the workings of a continuum of Protestant personalities and his classifications remain valuable despite their limitations. An effort to describe the "temperaments" of northern New England's New Light clergymen during the Great Awakening is bedeviled by the same difficulties. None of the dispositions to be described in the following pages can be considered absolute; twenty-five Maine and New Hampshire ministers will not fit into them precisely, and some have a foot in two
categories. As Greven observed, "individuals could and often did combine aspects of more than one of these basic patterns of temperament and religious experience." Others, for want of information, cannot with any accuracy be categorized at all. Nonetheless, the "types" I will suggest are of value. They help "to establish some of the dominant motifs or themes of certain enduring patterns of...thought and behavior that can serve...as models in our continuous quest for an understanding of people in the past." At the very least, they ought to put to rest the persistent habit historians have of treating New Lights as if they were one "mind."¹

Scholars in the field have acknowledged that "radical" New Lights like Daniel Rogers, Nicholas Gilman and Joseph Adams (of Stratham), who we met in chapters one and two, were a breed apart, but there has been no effort to establish the subtle gradations of more moderate New Light piety according to theology and religious practice. Each of the twenty-five individuals at whom we have been looking in this study supported the Great Awakening, although with varying degrees of enthusiasm. But they differed. Three belong to the "Radical" temperament. Twenty-two were "moderate" New Lights in that they were doctrinal conservatives who did not scandalize Old Lights and other supporters of the Great Awakening, and were with few exceptions, ashamed, embarrassed, and critical of radical
excess. A general picture of the moderates can be further refined. Four distinct archetypes have suggested themselves: the Innovative, Partisan, Conservative or Institutionalist, and Dogmatic temperaments.

I The Innovative Temperament

The Innovative temperament belonged to ministers who were willing to depart from tradition to promote the Great Awakening. William Shurtleff provides a good example of this temperament. Within the framework of his fairminded and balanced view of the "work" (as we saw in chapter seven), Shurtleff was tolerant of itineracy and lay exhorting and that degree of distress that was, in his estimation, conducive to conversion. John Blunt, Samuel Moody and Thomas Smith might have announced that they opposed specific irregularities and disorders, but in the final analysis, if something worked to facilitate what they were confident was a work of God, they encouraged it. They were pragmatic. That they were disposed to innovation helps to explain why Moody itinerated and ordained a minister at large, and why Blunt and Shurtleff tolerated itinerants, lay exhorting and a high degree of emotionalism. Richard Elvins's very life styles him an Innovative moderate. Converted by Whitefield, the poor son of a baker applied himself diligently to theological study and proved himself an intelligent and articulate, capable man of God— that he
bucked the whole system to do so warrants him a place beside Shurtleff and the others. Based at the Ipswich parish of John Rogers Sr., Elvins also itinerated across New England.

II The Conservative Temperament

The "Conservative" temperament belonged to those moderates who were primarily concerned that the Great Awwakening not disrupt ecclesiastical order. Daniel Emerson is a good example of this temperament. Champion of an educated clergy, foe of uneducated itinerants and a force in the Hollis Association, he exerted control over the course of the revival (and successive revivals) through organizations like the Young Men's Christian Association. In company with Emerson might also be placed Nicholas Loring, Benjamin Allen, Samuel Jefferds, Hohn Hovey and Moses Morrill, for, notwithstanding all the support and affection they offered Whitefield, theirs was a vigorous remonstrance against lay exhorters, uneducated itinerants, the ordination of ministers at large, and separations based on the "key of knowledge." Samuel Chandler, Ward Cotton and James Pike belong to the Conservative temperament because of the tone of their lives and dispositions. Chandler observed firsthand the excess of Gilman's people and thereafter was repelled by excessive emotionalism; Ward Cotton combatted these excesses and those of Joseph Adams of Stratham; he prayed that God would "heal all our unhappy Divisions, bring
back all our unscriptural Separations, and rectify all our disorders." James Pike led the Somersworth society in a fashion that was "so quiet, and steady, and orderly" that through all the tumult of the Great Awakening, none in the congregation were "tossed to and fro like unstable souls, or carried away with divers and strange doctrines." Pike was of a particularly irenic disposition. Into extreme old age he continued to visit every house in his parish, and even the Quakers welcomed him. A signer of Shurtleff's spirited letter in defense of Whitefield, who preached in his pulpit, Pike was first a man of order—in his parish, his church, and his family. The latter was "a little flock, whom he fed as a shepherd...with a wise and tender hand." Because he was a founder of the New Hampshire Association to oversee the churches, Amos Main also belongs in the conservative ranks.  

III The Partisan Temperament

The Partisan temperament belonged to those moderates who refused to face up to the error and disorder spawned by the revival and regarded its opponents with suspicion and hostility. David McGregor is the best example of this temperament. "Let us try promoters of the revival with Respect to their Manner of Life," McGregor sniffed. "And can it be denied that this has been very exemplary and heavenly?" Only opponents exhibited a "profane mocking
Spirit." As we saw in the preceding chapter, he never retracted any of these sentiments in the face of all evidence to the contrary. No other moderate ministers in northern New England were willing to go this far. They all conceded that the revival created an array of serious problems.  

IV The Dogmatic Temperament

The Dogmatic temperament belonged to those moderate New Light clergymen who were primarily concerned with doctrinal orthodoxy. This label does not signify that these individuals were a whit more concerned about orthodoxy than any other moderates. All moderates were horrified by Antinomianism and Arminianism, as we saw in chapters three and four on conversion and sanctification. Contrary to Raymond B. Wilbur's argument, the resolute doctrinal conservatism of most northern New England clergymen proved that "the preparationist discipline of the Hooker-Shepard tradition" did not "collapse in the revivalist enthusiasm of the Great Awakening." Wilbur (like James W. Jones), ignored the conservatism of the vast majority of Maine and New Hampshire ministers when he wrote that "the theology of revivalism...was a radical shift away from the traditional Puritan Calvinism of New England and was, in effect, a tacit repudiation of preparationist-predestinarian theology which had monitored the spirituality of New England Puritans for a
hundred years." Northern New England New Light moderates were indisputably Calvinist. In spite of James Schmotter's assertion to the contrary, there was "doctrinal consensus" in northern New England among moderate New Light proponents of the revival. Similarly, Nordbeck erred when she asserted that Samuel Moody's message was "unique." She wrote that "among northern ministers, only Samuel Moody consistently stressed both the need for spiritual enlightenment and the desirability of moral reform," but the beliefs and practices of almost any minister among the twenty-two moderate New Lights we have examined serve to refute this. Maine and New Hampshire New Light moderates stressed heart and head, a vital inner piety and conformity to the moral law; even the uneducated Richard Elvins, whom Nordbeck singled out to exonerate, preached this message. Her assertion that "prior to the Great Awakening" in northern New England "there seems to have been no Edwardsean or evangelical wing of the clergy to counterbalance the general inattention to vital inner piety" is wrong. These Calvinsist clergymen preached a God one might "encounter," a God who was "personally meaningful," with Whom one might enjoy an "emotionally satisfying" relationship, and to Whom one owed a strict "evangelical obedience." In any case, for them practical issues were subordinate to doctrinal considerations. The existence of the Dogmatic temperament underscores the fact that there were moderate New Lights who were supremely indifferent to disorders in practice, chose
to ignore them, and perhaps did not even construe them as problems. Jeremiah Wise illustrates the Dogmatic temperament.  

Wise is a provocative figure because what information there is about him is paradoxical and contradictory. He was the son of John Wise, whom Perry Miller described as a "vigorous, hard-hitting, racy champion of popular causes and the agrarian point of view." When in 1687 he led Ipswich "in fiery protest" against Andros' levy of taxes without legislative consent, he intoned in town meeting, "'We had a good God, and a good King, and should do well to stand to our Privileges.'" In some ways the son's disposition seems to have been a deliberate rejection of the father's propensity for fieriness, for in one sermon Jeremiah Wise preached that as far as rulers were concerned, "whatever their Character be, yet the just Power which they have, must be submitted to." In contrast, John Wise wrote that "democracy" was the government "most agreeable...in the church of God." Wise's sermons were anything but fiery, and his eulogizer described him as "well-temper'd with Wisdom and Prudence." Any man who, with his bride, could settle "happily in the midst of an Indian war, although there was not a house between Berwick and Canada," was certainly imperturbable. The composure hinted at by all the evidence suggests an unruffled man whose support of the revival was almost surprising. And yet the man whose sermons were so vapid on paper, preached to Gilman's people until they were
frenzied and Chandler recoiled. Wise also attested to the testimony of New Lights against disorder, and yet, contradictorily, he participated in Daniel Rogers's unorthodox ordination. Predictably, he did not scorn "the ordaining of Missionaries which had been practiced for some time in the country and has been lately voted a disorder."⁵

In view of this, Wise was noteworthy for his vigorous and conservative assertion that Antinomian and Arminian error be guarded against. He wrote that he was "ready to join with the Friends of the present glorious work of the Grace of GOD in the Land, in bearing Testimony to it as such a work; and to concur with them in the most proper Methods to remove disorders, and prevent the spreading and Increase of Errors; especially Arminiansism & Antinomianism: The latter of which, begin to appear bare-fac'd, as well as the former in some places."⁶

Wise understood that it was very easy for persons who were "in the Extrem of Arminianism, to run into the contrary Extrem of Antinomianism," affording enemies of both doctrines grounds "to reproach them, as naturally tending to Libertinism, Enthusiasm, and the like; and to possess People's Minds with Prejudices against them and the glorious work of GOD's Grace." Except for his thoughts on missionaries, Wise was silent on disorders and irregularities, referring the reader to those writings of Jonathan Edwards in which "he vindicates the Conduct of the friends of this Work in some of those things that are
accounted disorders, tho he censures them with Respect to others."7

It could be argued that Edwards himself would be first and foremost among New Lights of the Dogmatic temperament, for his life's work was an effort to reaffirm an uncompromising Calvinism within the framework of an all-powerful sovereign God.

Wise also illustrates the difficulties inherent in efforts to put persons into categories, for one might argue that he belongs with the "Innovatives" because of his participation with Moody in the ordination of Rogers as a minister at large and because he countenanced missionaries.

John Rogers illustrates the difficulty even better. John Rogers Sr. was fervently evangelical. The household in which Daniel and John were raised was one where daily life meant a never ending acknowledgment of God's presence; where one prayed unceasingly and sought, like Cotton Mather, unbroken converse with Heaven. We can only guess about similarities between the two brothers. In the company they kept they were certainly alike; John was as chummy with Gilman as Daniel and participated not only in his brother's ordination but in several other unorthodox ordinations that raised the hackles of Old Lights and, in one instance, led directly to a separation. If more of his writings were extant, perhaps we would find that he was radical. The only extant sermon however, is one he preached on the "Use and Improvement we ought to make of the Falls of those of our
own Order." "We should be very careful whom we ordain to the Work of the Gospel Ministry," Rogers intoned, ironic in the light of his later activities.  

But about error and disorder John Jr. never uttered a syllable; even his concern for orthodoxy was a postscript. At the end of a lengthy letter in which he rhapsodized at length about the "awakening, convincing and converting Influences" of the Holy Spirit, any anxiety he may have harbored about orthodoxy was penned in the next to last line as an afterthought; "And, Oh that something may be said against Arminianism as well as Antinomianism."  

Finally, in his view of the opposition, he was as partisan as McGregore:

I should not be for spending much time, on disputing with those who are Opposers of this glorious work of God's sovereign rich free Grace; but rather in carrying them to the throne of Grace, and there wrestle with the Lord to open their Eyes, and engage them from an Experience of the work in their own Souls to regard this glorious and gracious Operation of his Holy Spirit in the Hearts of so many, and that of all Sorts, in one Place & another."  

Ultimately, John Rogers resists classification.

V The Radical Temperament

The Radical temperament belonged to "enthusiasts." "Enthusiasm," as Goen put it, was the radicals' "belief in immediate inspiration by divine or supernatural power.... that led to acting on impulses thought to come directly from
the Holy Spirit. In extreme cases it led to a sort of frenzied possession." As we saw in chapter one, although the radical overemphasis on inner experience was not idiosyncratic in the history of Christianity, the degree to which they relied on it was altogether new in New England and subverted orthodoxy. Ultimately it led, as the Puritans discovered in 1636, to Arminianism and Antinomianism. If God revealed Himself in extraordinary fashion to Puritans such as Cotton Mather and Samuel Seward, such "revelations" were rare. Most Puritans agreed that God generally worked in a more ordinary fashion in the lives of ordinary mortals. Because they longed for divine "special treatment," Radical New Lights were then, immature Christians who behaved, in Lovelace's words, like "children and beginners in the faith." They had not yet learned that "faith is the assurance of things hoped for, the substance of things not seen."
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