SPRINGER BRIEFS IN ANTHROPOLOGY
ANTHROPOLOGY AND ETHICS

Richard J. Chacon
Michael Charles Scoggins

The Great Awakening and Southern Backcountry Revolutionaries

SpringerBriefs in Anthropology

Anthropology and Ethics

Series editor

Richard J. Chacon, Rock Hill, USA

For further volumes:
http://www.springer.com/series/11497

Richard J. Chacon · Michael Charles Scoggins

The Great Awakening and Southern Backcountry Revolutionaries

Springer

Richard J. Chacon
Department of Sociology
and Anthropology
Winthrop University
Rock Hill, SC
USA

Michael Charles Scoggins
The Southern Revolutionary
War Institute
Culture and Heritage Museums
York, SC
USA

ISSN 2195-0822 ISSN 2195-0830 (electronic)
ISBN 978-3-319-04596-2 ISBN 978-3-319-04597-9 (eBook)
DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-04597-9
Springer Cham Heidelberg New York Dordrecht London

Library of Congress Control Number: 2014932817

© The Author(s) 2014
This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed. Exempted from this legal reservation are brief excerpts in connection with reviews or scholarly analysis or material supplied specifically for the purpose of being entered and executed on a computer system, for exclusive use by the purchaser of the work. Duplication of this publication or parts thereof is permitted only under the provisions of the Copyright Law of the Publisher's location, in its current version, and permission for use must always be obtained from Springer. Permissions for use may be obtained through RightsLink at the Copyright Clearance Center. Violations are liable to prosecution under the respective Copyright Law.
The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.
While the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication, neither the authors nor the editors nor the publisher can accept any legal responsibility for any errors or omissions that may be made. The publisher makes no warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein.

Printed on acid-free paper

Springer is part of Springer Science+Business Media (www.springer.com)

Acknowledgments

Richard J. Chacon wishes to thank his good friend and co-author Mr. Michael C. Scoggins (McCelvey Center of York County) for the pleasure of collaborating on this publication. Chacon is especially grateful to Dr. Jonathan Marx (Chair of Winthrop University's Sociology and Anthropology Department) for his continued backing of this research. He is particularly thankful to Dr. Eddie Lee (Winthrop University) for his guidance in helping him understand the genesis of the Great Awakening. Chacon is also indebted to Dr. William Kiblinger (Winthrop University) and to Dr. Charles Foss (Episcopal Church of Our Saviour) for their guidance in helping him understand the impact of the Enlightenment on colonial America's Protestant population. Chacon wishes to acknowledge the helpful comments on early versions of this manuscript provided by Dr. John Kaltner (Rhodes College). This project benefited greatly from the diligent efforts of the entire Inter-Library Loan (ILL) Staff of Winthrop University's Dacus Library. Chacon also received indispensable computer support from Technology Services' Patrice Bruneau and T. J. Carney. Lastly, Chacon would like to thank his lovely wife Yamilette Chacon for her support over the many years this effort has entailed. Without her assistance, this project would have never come to fruition.

Michael C. Scoggins wishes to thank his friend and co-author Dr. Richard J. Chacon (Winthrop University) for the wonderful opportunity to collaborate on this project. Rick is truly a gentleman and a scholar! Scoggins would also like to acknowledge the assistance of the staff at the McCelvey Center in York, SC; the Dacus Library at Winthrop University, Rock Hill, SC and the South Carolina Department of Archives and History in Columbia, SC for all of their assistance in conducting the research for this book. He would also like to thank the Reverend Allen Wolfe of Armenia United Methodist Church in Chester County, SC for lending him several important reference works on religion in America. Last but not least, Scoggins would like to thank his family and fellow church members for their love and support. He dedicates his portion of the present volume to them.

Contents

1 Introduction 1
References 3

2 Pre-awakened Colonial North America 5
Church Membership 5
Establishment Protestant Ministers 6
Increased Emphasis on Formal Education 7
The Age of Enlightenment's Influence 8
Growing Class Conflict 8
Further Signs of Alienation 9
Spiritual Declension 10
Underserved Regions 11
Roots of the Awakening: Old World Pietism 11
Frelinghuysen's Pietism 12
Summary 13
References 14

3 The Great Awakening 15
Passion and Melodrama Stream from the Pulpit into the Aisles 18
Shifting the Blame 19
Sowing the Seeds of Discord Among Colonial Protestants 21
New Lights versus Old Lights 23
Davenport's Anti-denominationalism and Anti-intellectualism 25
Individualism and a New Form of Protestantism 28
Old Light Responses 30
Contributions of the Great Awakening 33
Outreach to the Marginalized 34
Turmoil, Millennialism, and Catharsis 37
Aftermath of the Awakening 39
References 40

4 Patriots, Monarchists, and the Antichrist 43
Introduction 43
The Seven Years' War and the Catholic Church as Antichrist 43

Stamp Act of 1765 44
The Tea Act of 1773 45
The Quebec Act of 1774 45
England as Antichrist 46
Millennialism and the Justification for Rebellion 48
References 49

5 Awakened Rebels and Holy War in the Southern Backcountry . . . 51
Settlement of the Carolina Backcountry 51
The Great Awakening and Religious Independence on the Appalachian Frontier 53
New Monsters and Presbyterian Dogs in the South Carolina Upcountry 62
Awakened Rebels in the Carolina Backcountry 66
Holy War Comes to the Southern Backcountry 71
David Versus Goliath: Buford's Massacre and Huck's Defeat 72
The Sword of the Lord and Gideon: The Battle of King's Mountain 87
Aftermath of the Holy War 96
References 97

6 Discussion and Conclusions 101
Introduction 101
Celtic Druid Revolt Against Roman Occupation of Britain 101
Maji-Maji Rebellion 102
Mad Man's War 103
Religion as a Powerful Unifying Force 103
Ethical Ramifications of Excising Religion From History 104
References 106

References 109

Index 115

Author Biography

Dr. Richard J. Chacon is an Associate Professor of Anthropology at Winthrop University. He has conducted ethnographic investigations throughout Amazonia. He has documented the subsistence patterns and belief systems of the Yanomamö of Venezuela, the Yora of Peru, and the Achuar (Shiwiar) of Ecuador. He has also done research on Andean belief systems and ritual violence among Otavalo and Cotacachi Indians of Highland Ecuador. His specializations are in optimal foraging theory, Amerindian subsistence strategies, warfare, ritual violence, the development of complex societies, ethnohistory, and the effects of globalization in addition to analyzing the effects of religion and missionization on society. His publications include: North American Indigenous Warfare and Ritual Violence (Eds., Richard Chacon and Rubén Mendoza) Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2007. Latin American Indigenous Warfare and Ritual Violence (Eds., Richard Chacon and Rubén Mendoza) Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2007. The Taking and Displaying of Human Body Parts as Trophies by Amerindians (Eds., Richard Chacon and David Dye). New York: Springer, 2007. The Ethics of Anthropology and Amerindian Research: Reporting on Environmental Degradation and Warfare (Eds., Richard Chacon and Rubén G. Mendoza. New York: Springer, 2012. Currently, Chacon serves as Series Editor for Springer's Anthropology and Ethics.

Michael C. Scoggins is the Historian for the Culture and Heritage Museums (CHM) and is Research Director of the Southern Revolutionary War Institute in York, South Carolina. Scoggins has an Associate Degree in Science from the University of South Carolina-Union, an Associate Degree in Engineering Technology from York Technical College, a Bachelor of Arts in History from Winthrop University, and is currently pursuing his Master's degree in history. He was employed as an electronics engineer for 20 years before changing careers in 1999 to pursue his life-long interest in military history and Southern history. He is the author of Historic York County: An Illustrated History (Historic Publishing Network, 2009), The Day It Rained Militia: Huck's Defeat and the Revolution in the South Carolina Backcountry, May–July 1780 (History Press, 2005), and Relentless Fury: The Revolutionary War in the Southern Piedmont (CHM, 2006). Scoggins also edited the republication of Benson Lossing's 1889 classic, Reflections of Rebellion: Hours with the Living Men and Women of the

Revolution (History Press, 2005), and co-authored with Dr. Bobby G. Moss, African-American Patriots in the Southern Campaign of the American Revolution (Scotia-Hibernia Press, 2004), and African-American Loyalists in the Southern Campaign of the American Revolution (Scotia-Hibernia Press, 2005). He has contributed articles to numerous historical publications and journals, including Patriots of the American Revolution; War, Literature and the Arts; Military Collector and Historian; The South Carolina Encyclopedia; Southern Campaigns of the American Revolution; Carologue; and American Revolution Magazine. Currently, he writes a monthly history column for YC Magazine, edits the York County Genealogical and Historical Society Quarterly, and is a frequent lecturer on topics of local and regional history. Scoggins is a member of the Company of Military Historians, the Brigade of the American Revolution, the Scotch-Irish Society of the USA, the Sons of Confederate Veterans, the York County Genealogical and Historical Society, the Amateur Radio Relay League, and is President of the Confederation of South Carolina Local Historical Societies.

Abstract

This work documents the impact that the Great Awakening had on the inhabitants of colonial America's Southern Backcountry. Special emphasis is placed on how this religious revival furrowed the ground on which the seeds of the American Revolution would sprout. The investigation shows how the Great Awakening can be traced to Europe's Age of Enlightenment. This effort also demonstrates how and why this revival spread so rapidly throughout the colonies. Special focus is placed on how the Great Awakening impacted the mindset of colonists of the Southern Backcountry. Most significantly, this research demonstrates how this eighteenth century revival not only cultivated a sense of American national identity, but how it also fostered a colonial mindset against established authority which, in turn, facilitated the success of the American Revolution. Additionally, this investigation will document (from a cross-cultural perspective) how religious revivals have fueled other revolutionary movements around the world. Such analysis will include the Celtic Druid Revolt, the *Maji-Maji* Rebellion of East Africa along with the Mad Man's War in Southeast Asia. Lastly, the ethical ramifications of minimizing (or denying) the role that religion played in political and social transformations around the world will be addressed. This final point is of paramount importance given current trend in academia to minimize the role that religion played in spurring revolutions while emphasizing material (i.e., economic) causal factors. This attempt at divorcing religion from history is misguided and unethical because it is not only misleading but it also fails to fully acknowledge the beliefs and values that motivated individuals to take certain actions in the first place.

Chapter 1
Introduction

This work explains the major impact that the Great Awakening had on the colonial era inhabitants of the Southern Backcountry of British North America. Emphasis is placed on how this religious revival furrowed the ground on which the seeds of the American Revolution would take root.[1] The investigation documents how the Great Awakening can be traced to Europe's Age of Enlightenment. This effort also shows how and why this revival spread so rapidly throughout the colonies. Special focus is placed on how the Great Awakening impacted colonial "establishment" Protestant denominations.[2] Most significantly, this research shows how this eighteenth-century revival fostered a colonial mindset against established authority which, in turn, facilitated the success of the American Revolution. Additionally, this investigation will analyze how religious revivalism fueled other revolutionary movements around the world (such as Celtic Druid revolt against the Roman occupation of Britain, the Mahi–Mahi Rebellion, and the Mad Man's War). Lastly, the ethical ramifications of minimizing (or denying) the role that religion in played in political and social transformations will be addressed.

The "Great Awakening" lasted from 1739 to 1745.[3] This evangelical movement arose among colonial North American Protestants and was based on the belief in the inherent depravity of humankind. This revival was also characterized by high levels of religious fervor. Placing a greater emphasis on trusting the heart over the intellect, this relatively novel form of Christianity came about in response to the currents emanating from the "Age of Enlightenment" which many of the establishment Protestant denominational clergyman (particularly the well educated) had embraced. Rejecting the belief in a universally depraved human nature, the Enlightenment favored the accumulation of human knowledge through science and logic.

[1] North American Protestantism has historically experienced various "revivals" which are constituted by "practices that sponsor and reinforce enthusiastic, emotional, and evangelistic faith" (Williams 1998, p. 213).

[2] By colonial era "establishmen" Protestant denominations, the authors are referring to groups such as the Anglican, Presbyterian and Congregationalist (also known as Puritan) churches.

[3] As reported by Leigh Heyrman (2000), some scholars contend that the Great Awakening continued into the 1770s.

R. J. Chacon and M. C. Scoggins, *The Great Awakening and Southern Backcountry Revolutionaries*, SpringerBriefs in Anthropology and Ethics, DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-04597-9_1, © The Author(s) 2014

This research documents how the eighteenth century witnessed the rise of opposing approaches to Christianity that divided colonial North American Protestantism into two camps. One faction was content to allow the influence of the Enlightenment's scientific discoveries and philosophy into Christian thought (along with the concomitant increased levels of secularization in society). The opposing faction was premised on the following two notions: (1) all "true" believers should trust Biblical revelation over human reason and (2) all "true" believers should battle against the continued secularization of eighteenth century colonial society (Keating 1988; Leigh Heyrman 2000; Valkenburgh 1994). Moreover, this work also documents how the growing tensions among Protestants were exacerbated by the growing class conflict that was present in many colonial era congregations and how this resulted in establishment ministers becoming alienated from many of their parishioners (Balmer 2006; Stout 1986).

The Great Awakening appeared among Protestants who believed that colonial denominations had been corrupted by secular forces. This revival, which started in New England in the late 1730s, reached its zenith 20 years later when converts to the movement could be found in every one of the colonies and approximately one-third of all colonists claimed to have undergone some type of religious conversion (Keating 1988; Landsman 1982; Valkenburgh 1994). According to Kraus (1928, p. 75), the revival "proved to be a force remolding every aspect of [colonial] American life—an emotional earthquake that scarcely left a home unaffected."

This work explores how the eighteenth-century Great Awakening sparked the creation of a vibrant and yet also, an acephalous and highly divisive form of Christianity. The theology of this revivalist movement emphasized the need for individuals to undergo a personal conversion experience rather than the receiving of sacraments and/or remaining faithful to any sort of covenant/creed. Moreover, this relatively novel Christian approach challenged many established beliefs and practices of colonial era denominational Protestantism. Therefore, adherents to revivalism operated without the ecclesiastical oversight and accountability normally present in Protestant denominations. Thus, North American colonial era Protestantism set itself upon a new path which established fiercely independent sects. These new congregations promoted novel beliefs and practices that paved the road for rebellion against England.

This research documents how revivalism supported the American Revolution in the Southern Backcountry. This investigation also records how religious revivals have likewise fueled social uprisings cross culturally. Lastly, the ethical ramifications of denying and/or minimizing the role that religion played in shaping history are addressed.

References

Balmer, R. (2006). *Mine eyes have seen the glory: A journey into the evangelical subculture in America*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Keating, K. (1988). *Catholicism and fundamentalism: The attack on "Romanism" by "Bible Christians"*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press.

Kraus, M. (1928). *Intercolonial aspects of American culture on the eve of the revolution*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Landsman, N. (1982). Revivalism and nativism in the middle colonies: The great awakening and the Scots community in East New Jersey. *American Quarterly, 34*(2), 149–164.

Leigh Heyrman, C. (2000). The first great awakening. TeacherServe home page. National humanisties center home page. Retrieved October 15, 2006, from http://www.nhc.rtp.nc.us/tserve/eighteen/ekeyinfo/grawaken.htm

Stout, H. (1986). *The New England soul: Preaching and religious culture in colonial New England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Valkenburgh, S. (1994). 1740s-Jonathan Edwards & the great awakening. The society of colonial wars in the state of Connecticut. Retrieved June 21, 2007, from http://www.colonialwarsct.org/1740_s.htm

Williams, R. (1998). "Great awakenings." In W. Swatos Jr (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of religion and society*. (p. 213). Walnut Creek: Alta Mira Press.

Chapter 2
Pre-awakened Colonial North America

Church Membership

In order to understand how and why this eighteenth century revival resonated with so many colonial era Protestants (particularly in the Southern Backcountry, one must first understand the pre-awakened sociocultural, political, economic, and religious milieu in existence existed before the Awakening began.

First of all, for many colonial pre-awakened establishment Protestants, church affiliation was by invitation only. That is to say, only those who were considered to be "proven saints" were permitted to join a congregation (Bonomi 1986; Bumsted and Van De Wetering 1976; Leigh Heyrman 2000). Most significantly, establishment Protestant clergyman reserved the exclusive right to administer or to withhold grace bestowing sacraments from recalcitrant congregants (Balmer 2006; Stout 1986).[1]

In New England, candidates wishing to be accepted into an establishment Protestant congregation often first had to subject their personal lives to the scrutiny of a panel comprised of church elders along with members of the clergy. Then, the applicant would be required to render an account of his/her religious life in front of the entire body of believers. The church panel would then proceed to conduct an investigation of the candidate's character that would sometimes include questioning townspeople at large about the applicant's life and morals. Finally, the candidate would be subjected to a probationary period where church elders would carefully monitor the neophyte's spiritual progress. It was only after having successfully navigated these requirements were candidates received into the covenant, at which they pledged loyalty to the congregation for life (Bonomi 1986).

[1] Additionally, some ministers were known to deny communion to believers "unless they could provide evidence of a work of grace in their lives" (Stein 2005, p. 2698).

R. J. Chacon and M. C. Scoggins, *The Great Awakening and Southern Backcountry Revolutionaries*, SpringerBriefs in Anthropology and Ethics,
DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-04597-9_2, © The Author(s) 2014

Establishment Protestant Ministers

"As social guardians or 'watchmen' [establishment Protestant] ministers were responsible for being on the lookout for divine warnings and, when they appeared, for bringing the people together for a diagnosis of their spiritual ills and for corrective action. No matter what the particular calamity, …sermons dwelt on the underlying truth that the sin of a people is the cause…of [God's] wrath against that people" (Stout 1986, p. 28). Moreover, establishment ministers often claimed special prophetic powers as indicted by Increase Mather's comment.

> Hearken to the voice of God in the Ministry of his word, mind what the Messengers of God speak in his name, for surely the Lord will do nothing, but he revealeth his secrets to his Servants the Prophets…believe his Prophets so shall you prosper…therefore, you may expect that God will communicate Light to you by them… (Mather cited in Stout 1986, pp. 81–82).

In 1714, Samuel Danforth Jr. proclaimed the following:

> The success of the laborers in God's vineyard consists in the upholding of religion where it is set up and in planting and propagating of it to other places. It is the good hand of God working for his people which provides pastors after his own heart for his church successively from age to age… (Danforth Jr. cited in Stout 1986, p. 142).

Additionally, establishment Protestant clergymen attempted to foster loyalty among their congregations by exhorting them to treat ordained establishment ministers with deference by telling them to "love God, love your neighbor, [and] obey them that have rule over you" (cited in Bonomi 1986, p. 153). One establishment cleric stated that "God does not chuse to speak immediately from heaven himself, nor to speak by Angles, but he raises up instruments of the sons of men whom he fits and qualifies by furnishing them with a suitable measure of the gifts and graces of his Spirit and by them he finds and speaks his mind to other men [*sic*]" (cited in Stout 1986, pp. 91–92).

Many preawakening establishment Protestant ministers were anything but demure with regards to the public's consideration of their mission. Evidence of this sentiment can be seen in Puritan Cotton Mather's belief that of all of mankind's vocations, the Christian ministry certainly was "the Highest Dignity, if not the Greatest Happiness, that Human Nature is capable of, here in this Vale below" (Mather cited in Schmotter 1979, p. 153). Nathaniel Eells even went so far as to assert that establishment ministers "officially stand nearer to God than others do" (Eells cited in Stout 1986, p. 162). In 1725, Azariah Mather echoed this view when he declared that establishment Protestant ministers were "to be looked upon as Sacred Persons, Men representing the King of Glory" (Mather cited in Stout 1986, p. 162).[2]

[2] Puritans or Congregationalists were Protestants who advocated strict religious discipline along with the simplification of the Church of England's creeds and rituals (Tudor 1962).

Increased Emphasis on Formal Education

In the early days of the colonies, an individual's personal piety was of paramount importance in determining whether or not he was fit for the ministry. However, the Enlightenment's emphasis on knowledge affected establishment Protestant denominational ordination committees. As such, formal training (i.e., college education) increasingly became a requirement for being appointed to positions of leadership in establishment Protestant denominations. Indeed, historical records show that establishment Protestant leadership in the Colonies felt that college educated individuals were best qualified for the august task of shepherding souls. Evidence of this clerical insistence on higher education can be seen in the following. In 1700, 12 % of ordained Congregational ministers had not attended Harvard College however by 1740, only 3 % of ordained Congregational ministers were nongraduates (Schmotter 1979, p. 157). Naturally, college educated ministers insisted on receiving higher salaries than individuals without higher education (Schmotter 1979) and Peter Clark unapologetically justified this attitude in 1728, when he reminded his congregation that "it is certainly and undeniably your Duty by the Law of CHRIST JESUS the Lord…to afford those that labor in Word and Doctrine a comfortable and honorable Maintenance" (Clark cited in Schmotter 1979, p. 156).

As previously mentioned, in the early days of the colonies among establishment Protestants, an individual's personal piety was an important factor when considering the qualifications for the preaching office. However, by the eighteenth century, it not only became increasingly important for establishment clerics to meet certain educational requirements but to also meet various social qualifications as well.

> …ministers are, or ought to be, Persons of an elevated Education and Accomplishments…Our Lord saw cause by immediate Inspiration to confer ministerial Gifts on Persons wholly illiterate; yet none may now reasonably expect, that unsought Accomplishments will be infused into him. Education, Study and Prayer are now the Method, whereby the Candidates of the Evangelical Ministry must be fitted for their charge (Wigglesworth cited in Stout 1986, p. 164).

Additionally, the establishment pre-awakened church was a part of a colonist's life from birth, through baptism, marriage and finally to death. Moreover, worship gatherings provided a mechanism for socializing. Significantly, one of the tenets of colonial era establishment Protestantism before the Awakening was the belief in the validity of grace bestowing sacraments which included the baptizing of infants (Bumsted and Van De Wetering 1976).[3]

[3] As previously stated, colonial era Anglicans, Presbyterians, and Congregationalists believed in the validity of sacraments. However, on the issue of church governance, Puritans parted company with their fellow establishment Protestants in that Congregationalist churches "were nothing more than local covenants whereby people voluntarily 'joined' themselves to one another and God in a visible assembly; there was no need for some higher agency or authority beyond local

The Age of Enlightenment's Influence

The eighteenth century European intellectual movement known as the Age of Enlightenment was associated with a rise of the bourgeoisie and the influence of scientific discoveries that "…promoted the values of intellectual and material progress, toleration, and critical reason as opposed to authority and tradition in matters of politics and religion" (Woods 2005, p. 2795). The Enlightenment touted the natural goodness and rationality of humankind along with the perfectibility of society. "It was believed that social institutions could be improved by conscious and intelligent effort; if people tried, they could bring about progress through political action" Hatch (1973, p. 40). In short, the Enlightenment posited faith in the innate goodness of humanity along with the belief in the power of human rationality (Hatch 1973). Moreover, Enlightenment thinkers such as Newton and Locke believed that the universe was rationally ordered and therefore, laws could be discovered that explained the motions of the planets as well as the behavior of people (Garbarino 1977).[4] "No well-read provincial [colonist] could escape the excitement these [Enlightenment] luminaries were generating in science, literature, epistemology, and ethics…" (Stout 1986, p. 128) and establishment Protestant ministers were no exception.

Increasingly, Enlightenment inspired notions were incorporated into sermons and this would not be to the liking of many colonials. In fact, one of the factors that played a major role in the success of the Awakening was that many congregants felt that much of the leadership of establishment denominations had lost its vitality due to being sidetracked by the Enlightenment's influence. Critics argued that sermons from establishment Protestant ministers often focused on scholarly matters that reportedly did not touch the hearts of common folk (Leigh Heyrman 2000).

Growing Class Conflict

Since the middle 1600s, the Colonies were rife with class antagonism as the ranks of the well educated in addition to the number of mercantile elites grew, particularly within coastal cities (Stout 1986). This situation was exacerbated by the fact

(Footnote 3 continued)
church officers" (Stout 1986, p. 18). That is to say, Puritans were not subject to external ecclesiastical authorities as Anglicans and Presbyterians were (Stout 1986). However, Congregationalist ministers were only allowed to preach after being properly ordained by local Congregationalist authorities (Dr. Charles Foss, personal communication to Chacon, 2008).

[4] Locke's emphasis on rationality is made apparent in the following quotes: "…faith is nothing but a firm assent of the mind; which, if it be regulated, as is our duty, cannot be afforded to anything but upon good reason; and so cannot be opposed to it" (Locke 1959, p. 413). "Reason must be our last judge and guide in everything" (Locke 1959, p. 438).

that many establishment Protestant clerics were relatively affluent vis-à-vis a large number of colonials (many of whom were deeply indebted).[5] Intermarriage between clerics and wealthy merchant families was not uncommon and this fostered a general alliance (at least in some regions) between a professional establishment Protestant clergy and the upper echelons of colonial society (Balmer 2006).

It is important to note that not all establishment Protestant clerics married into rich merchant families. In fact, by mid-seventeenth century, some establishment ministers actually felt threatened by the growing number of wealthy entrepreneurs. The reason why a number of clerics felt this way was because many successful businessmen did not treat ministers with the deference that establishment clerics believed was properly due them. Colonial "merchants, magistrates, and ordinary townspeople all seemed less disposed to honor their [establishment ministers'] social position" (Stout 1986, p. 76). In 1682, establishment Protestant minister Urian Oakes observed that the chief culprits were the parishioners whose "miscarriages were most grievously displayed in their lack of deference toward superiors in church and state" (cited in Stout 1986, p. 105). Many establishment "ministers perceived themselves as an embattled remnant whose misfortune it was to labor at a time when popular respect for God's ministers had sadly declined…" (cited in Stout 1986, p. 159).

Moreover, the historical evidence shows that the smoldering class antagonism existing between the well-educated establishment Protestant clergy and the generally less educated churchgoing population heightened in the eighteenth century as "[c]lerical demands for deference to the pulpit seemed to have no impact on parishioners, for provincial New Englanders did not hesitate to take cut off their pastor's salaries, take them to court, or publicly insult them" (Schmotter 1979, p. 159). In short, popular insubordination was becoming an increasing problem for establishment ministers even before the Great Awakening began (Stout 1986).

Further Signs of Alienation

As many colonial Protestants became dissatisfied with their spiritual leaders, even as far back as the 1670s, salary disputes had "become so common that incoming ministers routinely demanded written contracts with fixed salaries as a precondition to the 'peace and comfort' of their settlement" (Stout 1986, p. 107). In the late 1600s, some establishment Protestant ministers report being "treated with scorn, and paid in insults, and deprived of what is justly our dues, receiving no salary worth mentioning" (cited in Balmer 2006, p. 191). "As social superiors,

[5] In 1706, an Anglican missionary in New Jersey named John Brooke referred to "my parishioners of Amboy, who are generally poor," a description that applied to many North American colonists and that also likely accounted for much of their resentment toward the upper classes (cited in Balmer 2006, p. 196).

[establishment] ministers believed they were entitled to superior salaries" (Stout 1986, p. 107). Contrastingly, "[t]ight-fisted parishioners continued to argue that low salaries were good for clerical humility…" (Stout 1986, p. 159).

By the eighteenth century, parishioner dissatisfaction appears to have grown dramatically. Evidence of the increasing alienation of professional establishment clergy from congregants can be found in the numerous communiqués from salaried ministers complaining about the difficulty of collecting from congregants the money due them (Balmer 2006). Additionally, the more establishment Protestant ministers "argued for salary, the more worldly they appeared, and the more indifferent parishioners became to their demands" (Schmotter 1979, p. 161).

Spiritual Declension

Not only did many churchgoers feel that the establishment Protestant clerics were out of touch with their flocks, but communiqués describing a general spiritual malaise among many establishment congregations were not uncommon beginning in the latter half of the seventeenth century. By the 1650s, the signs of spiritual apathy were evident in the dropping of the Congregationalist church attendance rate to only one out of every two inhabitants of settled communities such as Dedham; rates in Boston were even lower (Stout 1986). Significantly, establishment clerics were not ones to mince words when it came to ascribing blame for the perceived lukewarm faith of pre-awakened colonial North American Protestants. Establishment ministers unhesitatingly pointed accusatory fingers at the laypeople for the spiritual failure and declension of the day (Stout 1986). Puritan Eleazar Mather, in 1656, delivered the following indictment of the state of New England colonial Congregationalist parishioners.

> The dayes wherein you live are backsliding times, evil dayes, times of great degeneracy, and Apostasy. Alas! little humble walking now, little self-denial, little holiness; Oh how weighty and difficult is their work, that are now called out to stand up for Christ…How hard it is to keep up an House when it is falling down, to keep the Ship from sinking, when it the leak that is sprung hath almost filled it with water [*sic*] (Mather cited in Stout 1986, p. 68).

In 1695, an Anglican minister named John Miller reported on the "wickedness & irreligion of the inhabitants" and of "the great negligence of divine things that is generally found in most people" (Miller cited in Balmer 2006, p. 194). Moreover, Miller also stated that some churchgoers indeed do attend services "out of curiosity to and to find out faults in him that preacheth" (Miller cited in Balmer 2006, p. 194). Some commentators from the first half of the eighteenth century felt that the population's state of morality had generally sunk to a lamentable degree (Valkenburgh 1994).

Underserved Regions

The religious situation was made worse by the lack of ordained clergy, as there were simply not enough seminary-trained ministers to serve the needs of remotely located and widely dispersed eighteenth century colonial era inhabitants (Divine et al. 1984). One frontier parish measured 80 by 130 miles, and one 1730s Pennsylvania minister's parishioners were so widely scattered that he traveled 1,632 miles in a single year to tend his flock (Bonomi 1986). Similarly scattered parishes existed throughout the Southern Backcountry. The most frequently employed metaphor for describing religious life in the Colonies at this time was that of scattered sheep without a shepherd (Bonomi 1986).

Roots of the Awakening: Old World Pietism

The Great Awaking did not arise in a vacuum; rather, it emerged in the wake of seventeenth century religious movements originating in Europe (Kraus 1928). The writings of individuals such as the Calvin-influenced English Puritan William Ames (1576–1633) and pietist Frenchman Philipp Jakob Spener (1635–1705) would have profound effects on subsequent forms of Christianity originating in North America. A nonconformist Ames argued that "any number of individual Christian believers can constitute themselves by voluntary agreement into a church which is conceived to be essentially a congregation of believers under a special bond or covenant with God and with each other" (Gibbs 1971, p. 53).[6] Spener perceived Protestant denominations as being legalistic and filled with complacency; therefore, he advocated the necessity of religious renewal through the sanctification of daily life and personal daily piety with a "new birth" for salvation (Bumsted and Van De Wetering 1976; Kraus 1928; Lauchert 2006; Stoeffler 2005a).[7]

Another pietist, August Herman Francke (1663–1727) from Germany, eschewed the need for rationality and formalism, calling for an "experiential religion" instead (Bumsted and Van De Wetering 1976, p. 31). Francke was one of Spener's followers who became a major advocate of Lutheran pietism (Stoeffler 2005b). In 1729, an English pietist named William Law (1686–1761) stressed the need for believers to undergo self-denial and meditation, and he strove to implement Christian doctrine into practical affairs. Law also called for the creation of a Christian religion based on the heart and argued against a rationalist approach to God. The prevailing message of the pietist movement was to seek God through a

[6] Ames' argumentation facilitated the eventual formation of acephelous and highly divisive types of Protestantism in eighteenth century colonial North America.

[7] It is important to note that Spener did not question the validity of infant baptism.

personal experience (Bumsted and Van De Wetering 1976; Rudolph 2005). These proto-revivalists emphasized the importance of a faith based on emotions over one founded on reason.[8]

Frelinghuysen's Pietism

Evidence that pietism had made it to colonial North America can be found in the preaching of a German-born Dutch Reformed theologian and minister named Theodorus Jacobus Frelinghuysen (1691–1748), who zealously emphasized repentance and strict moral standards while also professing that mere participation in religious rituals without true conversion was an abomination. In 1720, he appeared on a colonial landscape which had been furrowed by class antagonisms, political stress, sectarianism, disease, and the rumblings of war (Balmer 2006). In his efforts against what he perceived as establishment Protestantism's formalism and indifference, Frelinghuysen instituted individual and emotional experiences as prerequisites for church membership, and he called upon all who were listening for a 'new heart' (Bumsted and Van De Wetering 1976, p. 648). His message regarding salvation was a profoundly personal one, as he required prospective church members to undergo a thorough self-examination of their standing in relation to God (Bumsted and Van De Wetering 1976). Demanding greater attention to one's religious state than had been asked in the past, Frelinghuysen warned that those who had not been saved but who acted complacently in their church lives were in the greatest danger of damnation. Most startlingly, he denied communion to many (even members of the church consistory) that were believed to be unregenerate (Balmer 2006; Bumsted and Van De Wetering 1976).

Many of Frelinghuysen's detractors were establishment Protestants from the upper classes who criticized the proto-revivalist's emphasis on tangible religious personal experiences, his emotionalism, and his use of various other unauthorized and unorthodox religious practices, such as ordaining individuals without ecclesiastical permission. Moreover, Frelinghuysen's followers were described by his establishment critics as being "stupid farmers" and "wholly illiterate" (Balmer 2006, p. 199).

[8] Some scholars cite even earlier influences playing a role in the development of Christian revivalism such as the writings of John Duns Scotus (1266–1308), who emphasized aspects of God's power and glory over that of his divine love. This approach exerted a strong influence on John Calvin (1509–1564), who arrived at the conclusion that human beings were utterly depraved, and therefore, were powerless to do anything to save themselves except to first admit to being helplessly lost in this state. They could then look to God for a salvation which had been predestined for them from the very beginning of time. In short, for Calvin, all human efforts at attaining sanctification were futile (Dr. Charles Foss, personal communication to Chacon 2006; Dr. William Kiblinger, personal communication to Chacon 2006; Kidd 2010).

Frelinghuysen explained his great success in attracting converts from among the lower ranks of society by saying that "riches are, frequently, a hindrance in following Jesus" (Frelinghuysen cited in Balmer 2006, p. 198). "Before long, Frelinghuysen had split his church and initiated one of the longest and most bitter ecclesiastical disputes in colonial history" (Bumsted and Van De Wetering 1976, p. 48).

Another portent of the coming revival emanated from Northampton in the Connecticut River Valley in 1734, when a preacher named Jonathan Edwards (1703–1758) delivered a series of "conversion sermons that brought over three hundred new converts into full church membership in one year. Edwards rejoiced at how the revival saved sinners and immediately put an end to differences between ministers and people…All seemed to be seized with a deep concern about their eternal salvation" (Stout 1986, p. 188). While his efforts to spur religious fervor in the Colonies were insufficient to incite revivalism on a grand scale, Edwards would soon obtain support from two dynamic individuals possessing impressive oratorical skills (i.e., William Tennent and George Whitefield) who would help usher in the Great Awakening. In a few short years, these pietist-inspired individuals would ignite a powerful religious conflagration that would forever transform North America's religious and political landscape.

Summary

Perhaps, one of the best descriptions of colonial establishment Protestant life on the eve of the Great Awakening is recorded by Stout (1986), p. 176. "For the most part, young people in these [Congregationalist] communities had grown up in churches where they knew one another's families and where they had been indoctrinated since youth in the importance of local covenant keeping. They understood salvation less as a sudden conversion experience than as a gradual process that coincided with their coming-of-age as parents and landowners. And they were prepared to think of their local church in corporate rather than individual terms."

However, it is important to note that colonial religious life before the Awakening was also characterized by high levels of volatile sectarianism. Unlike Europe, with its established formal church and state relationships, English-held North America was a place where establishment Protestant denominations often jealously competed with each other for adherents (Bonomi 1986; Bumsted and Van De Wetering 1976; Divine et al. 1984; Valkenburgh 1994). Additionally, many colonial Protestants prior to the Awakening felt alienated from their establishment ministers, whom they perceived as being out of touch with commoners (Bumsted and Van De Wetering 1976; Stout 1986).

References

Balmer, R. (2006). *Mine eyes have seen the glory: A journey into the Evangelical subculture in America*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Bonomi, P. (1986). *Under the cope of heaven: Religion, society, and politics in Colonial America*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Bumsted, J., & Van De Wetering, J. (1976). *What must I do to be saved?: The Great Awakening in Colonial America*. Hindsdale: The Dryden Press.
Divine, R., Breen, T. H., Fredrickson, G., & Hal Williams, R. (1984). *America: Past and present*. New York: Scott, Foresman and Company.
Garbarino, M. (1977). *Sociocultural theory in anthropology*. Prospect Heights: Waveland Press.
Gibbs, L. (1971). The puritan natural law theory of William Ames. *Harvard Theological Review, 64*, 37–57.
Hatch, E. (1973). *Theories of man and culture*. New York: Columbia University Press.
Kidd, T. (2010). *God of liberty: A religious history of the American Revolution*. New York: Basic Books.
Kraus, M. (1928). *Intercolonial aspects of American culture on the eve of the revolution*. New York: Columbia University Press.
Lauchert, F. (2006). *Pietism*. New Advent: Catholic Encyclopedia.
Leigh Heyrman, C. (2000). *The first Great Awakening*. Teacher serve home page. National Humanities Center home page. Retrieved October 15, 2006 from http://www.nhc.rtp.nc.us/tserve/eighteen/ekeyinfo/grawaken.htm
Locke, J. (1959). *An essay concerning human understanding*. New York: Dover Publications Inc.
Rudolph, E. (2005). William law. In L. Jones (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of religion* (pp. 5324–5325). New York: Thompson Gale.
Schmotter, J. (1979). The irony of clerical professionalism: New England's Congregational ministers and the Great Awakening. *American Quarterly, 31*(2), 148–168.
Stein, S. (2005). Jonathon Edwards. In J. Lindsay (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of religion* (pp. 2698–2701). New York: Thompson Gale.
Stoeffler, F. E. (2005a). Spener, Philipp Jakob. In J. Lindsay (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of religion* (pp. 8679–8680). New York: Thompson Gale.
Stoeffler, F. E. (2005b). August Hermann Francke. In J. Lindsay (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of religion* (pp. 3185–3186). New York: Thompson Gale.
Stout, H. (1986). *The New England soul: Preaching and religious culture in Colonial New England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Tudor, J. (1962). *Congregationalists in England, 1662–1962*. London: Independent Press.
Valkenburgh, S. (1994). *1740s-Jonathan Edwards and the Great Awakening*. *The Society of Colonial Wars in the State of Connecticut*. Retrieved June 21, 2007 from http://www.colonialwarsct.org/1740_s.htm
Woods, T. (2005). *How the Catholic Church built Western Civilization*. Washington, DC: Regnery Publishing Inc.

Chapter 3
The Great Awakening

The pietist-induced spark that set off the Great Awakening occurred in the late 1730s and early 1740s when revivalist missionaries like Jonathan Edwards, William Tennent (1673–1745), and George Whitefield (1714–1770) began delivering impassioned and heartfelt sermons that brought many colonials to an evangelical conversion experience.

William Tennent was born in Lowland Scotland, educated at the University of Edinburgh, and ordained as a Presbyterian minister. After moving to the Ulster Plantation in the north of Ireland, however, he converted to Anglicanism and was ordained as a minister in the Church of Ireland in 1706. Along with his sons, Gilbert (1703–1764), William Jr. (1705–1777), John (1706–1732), and Charles (1711–1771), Tennent was profoundly influenced by Frelinghuysen's pietism and public speaking techniques and zealously spread the new birth revival throughout the English-held North American colonies (Bumsted and Van De Wetering 1976; Coalter 1986; Stout 1986). The Tennents were well known for their claims of mystical experiences and they related their alleged empyrean encounters to their audiences throughout their ministry. John Tennent's conversion experience reportedly "lasted four days and nights, which he spent in such anguish that brother Gilbert described John's conversion as the 'most violent in degree'" (cited in Landsman 1982, p. 157). The conversion of William Jr. was even more remarkable. "While discoursing with his elder brother upon the state of his soul, William [Jr.] fell into a trance that lasted for three days, during which he imagined that he had embarked upon a journey with a mystical guide" (Landsman 1982, p. 157). William Jr. would regularly retreat from his congregation to embark on "supernatural" voyages. "Several times [William Jr.] Tennent undertook such exercises, and each time it promoted a mini-revival within the congregation" (Landsman 1982, p. 157).

R. J. Chacon and M. C. Scoggins, *The Great Awakening and Southern Backcountry Revolutionaries*, SpringerBriefs in Anthropology and Ethics,
DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-04597-9_3, © The Author(s) 2014

The Calvinistic-leaning Jonathan Edwards helped spread the revival via itinerant preaching.[1] Edwards believed in the universal depravity of humankind and that the fate of each person had been predetermined by an omnipotent God.[2] Therefore, there was absolutely nothing a human being could do to save himself (Divine et al. 1984; Stein 2005). Preaching the need for a "new birth," he argued that an individual stood alone before God and that church membership was not enough for salvation. Edwards stated that what was needed was a true conversion on the part of the believer and that this true conversion occurred at the moment that grace was infused into the life of the individual. The veracity of this conversion experience was made evident by the presence of faith and love within a person (Divine et al. 1984; Hines 2006; Stein 2005). "Here is the point of revival for eighteenth century America. The reborn, who arrived at that state through an indescribable and relatively formless internal experience, could anticipate the beauty of salvation in the future and appreciate the joy of harmony with God in the present" (Bumsted and Van De Wetering 1976, p. 67). In other words, for Edwards, individuals seeking salvation would have to undergo a conversion experience rather than submitting to baptism. Edwards also claimed that many of the establishment Protestant clergymen had grown lukewarm in their faith (Divine et al. 1984; Hines 2006; Stout 1986).

In his sermons, Edwards often stressed the utterly corrupt state of humanity and the terrors awaiting the unrepentant in hell. His most famous sermon, "Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God," (see below) was so evocative that many listeners reported that it was as if Edwards had opened up the pit of hell so one could smell the smoke and brimstone (Hines 2006; Valkenburgh 1994).[3]

> Your wickedness makes you as it were heavy as lead, and to tend downwards with great weight and pressure towards hell; and if God should let you go, you would immediately sink and swiftly descend and plunge into the bottomless gulf, and your healthy constitution, and your care and prudence, and best contrivance, and all your righteousness, would have no more influence to uphold you and keep you out of hell, than a spider's web would have to stop a fallen rock (Edwards cited in Stout 1986, p. 229).

Moreover, in the 1740s, Edwards announced the Second Coming to be imminent and he managed to convince thronging crowds that God was preparing His chosen people (i.e., the North American colonists) for the Apocalypse.[4] He stated,

[1] New World itinerant preaching is linked to strategies employed by European non-conformists against the Church of England in the seventeenth century (Bonomi 1986).

[2] "Edwards was fighting against the tide of most eighteenth-century philosophy associated with the Enlightenment, which asserted that people were naturally good, or at least could cultivate virtue without God's intervention" (Kidd 2010, p. 100).

[3] Edwards' preaching style lacked the melodrama of his revivalist contemporaries; however, his use of language was exceptional (Stout 1986).

[4] Millennialism would come to dominate the worldview of revivalists.

"What is now seen in New England may prove the dawn of that glorious day" (Edwards cited in Divine et al. 1984, p. 99).[5]

William Tennent's son, John, also preached the absolute necessity of a "new birth" for salvation, chastised the sinful and excoriated anyone who opposed his teachings, which can be summarized as follows: "Man is a depraved sinner, destined to evil on earth and to damnation in eternity. He must search his soul to recognize his depravity, which once it is seen, permits hope. Once the unequivocal evil of the sinning state is recognized, the individual is prepared for a God-given rebirth…Every act could now be good and true. Life on earth could be dedicated to the glory of God" (Bumsted and Van De Wetering 1976, p. 67).[6]

For the Awakened, human beings could be placed in only one of two possible categories: "saved" and "unsaved." What determined a person's state depended on whether or not he or she had undergone an identifiable personal conversion experience. In other words, salvation no longer stemmed from baptism and the daily striving to remain faithful to one's baptismal and/or covenantal promises unto death (Bumsted and Van De Wetering 1976).[7] Additionally, many supporters of the revival "generally accepted the 'doctrine of assurance' which is the concept that one can know with absolute certainty one's place among the elect and that certain knowledge of one's election in itself constitutes critical evidence of a satisfactory conversion experience" (Bumsted and Van De Wetering 1976, p. 106).

[5] Most colonial era establishment Protestant ministers did not engage in attempts at uncovering the precise date of the Second Coming (Stout 1986). However, on the basis of his study of scripture, the Puritan minister Cotton Mather (1663–1728) predicted that the Second Coming would take place in 1697. After this year came and went without incident, he modified his "prophecy" and announced that the Apocalypse would occur in 1716, only to revise it later to 1717 (Boyer 2008).

[6] The influence of Calvinism is quite apparent in many of the Tennent's teachings.

[7] In short, the Awakened eschewed sacramental theology along with all liturgical forms of worship (Balmer 1984). This eighteenth century development marks a watershed in the history of Protestantism in North America, as it constitutes a radical rejection of Classical Christianity's belief in the validity of the sacraments (particularly belief in the efficacy of infant baptism). An analysis of the historical record reveals that the Early Church Fathers, Roman Catholic and Orthodox Christian theologians, along with every single one of the Protestant Reformers, believed in the merits of baptizing infants (Bennett 2002; Dr. Charles Foss, personal communication to Chacon, 2006; Dr. William Kiblinger, personal communication to Chacon, 2006; Jurgens 1970). It is important to note that Awakened preachers were not the first Christians to attack the validity of infant baptism. In the 1520s, Anabaptists believed that baptism only signified an external sign of an interior faith commitment on the part of the believer, and adherence to this novel belief caused this sect to come into conflict Luther, Zwingli, and the Roman Catholic Church. In short, they did not believe that baptism was a saving (regenerative) sacrament. This relatively novel understanding of baptism would influence the development of North American Protestantism (Dyck 2005; Weber 2007).

Passion and Melodrama Stream from the Pulpit into the Aisles

From the late 1730s through the early 1740s, the Calvinist-Methodist revivalist George Whitefield, who was originally ordained an Anglican deacon, also asserted that sinful human beings were totally dependent on the mercy of an all powerful God, and he went on to promote the Awakened "new birth" movement via itinerant preaching from New Hampshire to Georgia. By all accounts, Whitefield was a captivating and emotional preacher and performer, due in no small part to his early education in the theatrical arts. In both England and America, Whitefield enthralled unprecedented crowds who traveled long distances to hear him speak, filling up churches, town squares, and even open fields (Divine et al. 1984; Gaustad 2005; Valkenburgh 1994). "He generated such excitement that audiences appeared out of control as they elbowed, shoved and trampled over themselves to hear of 'divine things' from the famed Whitefield" (Stout 1986, p. 190). An observer described one of the revivalist's gatherings as being packed with people and horses (Valkenburgh 1994).[8] Whitefield's "hold on his hearers was magnetic, and there were few who did not feel the powerful attraction of his personality. It was estimated that between thirty and forty thousand converts were made in New England alone…" (Kraus 1928, p. 81).

According to Stout, "Whitefield straddled the line between drama and melodrama to near perfection" (1986, p. 190). So effective a communicator was Whitefield that after listening to the preacher, one person reported experiencing what he called a "heart wound" (Divine et al. 1984, p. 99). "So finely honed was his [Whitefield's] sense of timing (formed in part by a childhood exposure to the stage) that he frequently departed from his intended words to make some dramatic improvement on the moment." On one occasion, for example, the revivalist took advantage of a passing thunder storm to seemingly evoke the voice of the Almighty from the heavens as one eyewitness wrote:

> 'See here!' said he [Whitefield], pointing to the lightning, which played on the corner of the pulpit—'Tis a glance from the angry eye of Jehovah! Hark!' continued he, raising his finger in a listening attitude, as the distant thunder grew louder and louder, and broke in one tremendous crash over the building. 'It was the voice of the Almighty as he passed by in his anger!' As the sound died away, he covered his face with his hands, and knelt beside his pulpit, apparently lost in inward and intense prayer. The storm passed rapidly away, and the sun bursting forth in his [its] might, threw across the heavens a magnificent arch of peace. Rising and pointing to the beautiful object he exclaimed, 'Look upon the rainbow, and praise him that made it (Gilles cited in Stout 1986, p. 191).[9]

---

[8] Whitefield was such a popular preacher who drew such large crowds that revival organizers were often obliged to schedule his speaking engagements outdoors in order to accommodate the multitudes (Valkenburgh 1994).

[9] The eighteenth century revivalist penchant for the sensational is retained by some modern day Christian Fundamentalist leaders. In 1988, televangelist Pat Robertson publicly took credit for having used his intercessory powers of prayer to steer the oncoming Hurricane Gloria away from

Like Edwards, Whitefield was disillusioned with colonial establishment Protestantism and stated, "Don't tell me you are a Baptist, an Independent, a Presbyterian, a dissenter, tell me you are a Christian, that is all I want" (cited in Divine et al. 1984, p. 99).

Shifting the Blame

Unlike the long stream of establishment Protestant ministers who, since the seventeenth century, had placed culpability for the perceived lukewarm character of colonial religious life squarely on the shoulders of laypeople, Whitefield pointed an accusatory finger at the "unconverted" (i.e. nonrevivalist) establishment Protestant ministers whom he disparagingly described as being "a Stench to the nostrils of His Holiness" (Whitefield cited in Stout 1986, p. 195). Preaching extemporaneously, Whitefield unhesitatingly and vehemently criticized non-Awakened establishment clergy who in his view, had grown to rely too heavily on "head knowledge" (i.e., the Enlightenment's influence) to the detriment of the Gospel (Gaustad 2005; Stout 1986). Whitefield spoke of how the Lord had instructed him to "open my mouth boldly against unconverted [establishment Protestant] ministers; for I am persuaded, the generality of preachers talk of an unknown and unfelt Christ. The reason why congregations have been dead is, because they have dead men preaching to them…How can dead men beget living children?" (Whitefield cited in Stout 1986, p. 194). Therefore, Whitefield's declarations liberated common folk from shouldering the burdensome guilt of the pre-Awakened period's perceived tepid faith (Stout 1986). Based on this reasoning, revivalists claimed to "propagate a new Gospel, as unknown to the generality of [establishment Protestant] Christian ministers and people" (Gaustad 2005, p. 9726).

Whitefield's message that all needed to undergo a distinct new birth or "born again" conversion experience was accepted by many (but certainly not all) colonial Protestants. However, the young and the disenfranchised sectors of society, who were in dire need of rapid solutions to the constellation of problems they faced, were immensely attracted to the revival. In short, the Awakening's message deeply resonated with those who were anxious, insecure, afraid and/or marginalized, by tapping into their desire for an instantaneous, uncomplicated, irrevocable and infallible solution to the many vicissitudes of life they faced (Bumsted and Van De Wetering 1976).

Whitefield transmitted his impassioned revivalist message, which included claims that he was receiving special and direct guidance from the Holy Spirit, in unique ways. He transformed religious gatherings into gripping theatrical

(Footnote 9 continued)
his corporate headquarters located in Virginia Beach, VA. Unfortunately, Robertson failed to provide justification for why he chose to supernaturally deflect this storm toward other beaches located along the east coast causing damage in the billions of dollars (Media Matters 2005).

performances by employing dramatic gestures, sometimes openly weeping, and he would pepper his sermons with all-out threats of hell fire and brimstone being directed toward at anyone who failed to heed his call to repentance (Gaustad 1966, 2005; Leigh Heyrman 2000; Valkenburgh 1994). Regarding these gatherings, one eyewitness stated, "I have seen upwards of a thousand people hang on his [Whitefield's] words with breathless silence, broken only by an occasional half-suppressed sob" (cited in Divine et al. 1984, p. 99). His dramatizations resonated with so many, in part, because of his novel technique of extemporaneously speaking to audiences in everyday language.[10] According to Stout, "Whitefield urged [revivalist] ministers and aspiring ministers to preach without notes and criticized recorded sermons as a deficiency in faith" (1986, p. 192).[11]

Significantly, the Awakening's effusive religious services were antithetical to the existing establishment Protestant liturgical practices. The practice of delivering sermons without prepared notes was something that most eighteenth century college-trained establishment Protestant ministers traditionally did not engage in. Establishment clerics with formal education "were enjoined to keep to the substance of their sermons and keep to their notes; parishioners were enjoined to sit still and listen" (Stout and Onuf 1983, p. 568). Moreover, the demeanor in establishment religious meetings was one characterized by respectful and silent attention to sermons with congregations vocalizing appropriate responses at set times during the service but with **no** overt displays of emotion being allowed (Bonomi 1986).[12] Establishment ministers typically offered sermons calling for parishioners to engage in upright behavior, which meant observing moderation in social activities such as drinking, card playing, dancing, fiddling, horse racing etc. Additionally, as previously mentioned, many establishment Protestant ministers delivered sermons stressing rationalist ideas (stemming from the Enlightenment) that "promoted sound morality, or deep studied Metaphysiks" [*sic*] (cited in Bonomi 1986, p. 101). Moreover, at establishment services, rules of social order were scrupulously followed in terms of seating individuals in accordance to their position in the community's hierarchy (Kidd 2010; Stout 1986).

---

[10] During this time period George Whitefield also "garnered nearly one-third of the total colonial publishing market with his books and sermons" (Malone 2004, p. 437).

[11] Individuals possessing formal education and training but who, nonetheless, had converted to revivalism and wished to become itinerant preachers, were compelled to renounce much of what they had learned in college. "The new ideas, attitudes, and articles of reasonable faith that came with the Enlightenment had to be left behind, as did carefully reasoned written discourses that could be read from the pulpit in a properly grave manner. Instead, they had to learn to speak without substantial notes, and they had to learn to deliver their message in a more animated, 'heart-felt' style" (Stout 1986, p. 200). It is important to note that many converts to revivalism did not possess much formal education (Bonomi 1986; Bumsted and Van De Wetering 1976; Stout 1986).

[12] Locke, who was concerned about the conflating of human emotion (i.e. enthusiasm) with genuine spiritual insight, makes the following statement: "Whereby in effect it [enthusiasm] takes away both reason and revelation, and substitutes in the room of them, the underground fancies of a man's own brain" (Locke 1959, p. 430).

Contrastingly, at Awakened gatherings, stringent hierarchical seating arrangements reinforcing existing class distinctions were rejected and worship services were anything but demure, as reports of such revivalist meetings typically include descriptions of grown men being seized with the urge to sob and weep openly while wringing their hands and bewailing their sins. According to Stout, "A new form of mass communications appeared in which people were encouraged—even commanded—to speak out concerning the great work of grace in their souls" (1986, p. 193). It was reported that participants would often cry out loudly, sing, writhe in agony over their transgressions, sometimes collapse and generally would behave in exceedingly unusual manners (Bonomi 1986; Bumsted and Van De Wetering 1976; Stout 1986). The peculiar behaviors and unrestrained emotional outbursts of Awakened groups often drew large crowds that came to witness the spectacle. It was not uncommon for revivalists to shriek, sob uncontrollably, undergo convulsions (commonly referred to as 'the jerks') and then to collapse on the floor in a trancelike state (Leigh Heyrman 1997).[13] One eyewitness described one of these eighteenth century revival meetings:

> Many had their countenances changed; their thoughts seemed to trouble them, so that the joints of their loins were loosed, and their knees smote one against another. Great numbers cried out aloud in the anguish of their souls. Several stout men fell as though a cannon had been discharged, and a ball had made its way through their hearts. Some young women were thrown into hysteric fits. The site and noise of lamentations seemed a little resemblance of what we might imagine will be when the great Judge pronounces the tremendous sentence of "Go, ye cursed, into everlasting fire." There were so many in distress, that I could not get a particular knowledge of the special reasons, at that time, only as I heard them crying, "Woe is me! What must I do?" And such sort of short sentences with bitter accents (cited in Bumsted and Van De Wetering 1976, p. 89).

Sowing the Seeds of Discord Among Colonial Protestants

Undoubtedly, one of the aspects of the Awakening that caused great friction was the tenet held by revivalists that individuals who believed with absolute certainty in their own salvation could also discern the eternal state of other people's souls. That is to say, those who experienced a "new birth" often claimed the capacity to infallibly ascertain whether or not someone else was either "saved" or "unsaved" (Bumsted and Van De Wetering 1976). Additionally, many revivalists declared the ability to recognize "true" Christian ministers by way of an inward "feeling of the heart" (Vaklenburgh 1994).

---

[13] Edwards believed that the reason why so many people experienced outward seizures and fits (i.e., 'the jerks') at revivalist gatherings was because their leaders had not properly prepared them for their conversions; neither had they been provided with an adequate vocabulary to express their spiritual experiences (Stout 1986).

Moreover, the revivalists' evocative sermons, accusing nonrevivalists of following unscriptural (damnable) practices, inspired a large wave of peripatetic preachers who generally scorned establishment Protestantism's leadership and traveled the countryside accusing professional denominational clergy of being stiff necked and complacent in their attitude toward religion (Divine et al. 1984; Schmotter 1979). In March of 1740 at Nottingham, Pennsylvania, Gilbert Tennent publicly expressed his disdain for non-revivalist establishment Protestant leaders by delivering a speech titled "The Danger of an Unconverted Ministry," in which he accused the local non-Awakened clerics of hampering the will of God. Moreover he referred to non-revivalist leaders as "subtle selfish hypocrites" (cited in Bumsted and Van De Wetering 1976, p. 83).[14] Tennent held that most establishment Protestant ministers were unspiritual individuals and he went so far as to compare the Philadelphia Synod (which had rejected revivalist teachings) as being as hypocritical and legalistic as the Pharisees who had conspired against Christ. He asserted that nonrevivalist establishment leaders were like wolves in sheep's clothing, filled with intellectual hubris, and that their blindness to the truths of the Gospel stemmed from their lack of a personal knowledge of Christ (Bumsted and Van De Wetering 1976; Coalter 1986; Reid 2003). Tennent described nonrevivalist clergy as being unconverted and wicked men whose discourses are "cold and sapless, as it were freeze between their lips" (cited in Bonomi 1986, p. 144).

According to Tennent, colonial Christianity's greatest problem was not parishioner apathy but rather "blind, unregenerate, carnal, lukewarm, and unskilled guides" (cited in Stout 1986, p. 199).[15] An Awakened preacher derided any establishment Protestant minister who did not fully endorse the revival as being a promoter of "the way of the devil…Satan transformed into the Angel of Light" (cited in Bumsted and Van De Wetering 1976, p. 109). Edwards described critics of the Awakening as being self-justifying worms: "If one worm be a little exalted above another, by having himself more dust or a bigger dunghill, how much does he make of himself? What a distance does he keep from those that are below him!" (Edwards cited in Stout 1986, p. 205). One of Whitefield's associates and financial backers stated that non-revivalist Protestant ministers "waxed fat and kicked against Christ" (cited in Schmotter 1979, p. 161).

Thus, the Tennents, Edwards, and Whitefield openly promoted rebellion by encouraging laypeople to cease deferring to establishment Protestant authorities and to study their Bibles in their own homes. Gilbert Tennent urged those who had embraced the revival to abandon their non-Awakened establishment Protestant congregations by asking them the following question: "Isn't an unconverted [non-revivalist] Minister like a Man who would learn others to swim, before he has

[14] Frelinghuysen convinced Gilbert Tennent of the necessity of a conversion experience in the life of a person purporting to be a Christian (Coalter 1986).

[15] Revivalists found that attacks on allegedly unconverted (non-revivalist) ministers were an extremely powerful and effective strategy for inciting popular rebellion against establishment Protestantism (Stout 1986).

learn't it himself, and so is drowned in the Act, and dies like a Fool?" (Tennent cited in Schmotter 1979, pp. 162–163).

New Lights versus Old Lights

By the early 1740s, Protestant supporters of the Awakening had begun referring to themselves as "New Lights" and their relatively novel approach to Christianity was one that condoned effusive religious emotion and subjectivism. It is important to note that many itinerant revivalist preachers disparagingly referred to opponents of revivalism as "Old Lights" and characterized them as being "cold, uninspiring and lacking in piety and grace" (Leigh Heyrman 2000). Time and time again, converts to the New Light were urged to break fellowship and withdraw from Old Light (nonrevivalist) congregations so "that the precious Seed might be preserved and separated from all gross mixtures" (cited in Bonomi 1986, p. 152).[16] Indeed, many Awakened preachers instructed their listeners to sever all ties with nonrevivalist establishment Christians by quoting 2 Corinthians 6:14–17: "Be not unequally yoked together with Unbelievers…Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate." It is also important to note that the Awakening's itinerant preachers were generally considered as outsiders by the establishment clergy, and were thus "hungry for converts" (Dr. Edward Lee, personal communication to Chacon, 2006). Adherence to these separatist admonitions would result in the decentralization of control over the interpretation of Scriptural texts that colonial-era establishment Protestant clergy maintained up until this time (Leigh Heyrman 2000). The proclivity toward forming insular groups reflected the revivalist tendency of considering those who thought and acted differently from them as not being "true" Christians (Bumsted and Van De Wetering 1976).

The disdain that many New Light revivalists felt toward Old Light nonrevivalists is illustrated in the following example. In 1766, the Anglican missionary Charles Woodmason complained that on Christmas Day, Awakened South Carolina Presbyterians refused him the use of the local common meetinghouse to conduct the liturgy. When Woodmason insisted on celebrating the Anglican Rite of Communion, a revivalist mob broke into the chapel and smeared the communion table with excrement (Leigh Heyrman 1997).[17]

The Awakening promoted a radicalized and highly individualistic form of Christianity. "No longer were consensual values to prevail over individual ones, at least in matters concerning the soul. Now private judgment and intuitive

[16] It is important to note that at the beginning of the Awakening, many Old Lights and New Lights were often members of the same establishment Protestant denomination. Eventually many New Lights rejected the ecclesiastical authority of the colonial establishment Protestant denominations and formed independent Awakened revivalist fellowships.

[17] The passing of the English Test Act of 1704 caused many Scotch-Irish Presbyterians, who were being persecuted by the Church of England, to emigrate. Thus, many colonial settlers harbored deep resentment toward the Anglican Church (Scoggins 2012).

understanding had equal if not superior claim on the conscience. In a word, decision making [in religious matters] had been internalized" (Bonomi 1986, p. 158). The revivalist message was that "the individual, standing alone in the sight of God, was the primary vessel of salvation" (Bonomi 1986, pp. 159–160). Therefore, submission to establishment Protestant ecclesiastical authority was unnecessary for following Christ or for the interpretation of scriptural texts. Potential members of Awakened fellowships no longer needed to be scrutinized by an establishment church panel before being admitted into a congregation. Furthermore, converts to the revivalism enjoyed an alleged irrevocable "assurance of salvation" that was confirmed by way of their inward feelings. The revival transferred religious authority from college-educated clergyman into the hands of mostly untrained and relatively uneducated individuals (Bonomi 1986; McLoughlin 1959). Bumsted and Van De Wetering cogently summarize some of the simmering and destabilizing theological questions that surfaced at the Awakening:

> If conversion was necessary for church membership, and was as emotionally sudden as it had been during the revival, what about those who had become members before the Awakening? Were they truly converted? If all converted men were equal in God's eyes, and if grace were the only mark of a true Christian, then why all the clerical emphasis on professional standards such as education and formal ordination? If all Christians were equal, all could exhort and preach the Gospel. And if any converted soul could preach, why did [establishment] ministers insist on being so well paid for their activities?…How could infants be baptized if grace (which supposedly requires some intellectual assent) is the distinguishing mark of a Christian? (Bumsted and Van De Wetering 1976, p. 93).

The mass democratization of scriptural interpretation promoted by the revival resulted in colonial-era North American Protestants becoming even more sharply polarized than in pre-Awakened days.[18] Revivalists held that "a conversion experience that touched the heart was the only road to salvation. The non-revivalist rationalists demurred, preferring a faith tempered by an enlightened mind" (Bonomi 1986, p. 132).[19] Town assemblies, congregations and families alike were torn asunder over the question of whether one should follow a path which emphasized a heart-centered faith over a more reasoned and rational approach to Christianity (Bonomi 1986; Leigh Heyrman 1997).[20]

---

[18] The formation of "democratized" Christianity in North American is recorded by Hatch (1989).

[19] For Establishment Protestants, grace was achievable only over long periods of training and only to those possessing highly educable minds, which were relatively few in number. For revivalists, true religion lay not in doctrine but in an emotionally charged moment of conversion (Heimert 1966; McLoughlin 1967).

[20] Many converts to revivalism believed that it was their sacred duty to win over their non-revivalist kin, and many endeavored to do so in the most uncharitable of manners, often deeply offending and estranging targeted family members. See Leigh Heyrman (1997) for numerous examples of New Light revivalists treating their presumed "nonsaved" family members with great harshness. Conversely, in one instance, an irate Old Light husband, whose wife had been baptized by a revivalist without his permission, emptied a load of buckshot into the revivalist

The Awakening caused many parishioners with little or no theological training to begin making decisions on church related matters for themselves (Stout 1986). Thus, in this manner, New Lights spurred religious choices that threatened the ecclesiastical status quo among establishment Protestantism throughout colonial North America, and in its place, they introduced a destabilizing and acrimonious discourse. As one New Jersey Presbyterian of the day explained, "There are so many particular sects and Parties among professed Christians…that we know not in which of these different paths, to steer our course for Heaven" (cited in Divine et al. 1984, p. 101).

As previously reported, itinerant preachers publicly attacked non-revivalist leaders and as a result, Awakened converts openly criticized their Old Light Protestant ministers. Many churchgoers abandoned their establishment denominations for "new birth" revivalist congregations if their demands for change were not met to their satisfaction. Establishment Protestant clergy were often considered by the Awakened to be tax supported unconverted hireling preachers (Bumsted and Van De Wetering 1976; Stout and Onuf 1983). Many revivalist-inspired new birth fellowships, which rejected all forms of religious hierarchy and supported hyperzealous missionary activities, were typically led by individuals possessing little or no formal training/education (Bumsted and Van De Wetering 1976). According to Stout, many revivalists no longer trusted the preaching of ordained establishment Protestant ministers and therefore, they embarked on untutored, extemporaneous itinerant campaigns of their own (1986, p. 210).

Davenport's Anti-denominationalism and Anti-intellectualism

In the 1740s, revivalist James Davenport (1716–1757) claimed to receive empyrean knowledge of the "Truth" directly from the Holy Spirit and proceeded to attack establishment Protestant clergymen who opposed the Awakening by characterizing them as Pharisees and also as wolves in sheep's clothing (Bumsted and Van De Wetering 1976; Divine et al. 1984; Stout and Onuf 1983). Davenport declared that unregenerate (Old Light) ministers were as harmful to souls as "swallowing ratsbane or poison is to bodies" (Davenport cited in Stearns 1970, p. 44). He added fuel

(Footnote 20 continued)
pastor who presided over the ritual (Leigh Heyrman 1997). Colonial-era New Light leaders sought to console adherents (whose conversion had alienated them from their families) by declaring that followers of revivalism now had a new church family. Leaders would also minister to Awakened individuals bereft of family by quoting the following passage: "There is no man that hath left house, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my sake, and the gospel's, but he shall receive an hundredfold now in this time, houses, and brethren, and sisters, and mothers, and children, and lands, with persecutions; and in the world to come eternal life" (Mark 10:29–30). See Leigh Heyrman (1997) for further documentation of the divisive effects that revivalist teachings and practices had on many North American Protestant colonial era families.

to sectarian fires by publicly proclaiming a total of 12 Boston establishment Protestant ministers as being unconverted (i.e., unsaved) (Bonomi 1986). According to one 1742 report in the *Boston Evening Post*:

> Mr. D[avenport] I heard declare on the Hill near Charlestown Ferry, that the greatest part of the [establishment Protestant] Ministers in this Country were unconverted, and that they were murdering of souls by Thousands and by Millions. In the Common I heard him say, The greatest part of the Ministers in Boston were carnal unconverted men, and exhort the people to pray for the conversion of those miserable and wretched men. At another Time, in the Common, I heard him say, The Ministers of Boston were going to Hell themselves, and drawing multitudes after them (cited in Stout and Onuf 1983, p. 573).

Davenport continued to fan revivalist flames by encouraging those who had "seen the light" to spread the Awakening's message via itinerant preaching (Bumsted and Van De Wetering 1976, p. 90). In 1742, he traveled along the Connecticut coast heralding the need for pure living and also repudiating establishment Protestantism.[21] Moreover, he played upon popular emotions by providing the masses with theatrical services that employed public speaking techniques copied from Whitefield.[22] Davenport, like many other Awakened preachers, violated the eighteenth century norms of pulpit decorum by preaching extemporaneously and by conducting religious events in rather undignified locations such as fields, orchards, barns, and many other places lacking any pretense of religiosity (Divine et al. 1984; Stout and Onuf 1983; Valkenburgh 1994).[23] "At night, under the light of smoky torches, he danced and stripped, shrieked and laughed" (cited in Divine et al. 1984, p. 100). Davenport also employed music as a means of communicating his message as well as an outlet for the anger and frustration that many marginalized colonial inhabitants were experiencing at that time. "Of all the disorderly practices of Davenport's followers, singing in the streets, at the tops of their lungs—often at night—was most disturbing to public order. Enthusiasts broke into song on any and every occasion" (Stout and Onuf 1983, p. 567). In 1742, newspapers reported that "He walked the streets with a large mob on his heels, singing all the way…They look'd more like a company of Bacchanalians after a mad Frolick than sober Christians who had been worshiping God" [*sic*] (cited in Stout and Onuf 1983, p. 569).

Many Old Lights criticized Davenport's unorthodox preaching by stating that it was more appropriate for the stage than for a pulpit. One observer stated that

---

[21] "Davenport had no qualms about publically questioning the salvation of established ministers—sometimes naming those he deemed unconverted and publically praying for them to experience the new birth" (Kidd 2010, p. 22).

[22] Davenport was known to deliver emotional speeches evoking "the agonies of hell and the joys of salvation, and at least on one occasion he spoke for twenty-four hours straight" (Kidd 2010, p. 22).

[23] Some critics suggested that Davenport was mad and claimed that "in any sober country in the world, he would be confined; and yet in [Connecticut], he is attended with crowds and looked upon by numbers as an angel of God. In a hot day, he strips to his shirt, mounts a cart, or any eminence upon the street, and roars and bellows, and flings his arms, till he is ready to drop down with the violence of the action" (cited in Kidd 2010, p. 23).

Davenport's "Gestures in preaching are theatrical, his Voice tumultuous, his whole Speech and Behavior discovering the Freaks of Madness and the wilds of Enthusiasm" (cited in Stout and Onuf 1983, pp. 568–569). Another observer noted that Davenport would work himself up "into the most extravagant Gesture in both Prayer and Preaching—His expressions in Prayer are often indecently familiar" (cited in Stout and Onuf 1983, p. 569). According to one newspaper account, "Were you to see him [Davenport] in his most violent Agitations, you would be apt to think, that, he was a Madman just broke from his chains" (cited in Stout and Onuf 1983, p. 569).[24] Davenport promoted egalitarianism among his flock by encouraging congregants to assume assertive roles at religious gatherings and this practice is made evident by the many references and denunciations of "the most terrible noise, that was heard a mile from the place [of worship]"(cited in Stout and Onuf 1983, p. 570). At Davenport's amorphous and unscripted meetings, anyone was potentially a public speaker (Stout and Onuf 1983).[25] In stark contrast to Awakened gatherings, establishment Protestant services only permitted seminary-trained, ordained and salaried clergy to expound upon the Scriptures. Critics of revivalism disparaged Davenport's followers and assemblies by characterizing them as a "giddy audience…chiefly made up of idle or ignorant persons" (cited in Bonomi 1986, p. 150).

In 1742, Davenport's ministry embraced an Apocalyptic overtone as he informed his followers that he had been the recipient of an extraordinary message from God disclosing the proximity of The End of the world. Davenport assured his flock that it had been strongly impressed upon his mind that "in a very short time all these things will be involv'd in devouring flames" [*sic*] (cited in Stout and Onuf 1983, p. 574). In February of 1743, he once again reported having direct communications from God. On March 6th of that same year, Davenport admonished his followers to renounce the idol of worldly wisdom, and his distrust of formal learning led him to condemn universities as being places of darkness. His deeply entrenched anti-intellectual streak was further revealed when he instructed his large following that in order to be saved, they were to burn all books written by authors who had not experienced the "New Light" as defined by proponents of the Great Awakening. Under Davenport's orders, while singing religious psalms and hymns, agitated revivalists burned all such publications in a street bonfire (Bumsted and Van De Wetering 1976; Divine et al. 1984; Stout and Onuf 1983; Valkenburgh 1994). The mob engaging in the public torching of books was described by an eyewitness as "madmen consumed by their flaming zeal and enthusiastic fury" (cited in Stout and Onuf 1983, p. 557). Many of the burned works had indeed been authored by establishment Protestant

[24] Kidd (2010, p. 199) reports that Davenport would "scream at his congregations, beating the pulpit and foaming at the mouth, until the crowd would erupt into a chaos of shouts, tears, and extemporaneous prayers."

[25] Davenport justified such practices by claiming that the ability of nonordained individuals to speak out at religious gatherings was a gift of the Holy Spirit (Valkenburgh 1994).

clergymen (Valkenburgh 1994).[26] News of this act of senseless destruction shocked the colonial world and on March 29, 1743, the local Suffolk County Court issued writs against the book burners and it would later be determined that Davenport had been in a state of *non compos mentis* at the time of the burning (Stout and Onuf 1983; Valkenburgh 1994).[27]

Contrary to the antiintellectual attitudes promoted by the likes of Davenport, some New Lights founded several important centers for the training of young men and the promotion of revivalist inspired teachings. In 1747, New Light Presbyterians established the College of New Jersey, which later became Princeton University. Other revivalists were involved in the founding of Brown (1764), Rutgers (1766), and Dartmouth (1769) (Divine et al. 1984).

Individualism and a New Form of Protestantism

The inefficient transportation mechanisms operating in colonial times created vast pockets of isolated populations. Exacerbating this situation was the fact that many remotely located and economically marginalized communities found it exceedingly difficult to attract and retain seminary-trained establishment Protestant clergy. Consequently, many non-ordained itinerant Awakened preachers possessing little if any formal education, targeted underserved regions, and populations. These roaming revivalists, who promoted individualistic and new teachings, attracted vast crowds to their gatherings by using theatrical techniques, and sensationalistic proclamations that appealed to largely unchurched common folk. At these meetings, revivalists stressed the importance of an individual's relationship to God as opposed to emphasizing the need for Christians to work for social change.[28] Therefore, many of the Awakening's leadership made little effort at

[26] Davenport would go on to instruct his large following that they were also to set fire to all of their other "worldy items" (i.e., luxury goods). Items of apparel such as cambick caps, wigs, silk gowns, petticoats, short cloaks, hoods, gowns, red heeled shoes, rings, jewels, necklaces, and fans were considered carnal. Therefore, their immolation would symbolize a believer's rejection of all earthly attachments. This destruction of personal property would have certainly taken place had it not been for the intervention of a moderate who convinced Davenport and his followers to do otherwise (Bumsted and Van De Wetering 1976; Divine et al. 1984; Stout and Onuf 1983; Valkenburgh 1994).

[27] What the authors find most troubling about this episode in North American colonial history is not the fact that a certain leader called for the wanton destruction of books and other valuable items of personal property but that large numbers of individuals were so amenable to following a madman.

[28] However, in 1732, Jonathan Edwards preached on the need for Christian individuals to render aid to the poor (Capoccia 1986). Nonetheless, he never sought to change many of the social conditions that created and/or perpetuated social injustice and poverty (Stewart Swetland, personal communication to Chacon, 2007). In fact, Jonathan Edwards along with his father, the Reverend Timothy Edwards, and several other colonial era Protestant clergymen owned slaves. Additionally, while George Whitefield founded an orphanage in Georgia, both he and Jonathan

attempting to transform existing *internal* societal power structures which created and/or perpetuated social inequality (Bonomi 1986; Bumsted and Van De Wetering 1976).

Awakened itinerants not only rejected many of the tenets of Classical Christianity (such as belief in the validity of infant baptism), these roaming preachers also denounced such relatively innocuous activities such as dancing, fiddling, social drinking, card playing, log rolling, and horse racing as being sinful. Therefore, Awakened followers were instructed to renounce such activities and to break fellowship with anyone who engaged in these pastimes that revivalists considered ungodly. Adherence to these restrictions often further estranged converts from their non-revivalist friends and relatives who believed that these aforementioned practices were relatively harmless as long as they were conducted in moderation (Leigh Heyrman 1997). Further examples of some of the novel Protestant teachings and practices which sprouted from the Awakening are found below:

- An illiterate Englishwoman named Ann Lee (1736–1784) and a handful of European followers found the religiously chaotic North American Protestant landscape amenable to their heterodox faith traditions (Denison 1998; Melton 2004). Thus, Lee, who was referred to by her followers as "Mother" Ann Lee (Denison 1998, p. 465), brought Shakerism to the New World in 1774 (Melton 2004). Mother Ann claimed to have received the same spirit that Christ had possessed while on earth and one of her sect's tenets was the belief that sexual intercourse was the root of all evil. Therefore, Mother Ann rejected traditional forms of marriage for a life of celibacy (Denison 1998; Kidd 2010; Melton 2004). Additionally, the 'prophetess' "urged her followers to abstain from eating pork, insisted that they wear a specific, modest outfit, commanded military pacifism, and encouraged isolation from other 'heathen' [establishment Protestant] denominations…She convinced her disciples that they were a special, chosen group given new light from God for that day" (Beem and Beem 2008, p. 27).[29]
- "On May 19, 1780, New Englanders looked up to the sky and beheld a smoky cloud moving over them,…The smoke came from the forest fires roaring through much of the region's backwoods, but the darkened heavens seemed like a sign from a angry God…The darkness seemingly warned Americans to repent of their sins…The following weeks saw frenzied excitement and large numbers of conversions,…" (Kidd 2010, p. 187).
- In 1781, revivalist-inspired preaching caused an elderly Maryland couple to sink into such deep distress that they immolated all their earthly possessions in a

(Footnote 28 continued)
Edwards owned slaves and defended slavery as a *necessary* institution (Gillies 2001; Kidd 2010; Kraus 1928; Minkema 2002). Whitefield would go on to "promote the legalization of slavery in the newly founded colony of Georgia" (Kidd 2010, p. 135).

[29] The Shakers were officially known as the United Society of Believers (Denison 1998).

bonfire in accordance with the message stating that "old things must be done away with and that all things must become new" (Leigh Heyrman 1997, p. 40).
- In 1789, word spread of a female mystic "who tells that she had great views of Heaven and Hell when she lay for 13 Days without eating or drinking" (Leigh Heyrman 1997, p. 165).
- During the 1790s, revivalist-inspired leaders warned their congregations that Satan's presence was ubiquitous and reports of demonic apparitions became common. In 1794, an itinerant preacher named William Glendinning reported that he was being visited by Lucifer. These visits left him so despondent that by the following year he was contemplating suicide. Glendinning's erratic behaviors so concerned those around him that he was confined to bed rest for the 2 years and during this time period he had few visitors other than the devil. Glendinning described the Adversary (who frequently tormented him) in great detail, saying that the demon was male and had a larger than average body with a horn protruding from the top of his head. The Enemy was said to not only have balls of fire which flamed from its eyes but that he also made smoke arise in his vicinity. Glendinning eventually put his personal encounters with Satan down in writing, and this quickly attracted the attention of a publisher who proceeded to transfer this sensational story into profit. His memoirs were published in 1795 and not only did the book generate much income for publisher and author alike, but large numbers of people made pilgrimages to Glendinning's residence so as to hear first hand of his many remarkable and spell-binding confrontations with the Evil One (Leigh Heyrman 1997).

Old Light Responses

Understandably, numerous members of the establishment Protestant clergy felt outraged and insulted at revivalist-inspired challenges to their faith traditions and they took umbrage at Awakened preachers who fomented division within denominational congregations. Many traditionalists felt alienated by the revival's penchant for emotionalism and considered the movement as sheer nonsense, while other detractors categorized the Awakening as being both divisive and dangerous (Divine et al. 1984). Some critics stated that revivalists were enemies of "right reason" who had rejected rational thinking, and they described the Awakening as an "evil and dangerous guide in matters of religion" (Bumsted and Van De Wetering 1976, p. 119). Many establishment Protestants denounced revivalist gatherings as "disorderly tumults" characterized by the general acceptance of "indecent behavior" (Bonomi 1986, p. 151).[30]

---

[30] Critics of New Light congregations accused them of being "noisy, because in their most frenzied assemblies everyone had an opportunity to testify: Men, women, children, African—Americans, Native Americans and the poor—all were suddenly free to speak out about their apprehension of the Lord's grace" (Kidd 2010, p. 22).

In 1741, Alexander Garden expressed nothing but pity for those swept up in the Awakening by stating, "Alas my poor fellow creatures! Willfully abandoning their Reason (the alone distinguishing Dignity of their Nature!). Fleeing from it as from a Serpent. And throwing themselves into the Arms of strong Delusion" (cited in Bumsted and Van De Wetering 1976, p. 119). Traditionalists bitterly complained about the wild antics and public spectacle of impressionable congregations that were moved either to terror or to religious ecstasy by the ranting of itinerant preachers. Some critics even considered revivalism as being Satanic in origin (Bumsted and Van De Wetering 1976; Reid 2003).[31]

It is not surprising that many of the professional establishment Protestant clergy perceived the Awakening as a threat to their monopoly on the spiritual and ecclesiastical matters in the colonies (Schmotter 1979).[32] One critic named Charles Chauncy held that revivalism had replaced a reasonable type of Christian faith with one based on blind enthusiasm and madness (Stout 1986). For traditionalists, "[t]rue faith,…never worked to upset the godly order in the churches or in society, yet that was exactly what [revivalist] itinerants and lay exhorters accomplished through their wild censures and accusations" (Stout 1986, p. 204). Moreover, the socioeconomic sectors of colonial society were being disrupted by revivalists encouraging followers to abandon their trades and to usurp the role of establishment ministers (Stout 1986). Such interlopers were said to "throw the Body of Christ into great Disorder" (Chauncy cited in Stout 1986, p. 204). Chauncy also argued that true faith was not based on shrieking, screaming, convulsion-like trembling and agitation, but rather true faith was marked by sober and obedient Christian living. In short, for traditionalists like Chauncy, human beings should be governed by an enlightened mind, not heightened emotions (Valkenburgh 1994).

Those objecting to the Awakening insisted that humans were rational beings and therefore, sound religion must be founded on sound understanding (reason) which must overcome the lower (animalistic) passions (Bumsted and Van De Wetering 1976; Valkenburgh 1994). Old Light (non-revivalist) establishment Protestants pursued rational approaches to theology and many anti-Awakening arguments were generally based on the following logic: "If religion is reasonable and men are rational creatures, then surely man must play a conscious part in his own salvation, perhaps even willing it himself. Again, if religion is reasonable and men are rational, then all men should be admitted to the sacraments of the church" (Bumsted and Van De Wetering 1976, p. 119).

Many opponents of revivalism exposed the dangers of the Awakening's unbridled religious emotionalism and subjectivism by pointing out the lack of proper theological training that typified many of the revival's itinerant preachers. In 1741, Anglican missionary Isaac Brown wrote, "Some of the meanest and worst, of all

[31] Old Lights were particularly incensed at the revivalist penchant for breaking the long established rule requiring permission to preach in another clergyman's parish (Miller 1981).

[32] New Light accusations targeting Old Lights "unleashed a flood of popular criticisms against ministers who had previously enjoyed unquestioned authority over their congregations" (Kidd 2010, p. 22).

People are lately become converts to these Principles [of revivalism]…and are sent about the country to preach to all that come in their way, and they make it their business to reproach the [establishment Protestant] Clergy among the common people, to the great hindrance and discouragement of Religion in these parts" (cited in Bumsted and Van De Wetering 1976, p. 123). According to Brown, these Awakened itinerants included "a poor illiterate Weaver, another a Carpenter, a third an ignorant Schoolmaster, and a little before those about 4 or 5 common ploughmen undertook to teach and expound upon Sundays" (cited in Bumsted and Van De Wetering 1976, p. 123). Old Light supporting newspaper accounts describe revivalist meetings as being comprised of "idle or ignorant persons, and those of the lowest rank" (cited in Stout and Onuf 1983, p. 561). Moreover, many establishment clergymen did not consider the emotionally charged revivalist conversion as true manifestations of the Holy Spirit. Instead, nonrevivalists considered these manifestations to be mere expressions of deep seated human emotions (Valkenburgh 1994).

In order to check the spread of revivalism, in 1742, the Connecticut Assembly blocked the practice of itinerant preaching because such actions caused divisions threatening the ecclesiastical constitution established by the colony and were thus perceived to hamper growth in piety (Valkenburgh 1994). In 1743, the Assembly also prohibited the formation of new churches without the express approval of said body (Bonomi 1986).[33] In some instances, Old Light congregations removed ministers from office who were considered too sympathetic to New Light revivalist ideas (Stout 1986). In a remarkable display of the raw political power held by Connecticut Old Lights, in 1743, marriages and baptisms performed by revivalist pastors were disallowed, with some Awakened ministers being incarcerated for presiding at the wedding ceremonies of their own congregations (Bonomi 1986).[34] Moreover, one group of Old Light Virginians expressed their displeasure at revivalists by standing on benches and urinating on the faces of imprisoned "new birth" preachers who had been arrested for proselytizing (Leigh Heyrman 1997).[35] Thus, colonial North American Protestantism became deeply divided along New Light and Old Light factions with the aforementioned Davenport being arrested twice in one year and tried for disturbing the peace and inciting rebellion (Stout and Onuf 1983; Valkenburgh 1994).

---

[33] Both Connecticut and Massachusetts had colonial laws prohibiting the opening of new congregations without official approval. In Virginia, preaching without a license was illegal (Kidd 2010).

[34] In England, the 1689 Act of Toleration protected religious dissenters from state prosecution and granted them second-class status in society and politics. "Dissenters in the colonies also remained under a variety of legal restrictions; they often had to pay to support the established church, even though they did not attend it" (Kidd 2010, p. 40). For example, Virginia "barred Catholics from holding office and forbade "popish" priests from entering the colony" (Kidd 2010, p. 41).

[35] Also at this time, Massachusetts had passed "anti-itinerancy" laws. Moreover, in mid-eighteenth century colonial North America, no one was permitted to found a church without state approval (Kidd 2010).

The Great Awakening was a revival that pitted colonial Protestants against each other, but it would be a mistake to assume that the exodus from establishment denominations was fueled exclusively by theological disagreements. The Enlightenment's ideals greatly influenced many establishment Protestant ministers who, in turn, delivered progressive sermons that reportedly made many common folk feel alienated from their religious leaders. In short, the revival "ignited smoldering social tensions by calling into question the authority of local [establishment Protestant] ministers and, in the process, challenging their monopoly on the Word" (Stout 1986, p. 197). Indeed, many revivalists "rejected the notion that they should defer to a minister because of his education, instead making the indwelling of the Holy Spirit the ultimate qualification for a preacher" (Kidd 2010, p. 138).

Contributions of the Great Awakening

One of the major effects of revivalism was the *democratization* of colonial Protestantism in North America. Since all human beings (regardless of social class) were believed by the Awakened to be utterly depraved, religion, and positions of pastoral leadership were no longer monopolized by elites who often claimed a unique and rather exclusive proximity to God. Religion was now available to everyone (Hines 2006; Stout 1986; Valkenburgh 1994).[36] The Great Awakening also challenged the religious status quo by encouraging individuals, who had previously been taught to remain silent before traditional figures of authority, to now take their faith more seriously, to openly voice their opinions on Biblical matters, and also to take an active role in their faith journeys. Common folk no longer had to rely solely on their ministers and/or denominations for spiritual guidance (Bonomi 1986; Divine et al. 1984; Leigh Heyrman 2000). "The Great Awakening introduced common people to an exhilarating new world of spiritual possibilities. Never before had so many people had a chance to speak for themselves. Laypeople with no religious training often 'exhorted' in the revival meetings, rousing their listeners to accept the new birth in Jesus" (Kidd 2010, p. 22).

According to Stout, revivalist audiences "thrilled not only to the gospel message they heard but also to their own power visibly manifested in mass assembly. Local authorities could either applaud or condemn his [Whitefield's] revivals, but they could not stop them" (1986, p. 194). In short, this populist form of Christianity allowed commoners to reclaim a religious landscape that many felt had been usurped by the salaried establishment Protestant clergy who created and maintained hierarchical religious institutions that primarily served the interests of the elite (Miller 1997).

[36] "In the course of formulating their concept of the good society, the Evangelicals [revivalists] emphasized the essential equality or 'brotherhood' of all men…" (McLoughlin 1967, p. 107).

The Great Awakening altered the pre-existing patterns of church attendance and resulted in the creation of anti-establishment Protestant congregations that were increasingly assertive in expressing their needs and desires (Miller 1997). Stout and Onuf (1983) report that women responded enthusiastically to the revival in large numbers. For example, many New Light congregations provided women with greater opportunities for religious activities. In some instances, not only were women allowed to participate in church government but they were also granted the right to vote on issues regarding church membership. This type of participation had largely been the exclusive purview of males in Old Light Churches. One alarmed traditionalist complained that female exhorters were actually encouraging young girls to speak in the assemblies of New Light worship services (Bonomi 1986).

Outreach to the Marginalized

In pre-Awakened North America, both servants and the poor "made up a disproportionately high percentage of those outside the embrace of some religious community" (Bonomi 1986, p. 123). This was true especially of European indentured servants in southern rural areas, who had to remain at home caring for children while the heads of households sometimes traveled up to 10–15 miles to the nearest establishment Protestant church (Bonomi 1986). There can be no doubt as to the fact that the Awakening attracted many of the poor as the following 1744 report describing a revival illustrates: "…even the lower class of people here talk…about justification, sanctification, adoption, regeneration, free grace, reprobation, original sin,…as if they had done nothing but studied divinity all their time" (cited in Bonomi 1986, p. 125). By employing an itinerant form of proselytization, Awakened preachers made the Gospel more accessible to the many disenfranchised for whom traveling long distances to attend Sunday worship services was simply not a feasible option. In short, the Awakening found fertile ground among the largely unchurched lower echelons of society (Bonomi 1986; Bumsted and Van De Wetering 1976). Stout (1986) reports that the revival resonated with members of the lower and middle socioeconomic levels of society with relatively few well-educated individuals being attracted to the Awakening.[37] Heimert (1966) also reports that the Awakening was less popular among the wealthy than among the ranks of the poor.

Significantly, demographic analysis of church membership indicates that new converts to revivalism were substantially younger than members of nonrevivalist congregations. The Awakening transformed the religious environment from one that had been the domain of the older and more established members of society, to

[37] Stout and Onuf (1983) also report that many converts to the revival came from the ranks of the poor. Furthermore, they point out that the Awakening's separatist tendencies often alienated the more established and respectable members of society. See Valkenburgh (1994) for similar findings.

one that was open to all ages (Bumsted and Van De Wetering 1976). Accounts of the spread of the movement published in America's first religious magazine, *Christian History*, show how "almost daily…new instances of young persons (for the work of God's spirit seemed to be chiefly on young people) in great concern [seek out] what they should do to be saved" (cited in Bumsted and Van De Wetering 1976, p. 133). The revival provided young individuals who "though they lacked much of a stake in society, could entertain hopes of acquiring one" through participation in the Awakening (Bumsted and Van De Wetering 1976, p. 11).[38]

In colonial America, "[h]undreds of thousands of African Americans were owned by white masters, Native Americans' rights were largely ignored, and small groups of white elite whites exercised social, economic, and political authority over the common whites of the colonies" (Kidd 2010, p. 137). Colonial slave owners had often been against any type of instruction (either secular or religious) being offered to slaves out of fear that a well-educated and well-churched slave population could pose a threat to local Whites who were often outnumbered by Blacks in some regions (Bonomi 1986; Wood 1974).[39] Moreover, blacks had resisted conversion to revivalism "because Christianity was the faith of their white oppressors…" (Kidd 2010, p. 197). The Awakening afforded African-Americans increased opportunities for participation in religious activities. African Americans were known to frequently attend New Light services in the North with Edwards and Whitefield reporting great success in attracting members of this population to the Awakening (Bonomi 1986; Kidd 2010; Wood 1974).[40]

In New England, African Americans who had undergone dramatic conversion experiences were actually brought directly into the body of some revivalist churches. Some New Light congregations were known to have among their members one or two African Americans whose task it was to invite others to come to Christ. Moreover, some revivalist congregations reported the formation within their ranks of "a society of negroes, who in their meetings behave seriously and decently" (cited in Bonomi 1986, p. 124).[41] Therefore, credit for the racial integration of some churches rightly goes to the Awakened, and further evidence of these progressive practices can also be found in the numerous Old Light

---

[38] Stout and Onuf (1983) report that an average male New England revivalist was nearly 20 years younger than an average male Congregationalist. Female revivalists averaged 12 years younger than New England female Congregationalists. For similar reports of remarkably high numbers of youth being attracted to the Awakening see Stout (1986) and Valkenburg (1994).

[39] However, Massachusetts law called for the humane treatment of slaves and this meant that they were entitled to receiving religious instruction (Minkema 2002).

[40] Minkema (2002) reports that revivalist ministers and itinerants found slaves and free blacks responsive to their teachings. In fact, Edwards was known to baptize African Americans and admit them into full church membership. In addition, James Davenport, Gilbert Tennent, and George Whitefield reported converting many blacks while anti-revivalists such as Charles Chauncy complained about the presence of black exhorters.

[41] Some of the more radical revivalists went so far as to ordain uneducated African-American and Native-American men into the ministry (Kidd 2010).

condemnations of such revivalist activities that were empowering to minorities (Bumsted and Van De Wetering 1976; Minkema 2002).[42]

In 1782, a literate revivalist-inspired Virginian slave-preacher named Henry Lewis exhorted a crowd of 400 individuals with one White observer noting that Lewis' "gift exceeded [that of] many White preachers" (Leigh Heyrman 1997, p. 218). In 1794, Lewis preached at a funeral and that same White observer reported seeing "the power of God behind the eloquence of that poor Ethiopian" (cited in Leigh Heyrman 1997, p. 219). Some scholars suggest that the Awakening had a greater impact on African Americans than on any other single group in the North (Bonomi 1986).[43] In the 1780s, revivalism's liberating message continued to draw more slaves into revivalist gatherings where one African American exhorter addressed the crowd saying,

> We poor negroes were miserable, wretched creatures, taken captives and brought from our country in bondage here to men, and to what was worse, slaves to sin and the devil. But oh! The goodness of God to us poor black folks. He has made us free men and women in Christ, joint heirs with his own Son. He has sent his servant to preach the gospel to us, who takes us to the Lord's table with himself, and calls us his brothers and sisters in Christ!" (cited in Kidd 2010, p. 201).

There were few conversions by Native Americans to the "White man's religion" prior to the Awakening as staunch adherence to native beliefs likely functioned as a form of cultural resistance.[44] The Great Awakening spurred intense missionary activity targeting Native Americans who were attracted to the revival with New Light ministers successfully gaining many Indian converts in New Jersey and also from among the Connecticut Mohegans (Bonomi 1986).[45] In sum, many

[42] Some scholars also point out that the Awakening resulted in many instances of co-operation occurring among ethnically diverse New Lights. Indeed, it is argued that the success of the Great Awakening in attracting heterogeneous converts from every one of the colonies helped in the creation of a sense of American national identity in the eighteenth century (Landsman 1982). Reid (2003) also comments that the Awakening may have fostered a colonial mindset against established authority that may, in turn, have facilitated the success of the American Revolution. Valkenburgh (1994) points out that the revival not only influenced the lives of those converted during the colonial era, but that the Awakening continues to affect the lives of modern day Americans.

[43] African American revivalist congregations provided colonial era Blacks the opportunity to fellowship and to engage in solidarity enhancing activities. These actions were crucial for the survival of oppressed individuals who had been stripped of their freedom and robbed of their cultural heritage. To this day, African American revivalist-inspired fellowships play an important role in the lives of many Blacks in the United States.

[44] Bonomi (1986) reports that a cadre of pre-Awakened colonial era Mohawk Indians looked inside an establishment Protestant church door during liturgical services and went away laughing. Some native groups were known to beat loud drums just outside Protestant establishment chapels in order to disrupt worship services. In another instance, some Native Americans acerbically stated they would attend establishment worship services only if they were given a drink of rum (Bonomi 1986).

[45] The Awakening's outreach to Native Americans is truly remarkable as many colonials "saw Native Americans as degraded and hopeless" (Kidd 2010, p. 136).

marginalized groups in colonial society which rarely received religious education in pre-Awakened times because of the great distances involved in attending Sunday worship services, were served by Awakened pastors.

Turmoil, Millennialism, and Catharsis

It is not coincidental that the Great Awakening occurred during a period of extraordinary upheaval marked by economic, sociocultural and political unrest. Many colonists were exceedingly angry about how they were being taxed by the Mother Country (i.e., England), and there had recently been an extremely bloody slave revolt in the Carolinas (i.e., the Stono Uprising of 1739) that sent anxious spasms throughout the entire region (Divine et al. 1984).[46] Moreover, many of the colonists, who had fled a Europe wracked with warfare and famine, found themselves living as foreigners on a dangerous and sometimes lawless frontier where they faced the real possibility of being attacked by hostile Native Americans (Balmer 1984; Bumsted and Van De Wetering 1976; Leigh Heyrman 2000). In fact, "[i]t was commonplace in those [colonial] days for both the minister and the congregation to bring their flintlock rifles and muskets with them to church, in case the Indians would attack them during services" (Scoggins 2012). Indeed, "[m]any accounts tell of sermons preached with the minister, gun at hand in the pulpit, keeping watch through the church door for signs of Indians" (Leyburn 1962, p. 229).

Beginning in the 1720s, New England and New York colonists suffered devastating epidemics of diphtheria, scarlet fever, and measles. Additionally, in 1738, a small pox outbreak killed many residents of Charleston, South Carolina (Bumsted and Van De Wetering 1976; Leigh Heyrman 2000; Stout 1986).[47] Moreover, in 1729, New England townspeople awoke to the most devastating earthquake in living memory. Eyewitnesses reported that the massive temblor was accompanied by a "horrid rumbling" and that "the motion of the Earth was very great, like the waves of the sea…Awakened sleepers huddled in groups in the streets, certain that the day of judgment had come" (cited in Stout 1986, p. 177).

This tense situation was exacerbated by the fact that the English-held Protestant Colonies were threatened by a possible invasion from Spanish Catholic forces garrisoned in Florida. Some revivalists predicted that an impending Spanish invasion would usher the Second Coming. Thus, the Awakening's promise of a supernatural "clean slate" from which to make a spiritual "fresh start" just in time for the beginning of Christ's millennial reign, likely provided solace for

[46] This rebellion involving approximately 100 slaves occurred in South Carolina and resulted in the deaths of 20 Whites and nearly twice as many African- Americans (Wood 1974).

[47] In days prior to the advent of the Germ Theory of Disease, human sickness was often believed to be a form of divine punishment targeting transgressors. Therefore, these epidemics were interpreted by many colonials as being signs of God's wrath against individual and corporate sin (Bonomi 1986; Leigh Heyman 2000).

individuals experiencing extremely high levels of stress. Acceptance of the Awakening's novel scriptural interpretations provided adherents with instantaneous and irrevocable heavenly security in an environment redolent of violence, death, and economic turmoil (Bumsted and Van De Wetering 1976; Kidd 2010; Leigh Heyrman 2000; Stout 1986). In short, the promise of a radical reorientation of life, that is, a new birth, clearly appealed to many colonials (Lumpkin 2005).

As has been reported, the Great Awakening spurred a dramatic rise in the numbers of peripatetic preachers, particularly laymen, thereby facilitating the spread of revivalism throughout the Colonies. Being an itinerant preacher in the movement provided individuals of low social standing with the opportunity to occupy important positions of religious leadership without having to invest any time or money whatsoever in college or seminary training. Thus, these relatively uneducated roaming preachers found themselves heralding the new "Truths" to multitudes. Perhaps one of the most exhilarating teachings they promoted was that individuals could obtain grace without the assistance of professional establishment clerics. Moreover, believing the formally trained (i.e., college educated) establishment Protestant leadership (and all who followed them) were doomed to hell while the largely uneducated and disenfranchised New Light revivalist masses were "saved," may have been quite cathartic to many itinerants (and also to their followers) who were largely of humble origins (Bonomi 1986).[48]

In essence, commoners who espoused the Awakening were afforded the opportunity to spiritually and socially reinvent themselves by becoming New Lights. Individuals who shared this emotionally charged conversion experience formed new and vibrant revivalist fellowships that were often suspicious of both formal education and establishment Protestantism. Additionally, as previously mentioned, Awakened worship services were quite egalitarian in nature. Seating arrangements were not constrained by norms of social ranking, and individuals (regardless of their educational background) were encouraged to freely speak their minds at gatherings. Therefore, it should not be surprising that revivalism was highly attractive to members of the lower socioeconomic sectors of society (Stout 1986; Stout and Onuf 1983). Moreover, for members of the lower socioeconomic classes who felt exploited, the adoption of an aggressive new belief system may have provided a convenient theological cover for the expression of deep seated resentments toward the upper echelons of society.

Furthermore, for New Lights inhabiting a very lonely frontier, the opportunity to participate in revival meetings (sometimes held in open fields or remodeled theatres) involving thousands people coming together for several nights of socializing, dancing, singing, and shouting must have been very exhilarating.[49] Most importantly, the authors have no doubt that the revivalism's very personal

---

[48] It is important to note that many colonial era establishment Protestant leaders considered New Light itinerant preachers to be social outcasts (McLoughlin 1959).

[49] Leigh Heyman (2000) reports that from 10 to 25 thousand people were known to attend some gatherings. See Bonomi (1986) for an extensive analysis of the many functions that revival meetings may have fulfilled.

approach to God must have deeply touched the lives of many eighteenth century individuals whose spiritual needs were apparently not being met by existing establishment Protestant denominations. Moreover, the Awakening's promise of a quick "solution" for many of life's complicated problems must have been very attractive to large numbers of colonial North American Protestants (particularly to marginalized populations).

However, the spiritual "remedy" administered by revivalists to an ailing body of colonial believers also contained high levels of individualism, millennialism, anti-denominationalism, and anti-intellectualism that deeply divided North American Protestants.

Aftermath of the Awakening

By the late eighteenth century, the religious colonial landscape was peppered with numerous autonomous revivalist groups that rejected what they considered to be elitist and dreary establishment Protestant denominationalism. These new and independent congregations created egalitarian *democratic* religious services in which individuals were granted great levels of freedom in worship. In the 1760s, an Anglican parson named Charles Woodmason, who travelled throughout the Southern Backcountry, reported that revivalists had "poisoned the minds of North Carolinians, instilling 'democratical' notions in them, making them hostile to the Anglican establishment, and telling them that 'they owe no subjection to Great Britain'" (cited in Kidd 2010, pp. 49–50).

Members of Awakened fellowships were encouraged to sing and shout spontaneously, prophecy, weep openly and/or to experience "the jerks" (Miller 1997). In effect, the Awakening wetted the colonists' appetite for alternative styles of religious leadership and worship (Schmotter 1979). Concomitantly, "new birth" revivalists continued to encourage others to cross the Rubicon by stressing that a person's individual relationship with God (*not* a corporate denominational affiliation or fidelity to any sort of covenant) was what really mattered (Bonomi 1986; Valkenburgh 1994).

Thus, the Great Awakening's injunction to challenge what emanated from establishment Protestant pulpits predisposed colonists to be hostile and even contemptuous toward established religious and *political* authority. For Awakened colonials, this revival had

> "cut across the boundaries of colonies and sects, and for the first time *united great numbers in all of them in a common and emotional experience*…of fundamental and far reaching import. Those throughout the colonies who separated from the old churches were bound together by common opposition to the privileges conferred by a union of church and state…It was *a unifying influence among a large group with 'democratic tendencies,'…a movement…of discontent…against an established order*" (Adams 1923, pp. 177–178, emphasis added).

We now turn to show how the Great Awakening's Millennialist ethos provided many colonials with sufficient ideological and moral justification for rebelling against longstanding established political authority.

References

Adams, J. (1923). *Revolutionary New England, 1691–1776*. Boston: Simon Publications.
Balmer, R. (1984). The social roots of Dutch Pietism in the Middle Colonies. *Church History, 53*(2), 187–199.
Beem, T., & Beem, A. (2008). *It's ok not to be a Seventh-Day Adventist*. Charleston: Book Surge Publishing.
Bennett, R. (2002). *Four witnesses: The early church in her own words*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press.
Bonomi, P. (1986). *Under the cope of heaven: Religion, society, and politics in Colonial America*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Boyer, P. (2008). The Puritans. NOVA PBS Homepage. Retrieved May 26, 2009 from http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/apocalypse/explanation/puritans.html
Bumsted, J., & Van De Wetering, J. (1976). *What must I do to be saved?: The Great Awakening in colonial America*. Hindsdale: The Dryden Press.
Capoccia, T. (1986). *Christian charity or the duty of charity to the poor, explained and enforced by Jonathan Edwards*. The Bible Bulletin Board. Retrieved November 6, 2007 from http://www.biblebb.com/files/edwards/charity.htm
Coalter, M. (1986). *Gilbert Tennant, Son of Thunder: A case study of continental Pietism's impact on the first great awakening in the middle colonies*. Westport: Greenwood Press.
Denison, B. (1998). Shakers. In W. Swatos (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of religion and society* (pp. 465–466). Walnut Creek: Alta Mira Press.
Divine, R., Breen, T. H., George, F., & Williams, R. H. (1984). *America: Past and present.* New York: Scott, Foresman and Company.
Dyck, C. (2005). Anabaptism. In J. Lindsay (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of religion* (pp. 304–305). New York: Thompson Gale.
Gaustad, E. S. (1966). *A religious history of America*. New York: Harper & Row.
Gaustad, E. S. (2005). George WhiteField. In J. Lindsay (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Religion* (pp. 9726–9727). New York: Thompson Gale.
Gillies, J. (2001). *Memoirs of the life of the Rev. George Whitefield*. Carlisle, MA: Applewood Books.
Hatch, N. (1989). *The democratization of American christianity*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
Heimert, Alan. (1966). *Religion and the American mind from the Awakening to the Revolution.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
Hines, M. (2006). *The Great Awakening*. Church History for the Masses Home Page. Retrieved October 15, 2006 from http://www.christianchronicler.com/history1/great_awakening.html
Jurgens, W. (1970). *The faith of the early fathers* (Vol. I). Collegeville: The Liturgical Press.
Kidd, T. (2010). *God of liberty: A religious history of the American Revolution*. New York: Basic Books.
Kraus, M. (1928). *Intercolonial aspects of American culture on the eve of the Revolution*. New York: Columbia University Press.
Landsman, N. (1982). Revivalism and nativism in the Middle Colonies: The great awakening and the Scots community in East New Jersey. *American Quarterly, 34*(2), 149–164.
Leigh Heyrman, C. (1997). *Southern cross: The beginnings of the Bible belt*. New York: Alfred Knopf Inc.

Leigh Heyrman, C. (2000). *The first Great Awakening*. TeacherServe Home Page. National Humanisties Center Home Page. Retrieved October 15, 2006 from http://www.nhc.rtp.nc.us/tserve/eighteen/ekeyinfo/grawaken.htm

Leyburn, J. (1962). *The Scotch-Irish: A social history*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Locke, J. (1959). *An essay concerning human understanding*. New York: Dover Publications Inc.

Lumpkin, W. (2005). Great Awakening. In H. Samuel & L. Charles (Ed.), *Religion in the South* (pp. 354–356). Macon: Mercer University Press.

Malone, D. (2004). U.S. Civil War and Christian churches. In P.F. Gabriel (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of religion and war* (pp. 437–442). New York: Routledge.

McLoughlin, W. (1959). *Modern revivalism: Charles Grandison Finney to Billy Graham*. New York: The Ronald Press Company.

McLoughlin, W. (1967). The American Revolution as religious revival: 'The Millennium in one country' religion and the American mind from the awakening to the revolution by Alan Heimert. Essay review. *The New England Quarterly, 40*(1), 99–110.

Media Matters. (2005). *Pat Robertson's contradictory theology*. Media Matters for America. May 2, 2005. Retrieved October 15, 2006 from http://www.Mediamatters.org/items/200505020002

Melton, J. G. (2004). Shakers. In F. Salamone (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Religious Rites, Rituals and Festivals* (pp. 392–394). New Yourk: Routledge.

Miller, G. (1981). Revivalism. In K. Crim (Ed.), *Abingdon dictionary of living religions* (pp. 621–623). Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Miller, D. (1997). *Reinventing American Protestantism: Christianity in the new millennium*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Minkema, K. (2002). *Jonathan Edward's defense of slavery*. The Massachusetts Historical Review (Vol. 4) (NA). Retrieved November 4, 2007 from http://www.historycooperative.org/journals/mhr/4/minkema.html

Reid, T. (2003). *Gilbert Tennet*. Evangelical Times, February 2003. Retrieved June 21, 2007 from http://www.evangelical-times.org/Articles/Feb03/feb03a03.htm

Scoggins, M. C. (2012). A revolutionary minister: The life of Reverend Alexander Craighead. *The Journal of Scotch-Irish Studies*, 3(3):98–116.

Schmotter, J. (1979). The irony of clerical professionalism: New England's Congregational ministers and the Great Awakening. *American Quarterly, 31*(2), 148–168.

Stein, S. (2005). Jonathon Edwards. In Lindsay J. (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of religion* (pp. 2698–2701). New York: Thompson Gale.

Stearns, M. (1970). *The Great Awakening: 1720–1760*. New York: Franklin Watts Inc.

Stout, H. (1986). *The New England soul: Preaching and religious culture in colonial New England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stout, H., & Onuf, P. (1983). James Devenport and the Great Awakening in New London. *The Journal of American History, 70*(3), 556–578.

Valkenburgh, S. (1994). *1740s-Jonathan Edwards and the Great Awakening*. The Society of Colonial Wars in the State of Connecticut. Retrieved June 21, 2007 from http://www.colonialwarsct.org/1740_s.htm

Weber, N. A. (2007). *Anabaptists*. In *Catholic Encyclopedia*. New York: Robert Appleton Co. Retrieved June 6, 2007 from http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/01445b.html

Wood, P. (1974). *Black majority: Negroes in colonial South Carolina from 1670 through the Stono Rebellion*. New York: Alfred E. Knopf.

Chapter 4
Patriots, Monarchists, and the Antichrist

Introduction

Claiming that "God is on one's side" is an ancient and widespread practice. History is replete with examples of leaders claiming that they are favored by God and the American Revolution was of no exception. Not only did Revolutionaries claim that the Deity favored their cause, many claimed they were battling against the forces of Antichrist. This section will show how religion and the Great Awakening provided critical ideological, moral, and theological justification for the American Revolution.

The Seven Years' War and the Catholic Church as Antichrist

The Great Awakening "stoked the belief of many colonials that religious signs portended major changes, including massive numbers of conversions, transformative political events, or both" (Kidd 2010, p. 25). Few "signs" were considered more portentous than the Seven Years' War. This conflict, actually lasting from 1754 to 1763 in North America, involved the forces of Protestant England battling against a Catholic French and Spanish alliance (Kidd 2010).

Many of the chaplains serving the pro-English forces during the Seven Years' War were revivalists and thus, actively promoted millennialism among the troops (Kidd 2010). "Many colonists hoped that the Seven Years' War would finally end what they perceived as an apocalyptic struggle between Catholics and Protestants" (Kidd 2010, p. 17). In fact, during the conflict, the Dutch Reformed minister Theodorus Jacobus Frelinghuysen informed Protestant soldiers that "Antichrist must fall before the end comes…The French now adhere and belong to Antichrist, wherefore it is to be hoped, that when Antichrist falls, they shall fall with him" (cited in Kidd 2010, p. 17–18). In 1759, Pastor John Burt from Rhode Island described the French as children of the "Scarlet Whore, that Mother of Harlots, who is justly the abomination of the earth" (cited in Kidd 2010, p. 18). A Virginia

R. J. Chacon and M. C. Scoggins, *The Great Awakening and Southern Backcountry Revolutionaries*, SpringerBriefs in Anthropology and Ethics,
DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-04597-9_4, © The Author(s) 2014

pastor named Samuel Davies proclaimed that the war was in fact, the "grand and decisive conflict between the Lamb and the beast" (cited in Kidd 2010, p. 18).[1]

With England's eventual victory over the Catholic French and Spanish alliance, colonials emerged from the Seven Years' War confident that Divine Providence had favored the Protestant cause. This outcome was a great relief to many New World Protestants as "[c]olonists had long seen Catholicism as the primary threat to their liberty and economic fortunes" (Kidd 2010, p. 30). For many colonial Americans, "the overall Protestant faith represented spiritual and political freedom, whereas Catholicism, or what was called the spirit of popery, represented tyranny and bondage" (Kidd 2010, p. 16). In fact, the "Great Awakening and the Seven Years War forged a visceral bond among Protestantism, anti-Catholicism, and liberty" (Kidd 2010, p. 16).

Stamp Act of 1765

In 1765, England foisted the Stamp Act on colonial North America.[2] This measure required that many types of printed materials produced in the colonies be printed on stamped paper imported from London carrying an embossed revenue stamp. This tax, which had to be paid in British currency, was to help pay for troops that remained stationed in North America after the Seven Years' War (Kidd 2010; Morgan and Morgan 1953).

Not surprisingly, this act outraged many colonials. Significantly, Samuel Adams warned that Britain's threat was not simply political but religious as well. Adams "anticipated that the British would not only use the power of taxation but the might of the Anglican Church (the Church of England) to subdue the colonists" (Kidd 2010, p. 12). Moreover, Samuel Adams "personally loathed the Massachusetts clergymen, mostly ministers of the Church of England, who were trying to consolidate and advance the authority of the British government by telling colonists to obey the new tax law [Stamp Act of 1765]. He called these parsons 'devout religious slaves,' averring that 'a religious bigot is the worst sort of men'" (Adams cited in Kidd 2010, p. 12). Adams warned that sinister forces where operating within the British government and church with the intention of oppressing and enslaving all America (Kidd 2010).[3]

[1] In 1774, Samuel Langdon, soon to become president of Harvard, "published a tract in which he systematically claimed that Roman Catholicism represented one of the mythical beasts of the book of Revelation" (Kidd 2010, pp. 66–67).

[2] "Parliament passed the Stamp Act, which stipulated that goods from newspapers to playing cards had to be printed on paper bearing a royal stamp, reflecting the tax paid" (Kidd 2010, p. 15).

[3] "Many of the original colonists had come to America to escape the threat of Catholicism or any religious traditions that smacked of it—which included the Church of England. The Puritans of Massachusetts and Connecticut went to America because they feared that England and its official state church remained too 'popish,' or tainted by its Catholic practices" (Kidd 2010, p. 20).

The Tea Act of 1773

In 1773, the British Parliament further infuriated colonials by passing the Tea Act granting the East India Company a monopoly in colonial America. When ships carrying East India Company tea arrived in Boston, under cover of darkness, in protest, a group of colonists tossed approximately £10,000 worth of tea into Boston Harbor (Kidd 2010, p. 66).

The Quebec Act of 1774

The anger caused by the aforementioned Stamp and Tea Acts reached a boiling point with the passage of the Quebec Act of 1774. "After capturing the region from the French in the Seven Years' War, the British needed to make clear the legal status of Quebec. In an attempt to pacify the conquered Quebecois, the act reinstated the principles of the French legal system, and most critically, granted French Canadian Catholics the freedom to practice their religion openly" (Kidd 2010, p. 67). For many colonists, the Quebec Act 'proved' the existence of a European plan to destroy Christian liberty. "The *Connecticut Current* proclaimed that 'the mask is at length thrown off,' with 'Popery' to be established in Canada and 'slavery' in Massachusetts" (cited in Kidd 2010, p. 67).[4] "The *Massachusetts Spy* newspaper suggested that the act heralded unprecedented cooperation between Rome and London and went on to predict that the Catholic religion would become established in England within 5 years. The newspaper reported that the pope was mobilizing French Catholics to destroy the people of Boston, who were 'bitter enemies to the Romish religion and monarchical power'" (cited in Kidd 2010, p. 67).

The Quebec Act caused great consternation among colonials. "South Carolina Baptist pastor Richard Furman averred that the act was secretly intended to place a hostile Catholic force at the colonies' northern doorstep. Should the colonists continue to resist parliamentary actions, a Catholic army would swoop down to destroy them" (cited in Kidd 2010, pp. 68–69). Moreover, Alexander Hamilton "agreed that the Quebec Act revealed the 'dark designs' of the British administration more than any previous transgression" (Kidd 2010, p. 69).

Thomas Paine exploited fears "raised by the Quebec Act and used them to promote independence…he declared that the Quebec Act was designed to impose despotic rule on all of America…[and] asserted that 'Monarchy in every instance is Popery of government'" (cited in Kidd 2010, p. 73).[5] The Reverend Samuel

---

[4] Supporters of King George III were called "papists" by revivalists (Kidd 2010, p. 33).

[5] Thomas Paine did not accept the French Revolution's rejection of belief in the divine but he did make the following declaration: "I believe in one God and no more…I do not believe in the creed professed by…any church that I know of. My own mind is my own church" (cited in Kidd 2010, p. 232).

Sherwood of Fairfield, Connecticut "singled out the Quebec Act as an 'open attempt to propagate and establish Popery, that exotic plant, in these northern regions.' He also accused the British government of recruiting Roman Catholic armies in Canada to enslave and destroy the American colonists…Sherwood hoped that the crisis would lead to the downfall of the power of Antichrist and the coming of the millennium" (cited in Kidd 2010, p. 71).

The uproar over the Quebec Act permitted radical colonists to tap into the increasing momentum favoring revolution. "It is important to remember that the path to nationhood was not assured in 1774, nor was the collapse of confidence in King George…The loss of religious liberty threatened by the Quebec Act, apparently passed with the blessing of the king, so offended and disturbed many American Christians that the king and the British administration could never recover the trust they once held" (Kidd 2010, p. 70–71). Indeed, to many colonists, "the Quebec Act seemed like outright betrayal" (Kidd 2010, p. 69).[6]

England as Antichrist

Samuel Adams believed that the Stamp Act was part of a larger scheme "contrived with a design only to inure the people into the habit of contemplating themselves as the slaves of men; and the transition from thence to subjection to Satan, is mighty easy" (cited in Kidd 2010, p. 58). Samuel Adams was not alone in viewing the conflict with Britain as a contest between spiritual freedom and spiritual bondage. Many colonists shared his viewpoint. "At a 1766 meeting of the Sons of Liberty in Boston for instance, an anonymous speaker compared the Earl of Bute and Lord of Grenville, two of the Stamp Act's chief proponents in England, to the monstrous beasts of the book of Revelation. By accepting paper with the royal stamp, he warned, colonists would 'receive the mark of the beast'" (cited in Kidd 2010, p. 15). The following Connecticut account of the Act's repeal shows the colonists had come to conflate political tyranny with the spirit of Antichrist. "When word arrived of the repeal [of the Stamp Act] in 1766, a crowd composed of evangelicals [revivalists] celebrated, saying 'that victory was gained over the beast and over his mark…[and] we can yet buy and sell without the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name'" (cited in Kidd 2010, p. 33).

As tensions grew, many colonists like Samuel Adams redirected their long-standing antagonisms toward the Catholic Church to a new enemy: England. Thus, they began "perceiving the dark forces of Roman Catholicism behind the political actions of the British and believing that their freedom as Protestants was in jeopardy. Their fears gave fuel to the revolutionary cause as Americans took the warnings to heart and prepared themselves to take whatever actions were

[6] Israel Holly, revivalist pastor of Suffield, Connecticut, "suspected that the ultimate end of [British] political tyranny would be the forced adoption of Catholicism" (Kidd 2010, p. 78).

necessary to defend themselves" (Kidd 2010, p. 58). "In this new formulation, the identity of Antichrist altered. Earlier American interpretations of Antichrist had typically associated the apocalyptic force as arising out of Catholicism and Islam, but as the crisis built in the 1760s and 1770s, some preachers and writers began to ascribe the spirit of Antichrist to the British" (Kidd 2010, pp. 91–92). For example, a "widely circulated article by 'Scipio,' writing in the *Pennsylvania Journal,* promised the king that American Protestants would fight against violation of their civil and religious liberties and resist 'the Pope, the Devil, and ALL their emissaries'" (cited in Kidd 2010, pp. 69–70). In 1777, an anonymous pamphleteer reported that "the Hebrew and Greek words for 'Great Britain' and 'Royal Supremacy' contained the hidden numbers 666, the number of the beast in Revelation 13. But several others anticipated that the war would fulfill biblical prophecy and hasten the coming of Christ's kingdom" (cited in Kidd 2010, p. 92).

In the *Church's Flight into the Wilderness* (1776), the Reverend Samuel Sherwood of Fairfield, Connecticut, claimed that the American Revolution was in fact, a fight against the Roman Catholic Church which he believed was supportive of Antichrist. "Sherwood, speaking on a text from the book of Revelation, argued that all of human history revealed a great contest between God's true church and the forces of 'Popery'. [For Sherwood], Popery was rooted in the Catholic Church, but any forces of tyranny and oppression were also connected to this Antichristian spirit" (Kidd 2010, p. 71).[7]

Sherwood claimed that the following scriptural passage predicted what colonial America was experiencing at that time:

> And to the woman were given two wings of a great eagle that she might fly into the wilderness, into her place, where she is nourished for a time, and times, half a time, from the face of the serpent. And the serpent cast out of his mouth water as a flood, after the woman; that he might cause her to be carried away by the flood. And the earth helped the woman, and the earth opened her mouth, and swallowed up the flood which the dragon cast out of his mouth. And the dragon was wroth with the woman, and went to make war with the remnant of her seed, which kept the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ (Revelation chapter 12:14–17).

Reverend Sherwood interpreted the above cited passage as follows: the woman mentioned represented the 'true' church of Christ. The wilderness was North American continent colonized by Protestants. The serpent referred to England while the flood cast from the serpent's mouth was the Quebec Act of 1774 (Sherwood 1776).

[7] "Once the colonists perceived the British government to be an agent of Antichrist, no expression of goodwill toward Protestant liberty could calm their fears" (Kidd 2010, p. 71).

Millennialism and the Justification for Rebellion

Approximately 117 men served as chaplains in the Continental Army but most of these clergymen did not take up arms (Kidd 2010, p. 116). "Instead, they worked to maintain courage, piety, wholesome behavior, and good order" (Kidd 2010, p. 119). However, in 1775, revivalist chaplain David Avery left his Vermont congregation to serve in the Patriot cause at the Battle of Bunker Hill.[8] Many revivalists believed that the conflict was an important step toward inaugurating the Kingdom of God on earth (Kidd 2010).

During the Revolution, many people merged America's political aspirations with Divine Providence, "which lent an aura of redemptiveness to the war and to the agenda of a fledging nation…the cause of America had become the cause of Christ…" (Kidd 2010, p. 9).

Indeed, many colonials viewed America's war with Britain through the lens of biblical prophecy. "Many believed that it could signal a critical epoch in the events leading to the return of Christ or the beginning of the millennium…the brewing war with Britain seemed to evangelicals [revivalists] like the fulfillment of New Testament prophecy" (Kidd 2010, p. 91).

Moreover, revivalist minister "Ebenezer Baldwin of Danbury, Connecticut, boldly proclaimed that the war with Britain was intended by God to establish in America the headquarters of the millennium kingdom of God on earth" (Kidd 2010, p. 92). Millennial beliefs spurred on by revivalists, "provided nearly unlimited resources for justifying the war to a biblically minded people while assuring them that God held the results in his hands. In the Protestant millennial vision, God would not ultimately give his people over to forces of tyranny and slavery, and God's people had a right to revolt against those who stood on the wrong side of the millennial divide" (Kidd 2010, p. 94).[9] Additionally, Long Island Presbyterian minister Abraham Ketelas described the Revolution as "the cause of heaven against hell" (cited in Kidd 2010, p. 108).[10]

The following excerpt from one of Reverend Sherwood's sermons illustrates how for many pro-independence colonials, the conflict with England indeed was a holy war: "The time is coming and hastening on, when Babylon the great shall fall to rise no more; when all wicked tyrants and oppressors shall be destroyed forever. These violent attacks on the woman in the wilderness, may possibly be some of the last efforts, and dying struggles of the man of sin. These commotions and convulsions in the British empire, may be leading to the fulfillment of such [biblical] prophecies as to relate to his downfall and overthrow, and to the future glory and

[8] Avery had experienced conversion under George Whitefield (Kidd 2010).

[9] Both Patrick Henry and Thomas Paine employed biblical and evangelical rhetoric to make their case for the Revolution (Kidd 2010).

[10] Moreover, during the Revolutionary War, many patriots thought of Americans as the Israelites mentioned in the Old Testament (i.e., God's chosen people) (Heimert 1966; Kidd 2010; McLoughlin 1967).

prosperity of Christ's church…May the Lord shorten the days of tribulation, and appear in his glory, to build up Zion; that his knowledge might cover the earth, as the waters do the seas; wars and tumults may cease thro' the world, and the wolf and the lamb lie down together, and nothing hurt or destroy throughout his holy mountain" [sic] (Sherwood 1776, pp. 42–43).

Indeed, many pro-independence colonials thought of the Revolutionary War as a holy war against Antichrist (King George III) while royalist supporters were deemed enemies of God (Heimert 1966; Kidd 2010; McLoughlin 1967; Sherwood 1776).[11] We now turn to how this Apocalyptic mindset supported the Revolutionary cause throughout colonial America's Southern Backcountry.

References

Heimert, A. (1966). *Religion and the American mind from the Awakening to the Revolution*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Kidd, T. (2010). *God of liberty: A religious history of the American Revolution*. New York: Basic Books.

McLoughlin, W. (1967). The American Revolution as religious revival: 'The millennium in one country' religion and the American mind from the Awakening to the Revolution by Alan Heimert. Essay review. *The New England Quarterly, 40*(1), 99–110.

Morgan, E., & Morgan, H. (1953). *Stamp Act crisis: Prologue to Revolution*. Raleigh: University of North Carolina Press.

Sherwood, S. (1776). *The Church's flight into the wilderness: An address on the times, containing some very interesting and important observations on Scripture prophecies.* New York: S. Loudon.

[11] "In 1778, with enormous irony, anti-Catholic American patriots entered into an alliance with Catholic France, a diplomatic victory that was essential to America's success in the Revolution…Only fifteen years earlier, at the end of the Seven Years' War, Americans had seen France as one of the chief political agents of Antichrist. Now the French were their indispensable allies" (Kidd 2010, pp. 73–74).

Chapter 5
Awakened Rebels and Holy War in the Southern Backcountry

Settlement of the Carolina Backcountry

European settlement of the North Carolina and South Carolina Backcountry began in the 1740s. The majority of the settlers who moved into this region came from earlier settlements in New England, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and the Shenandoah Valley of Virginia by way of a heavily traveled migration route known as the Great Philadelphia Wagon Road. Because many of these families were second- or third-generation colonists, they had already felt the evangelical, iconoclastic influences of the Great Awakening in Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia. Other, more recent arrivals experienced the Awakening firsthand in the frontier settlements of Pennsylvania, Virginia, and the Carolinas, where traveling preachers like John and Charles Wesley and George Whitefield left a lasting imprint on the religious and social fabric of the Backcountry (Bridenbaugh 1952; Fischer 1989; Leyburn 1962).

Foremost among the Backcountry settlers, both in numbers and cultural influence, were the lowland Scots and northern English "Border Clans," who had colonized the Ulster plantation in northern Ireland in the seventeenth century and then migrated to the Appalachian frontier of America in the eighteenth century. These immigrants were generally known during the colonial period as "Scotch-Irish," since they were for the most part the descendants of Scots who settled in Ireland. Their heritage included centuries of internecine clan feuds as well as the interminable Anglo-Scottish wars of the Middle Ages. During the Protestant Reformation, the English-speaking lowland Scots enthusiastically embraced Presbyterianism, the highly democratic, Calvinistic faith of the Scottish reformer John Knox. Presbyterianism rapidly supplanted the Anglican Church and became the national Church of Scotland, or as it was known in the lowland Scots dialect, "the Kirk." Religious strife between Presbyterians, Catholics, and Anglicans marked much of the post-Reformation history of Scotland. There were also

---

A modified version of this chapter was presented at the "Rethinking Warfare Conference" on November 9–10, 2012 held in Fernando Pessoa University, Porto, Portugal.

R. J. Chacon and M. C. Scoggins, *The Great Awakening and Southern Backcountry Revolutionaries*, SpringerBriefs in Anthropology and Ethics,
DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-04597-9_5, © The Author(s) 2014

conflicts within the Scottish Kirk itself, as urban factions seeking to introduce Anglican-style bishops and ministerial appointments were opposed by militant fundamentalists known as Cameronians and Covenanters. In northern Ireland, the Anglican Church (known in Ireland as the Church of Ireland) made a concerted effort to outlaw the Presbyterian faith of the new Scottish settlers. Presbyterian ministers were forbidden to perform the sacraments, and the predominantly Presbyterian Ulster Scots were forced to pay tithes to support the Church of Ireland while their own ministers went unpaid (Bridenbaugh 1952; Fischer 1989; Leyburn 1962; McWhiney 1988).

Beginning about 1714, the Scotch-Irish, along with other Protestants from northern Ireland, Wales, and the Anglo-Scottish border country, began a large-scale migration to the American colonies along the Atlantic seaboard, seeking economic and religious freedom. Colonial governors in Pennsylvania, Virginia, and the Carolinas offered generous land grants to these incoming settlers along the Appalachian frontier. This colonial policy had the dual benefit of distancing the newcomers from the predominantly English coastal cities and employing them as a buffer against the generally hostile eastern Indian tribes, who were being gradually pushed out of their ancient homelands (Bridenbaugh 1952; Fischer 1989; Leyburn 1962; McWhiney 1988).

The martial heritage of these “Northern Britons” made them an ideal foil against the warlike nature of the woodland Indians, while the remoteness of the frontier settlements forced the settlers to become increasingly self-sufficient and self-reliant. Whereas the German Moravians and Mennonites and the English Quakers who also settled in the Backcountry refused to take arms against any threat, the Scotch-Irish and northern English Border clansmen had no qualms about extending their settlements into Indian territory and bringing their own brand of Anglo-Scottish frontier warfare to the foothills and mountains of the Appalachian ridge. In fact, during the French and Indian War, the northern British settlers quickly adapted their traditional brand of border warfare to incorporate fighting techniques learned from the Indians, and were more successful in frontier fighting than any regiments of British regular troops. On the rare occasions when colonial officials from the coastal capitals journeyed into the Backcountry, they noticed how successfully the Scotch-Irish and northern British settlers had adapted to life on the frontier (Bridenbaugh 1952; Fischer 1989; Leyburn 1962; McWhiney 1988). In July 1765, the attorney general of North Carolina, Robert Jones Jr., returned from a month-long sojourn among the Scotch-Irish settlers in the foothills of the Appalachians with the following observations:

> The Inhabitants are hospitable in their way, live in Plenty & Dirt, are stout, of great Prowess & manual Athletics, & in private conversation bold impertinent & vain. In the art of War (after the Indian manner) they are well skilled, are enterprizing & fruitful in Stratagems, and when in Action as bold & intrepid as the antient Romans [*sic*]. The Shawanese [Shawnees] acknowledge them their Superiors even in their own way of fighting (Jones cited in Saunders 1890, p. 101).

The decade of the 1760s proved to be a period of great social and political upheaval throughout the Southern Backcountry. The Great Awakening, led by the charismatic and influential George Whitfield, brought a religious fervor to the Appalachian frontier that did much to loosen the Church of England's tenuous influence in the region. The Scotch-Irish Presbyterians from Ulster, along with Baptists and Methodists from northern England and Wales and Reformed Calvinists from the German and French speaking areas of Europe, completely undermined the efforts of the Established Church to "Anglicize" the western Carolinas. At the same time, the complete disregard shown by the colonial governments, particularly in North and South Carolina, for the safety and well-being of the Backcountry, while at the same time leveling taxes to support a government and church in which the settlers had no representation, led to a period of vigilante justice and armed rebellion known as the Regulator Wars. Many historians see the turbulent social and political events of the late 1760s and early 1770s as the real beginnings of the American Revolution in the Southern Backcountry (Bridenbaugh 1952; Fischer 1989; Leyburn 1962; Holifield 2003; Kidd 2007, 2010).

The Great Awakening and Religious Independence on the Appalachian Frontier

Although the Church of England exercised great control over the colonial governments of Virginia and the Carolinas, as well as the predominantly English population living along the coast, the Backcountry settlements were beyond its reach and generally hostile to its influence. In an environment of independent colonists far from the oversight of royal government and Established Church, the influence of itinerant evangelists cannot be overestimated. Foremost among these traveling ministers was George Whitefield, who visited America seven times between 1738 and 1770. His preaching both enervated and liberated settlers who already felt disenfranchised by a government that ignored them and a church that regarded them as little better than savages and apostates. As it had done in the North, the Awakening democratized religion in the Southern colonies by equalizing the balance of power between minister and congregation. Presbyterians and other Calvinists in the Backcountry found this entirely in keeping with their own religious organization, where congregations were governed by elected elders who hired and fired ministers as they saw fit. Although Whitefield was an Anglican and (along with the Wesley brothers) one of the founders of Methodism, he rejected the Arminian doctrines of grace and atonement which appealed to the Wesleys. Instead, he embraced the Calvinist tenets of predestination and eternal election promulgated by John Calvin and John Knox. This made him especially popular with Presbyterians and other Calvinists in the Backcountry (Gaustad 1966; Holifield 2003; Hudson 1973; Kidd 2007, 2010).

Anglican officials in the eastern cities of the Carolinas regarded Whitefield's visits with apprehension and suspicion. Mainstream Anglicans had little respect for

the reforming efforts of the Methodists under the best of circumstances, and they regarded Whitefield as little more than a showman. In the fall of 1764, Whitefield set out on one of his journeys from New York to the Carolinas and Georgia. As Whitefield passed through North Carolina, the Anglican rector at the North Carolina capital of New Bern, the Reverend James Reed, documented his progress in letters to the Secretary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts (SPG), the Church of England's missionary organization:

> On Saturday the 17 of Nov^{r} last the Rev^{d} Mr. Whitford [Whitefield] arrived here from the northern Provinces, on his Journey to S^{o} Carolina [and] Georgia and at the request of the inhabitants of this town stayed & Preached on Sunday in the forenoon to a very numerous Congregation & in the afternoon proceeded on his Journey…he kept quite clear of Enthusiastic rant & within the bounds of decency, till towards the close when he got to raving & in the opinion of the most competent Judges, spoiled the whole [sermon]… (Reed cited in Saunders 1888, p. 1061).

Reed also expressed the opinions of many Anglican ministers, particularly those in the colonies, regarding the evangelical Methodists who regarded Whitefield as a founding father. During a return visit to North Carolina in July 1765, Whitefield preached to a crowd in New Bern that included many Methodists, whom Reed described in a letter to the Secretary of the SPG in less than complementary terms. Reed noted with satisfaction that Whitefield's enthusiasm for the more dramatic aspects of Methodist worship was apparently beginning to fade:

> Several that had been tinctured with the principles of Methodism came a great many miles to hear him, but had the mortification to hear both their principles and practice in general condemned. For his Sermon, the very digressive was clear of enthusiastic Rant and really a good one the substance of it contradictory to some of their principal Tenets and *particularly severe against a vile prejudice to which they were very much addicted vizt of making their religion a mere Cloak as pretext for their indolence and sloth. As his name had been frequently made use of here to countenance the principle and practice of an Idle dissolute and disorderly Sect, against which some part of his discourse was particularly levelled…* (Reed cited in Saunders 1890, p. 97, emphasis added).

Royal governors in the Carolinas, as representatives of the Crown, fully expected the Church of England to be supported by both king and colonists as the officially established church. In July 1765, the newly appointed lieutenant governor of North Carolina, William Tryon, wrote to the SPG regarding the desperate need for Anglican clergy in the province, particularly to counteract the considerable influence of the Presbyterians and New Light Baptists in the Carolinas.[1] Tryon was himself a devoted Anglican and very anxious to see the Church of England obtain a more secure foothold over the religious affairs of his colony:

> *Every sect of religion abounds here except the Roman Catholic and by the best information I can get, Presbytery and a sect who call themselves New Lights, (not of the flock of*

[1] Royal governors were generally members of the nobility who showed little interest in running their colonies and seldom bothered to visit them from England. Lieutenant governors were the de facto heads of state, particularly in the Carolinas, and largely responsible for the success or failure of colonial rule.

> *Mr Whitefield) but Superior Lights from New England, appear in the front.* These new Lights live chiefly in the maritime counties, the Presbyterians are settled mostly in the back or westward counties, tho' the Church of England I reckon at present to have the majority of all other sects; and when a sufficient number of clergy as exemplary in their lives, as orthodox in their doctrine, can persuade themselves to come into this Country, I doubt not but the larger number of every sect would come over to the established religion…Many efforts have been made to obtain a good clergy act in this province, but as every trial have been [*sic*] as often clogged with objections incompatible with the rights of the Crown and the ecclesiastical jurisdiction, they have proved fruitless. This Act however I flatter myself is free from every material objection, and therefore beg leave *to recommend to the consideration of the Society the extreme advantage that will accrue to his Majesty's subjects by a happy establishment of religion here*…As no British colony on this continent stands in more, or so much need of regular moral clergymen, as this does, I hope the Society will give all possible assistance to contribute to the happy effects of the present orthodox bill…(Tryon cited in Saunders 1890, pp. 102–103, emphasis added).

Tryon's predecessor, Arthur Dobbs, was a native of Ireland and although Anglican, he understood the Scotch-Irish and encouraged them to settle in western North Carolina. In August of 1755, Dobbs visited the Scotch-Irish settlers on the upper Yadkin and Catawba rivers. In a subsequent letter to the British Board of Trade, he noted, "They are a Colony from Ireland removed from Pennsylvania, of what we call Scotch-Irish Presbyterians who with others in the neighbouring Tracts had settled together in order to have a teacher of their own opinion and choice…" (Dobbs cited in Saunders 1888, p. 356). Dobbs died in office in 1765, and he would prove to be the last royal governor of that colony to view the Scotch-Irish Presbyterians so favorably. As Dobbs noted, the Presbyterians preferred their own ministers to those appointed by the Church of England, but in the Backcountry ordained ministers were in short supply, regardless of denomination (Saunders 1888). The Presbyterians in western North Carolina did not receive a full-time pastor until 1758, when the Reverend Alexander Craighead accepted a call from the Rocky River congregation in present-day Cabarrus County. Craighead would prove to be the most influential minister in western North Carolina prior to the outbreak of the American Revolution, and he was instrumental in encouraging the anti-British and anti-Anglican sentiment that prompted British officers to regard the Carolina Backcountry as the heart of the rebellion (Craighead 1876; Foote 1846; Thompson 1963; White 1911).

Alexander Craighead was a third-generation Presbyterian minister whose father and grandfather, along with many other Presbyterians, had suffered severely at the hands of the English Crown and Church in northern Ireland. This history of persecution instilled a long-standing animosity toward the British that ran deep in the Craighead family for generations (Craighead 1876; Scoggins 2012). Craighead was born in County Donegal, Ireland in 1707 and immigrated to Boston in 1714 with his father, Reverend Thomas Craighead, and another Presbyterian minister, Reverend William Holmes, along with their families and members of their congregations. This immigration is the earliest recorded removal of a Presbyterian minister and congregation from Ulster to North America, but it would certainly not be the last (Leyburn 1962; Matthews 1967; McElwain 1956; McGeachy 1954;

Scoggins 2012; White 1911). Thomas Craighead preached in Massachusetts and Delaware before being assigned to the Pennsylvania frontier, where he became the first pastor to be installed in the Cumberland Valley. Alexander Craighead grew up on the Pennsylvania frontier and studied under his father, from whom he inherited a large dose of anti-British sentiment. He was licensed by the Donegal Presbytery in 1734 and became the first Protestant minister to preach west of the Susquehanna River (Craighead 1876; Matthews 1967; McElwain 1956; McGeachy 1954; Scoggins 2012; Spence 1954).

Alexander Craighead was an earnest and impassioned preacher and was greatly respected by his congregants. He became a friend and admirer of the great evangelical Methodist preacher George Whitefield, and he adopted Whitefield's zeal for revivals (Craighead 1876; Scoggins 2012). The Awakening evangelist Reverend Samuel Blair attended one of Craighead's sermons in Pennsylvania in which the congregation was so moved that "some burst out with an audible noise into bitter crying" (Blair cited in Craighead 1876, p. 42). Craighead often escorted Whitefield, Blair, and their fellow evangelist Gilbert Tennent through the settlements of Chester County, Pennsylvania, and Blair later wrote that as they rode together "they made the woods ring, most sweetly singing and praising God" (Blair cited in Craighead 1876, p. 42). Revivalists like Whitefield and Craighead believed it proper to preach within the territory of other congregations whenever they were invited to do so, in spite of a resolution passed in 1739 by the Presbyterian Synod forbidding its members to preach "out of their own bounds" without the permission of their presbytery. As a result of these unconventional practices, Craighead soon incurred the displeasure of his presbytery and lost his license to preach (Craighead 1876; McGeachy 1954; Scoggins 2012; White 1911).

By 1741, the Great Awakening had created a divisive debate that split the Presbyterian Church into two factions, the New Side and the Old Side (Holifield 2003; Howe 1870; White 1911; Scoggins 2012). The New Side party favored revivals, claiming that they revealed the power and grace of God, while the Old Side party opposed them, claiming that revivals created too much excitement and disorder (Holifield 2003; Howe 1870; White 1911). This division resulted in the creation of the Synod of Philadelphia (Old Side) and the Synod of New York (New Side) in June 1741, and the synod remained so divided for 17 years (Howe 1870; McGeachy 1954). When the synod split, Craighead aligned himself with the New Side party and the New Castle Presbytery. He endeavored to persuade his fellow New Side ministers to adopt the National Covenant of 1581 and the Solemn League and Covenant of 1643. These covenants, which were drafted in Scotland during the Reformation, promised to defend the Presbyterian faith as the true Christian doctrine taught in the Holy Bible, and renounced all secular authority over the Church such as that exercised by the King of England over the Church of England (McGeachy 1954; Scoggins 2012). Craighead declared his allegiance to the Reformed Presbyterians, commonly known as Covenanters or Cameronians, who were both spiritual and lineal descendants of the original signers of the old Scottish Covenants. He began corresponding with the Reformed Presbytery of

Scotland, although he never officially became a minister of the Reformed Presbyterian Church (Scoggins 2012; Spence 1954).

In January 1742, Craighead led his congregation in a renewal of the Solemn League and Covenant, and he published a booklet describing the ceremonies and the reasons for their observance (Spence 1954). He required new parents to adopt the Solemn League and Covenant before baptizing their children, and he withdrew from the New Castle Presbytery because the presbytery refused to acknowledge the binding authority of the Scottish Covenants (Craighead 1876; McGeachy 1954; Scoggins 2012; Thompson 1963). With these actions, Craighead revealed the interesting personal contradictions that marked his entire adult life: he was politically very liberal, while theologically very conservative:

> Mr. Craighead was the foremost American of his day in advocating those principles of civil liberty under a republican form of government, to confirm which the Revolutionary War was fought. At the same time, he was one of the least liberal of men in the matter of religious tolerance, and a breeder of dissension amongst his clerical brethren (Hanna 1902 II, p. 40).

In 1743, Craighead published a pamphlet outlining his reasons for leaving the presbytery, stating that he had withdrawn from the New Siders because neither synod nor presbytery had publicly adopted the Westminster Confession (Craighead 1876; Scoggins 2012). That same year an anonymous political pamphlet began circulating that denounced the colonial government of Pennsylvania in no uncertain terms. It was widely believed that the author of the pamphlet was the Reverend Alexander Craighead, and he made no attempt to deny it. Thomas Cookson, one of His Majesty's justices for Lancaster County, brought the pamphlet to the attention of the Synod of Philadelphia. The synod examined it and agreed unanimously that the booklet was "full of treason and sedition," and on May 26, 1743, the synod publicly disowned Craighead and his booklet, which they said was designed to "foment or encourage sedition or dissatisfaction with the civil government that we are now under" (Synod cited in Thompson 1963 I, p. 63). This action prompted Craighead to make his own public statement: on November 11, 1743, he and his Covenanters on the Pennsylvania frontier raised their swords toward Heaven and signed a new covenant affirming their allegiance to the true Christian church and denouncing the royal authority on both sides of the Atlantic (Hanna 1902; Spence 1954; Thompson 1963). The document addressed both the present and future kings of England in no uncertain terms:

> We do likewise enter our Testimony against *George* the I., his having any legal Right to rule over this Realm, because he being an outlandish *Lutherian*; and likewise against *George* the II., for their being sworn Prelaticks, the Head of Malignants, and Protectors of Sectarian Hereticks, and Electory Princes of *Brunswick*, in chusing of new Emporers [*sic*], which is their giving their power to the Beast; and for their Confederacy with Popish Princes, directly contrary to the second Commandment; and for Want of their Scriptural and national Qualifications, as is above said; and for their being established Head of the Church by the Laws of *England*… We likewise state our Testimony against all that shall succeed them under these Limitations to the Crown (Craighead cited in Spence 1954, p. 11).

After enacting this new covenant, Craighead labored to secure additional Reformed ministers to emigrate from Scotland to North America. His affinity for the Covenanters led him to serve as president of the Covenanter Society in Pennsylvania from 1743 until 1749 (Craighead 1876; McGeachy 1954; Spence 1954). During this period Craighead "roamed at will, sometimes with one group, sometimes with another, but always carrying the Gospel to the pioneers and braving the dangers of the frontier" (McElwain 1956, p. 37). In the late 1740s, he quarreled with some of the Covenanters in Pennsylvania, and in 1749, he took his family to Augusta County, Virginia, which at that time included the entire Virginia frontier west of the Blue Ridge Mountains (Craighead 1876; Spence 1954; Thompson 1963). By June of 1752, he had settled near the forks of the James River, about 2 miles south of Lexington in what is now Rockbridge County, where he helped to establish the Forks of the James Meeting House (Caruthers 1842; McGeachy 1954; Wilson 1954; Scoggins 2012).

Because the Church of England was the Established Church in colonial Virginia, non-Anglican ministers and congregations in Virginia were required to support the Church with tithes, but at the same time dissenting ministers were not allowed to perform marriage ceremonies in their own congregations (Matthews 1967; Scoggins 2012). Craighead soon came into conflict with the Anglican Church and colonial authorities over this issue. Two Anglican vestrymen in Augusta Parish complained to the Governor's Council that "the Revd Mr Alexander Creaghead [*sic*] had taught and maintained treasonable positions, and preached and published pernicious doctrines." On June 10, 1752, Lieutenant Governor Robert Dinwiddie instructed the Augusta County sheriff to "apprehend and secure in safe custody the said Creaghead, and immediately bring him before the Governor in Williamsburg" (Dinwiddie cited in Matthews 1967, pp. 27–28).

Craighead was forced to take the necessary oaths of conformance to the Established Church in order to be licensed to preach in Augusta County (Chalkley 1965 I, p. 54). He appeared before the Governor's Council in Williamsburg on October 17, 1752, in order to address the complaints lodged against him by the Anglican vestrymen (McGeachy 1954). Craighead produced a testimonial from the presbytery and his license from Augusta County, and the Council ordered the following:

> That the said Alexander Creaghead be permitted to preach, upon fully recanting his disloyal Principles, and the Doctrines contained in the Book delivered to the Governor, and taking the Oaths to the Government openly in the General Court (Council cited in McGeachy 1954, p. 28).

The outbreak of the French and Indian War in 1754 turned the Virginia frontier into a bloody battleground between colonists and Indians. In July of 1755, the entire Valley of Virginia was thrown into a panic when General Edward Braddock's British army suffered a disastrous defeat at the hands of the French and their Indian allies in Ohio. Encouraged by their victory over the British, the Indians terrorized the frontier settlements from Canada to southern Virginia, burning homes, killing settlers, and taking scalps to sell to the French (Leyburn 1962; Scoggins 2012). The

situation soon became intolerable for Craighead and his Scotch-Irish neighbors in western Virginia. The colonial government in Williamsburg expected them to defend the frontier against the Indians and the French, and to support the Church of England with their taxes, but at the same time Presbyterian ministers like Craighead were not permitted to perform marriages in their own congregations without swearing oaths of loyalty to the Established Church (Scoggins 2012; Waddell 1888).

After Braddock's defeat, many of the settlers on the Virginia frontier fled east across the Blue Ridge Mountains, and some continued on into the Carolina Backcountry. In the fall of 1755, most of Craighead's congregation packed up and moved to the comparative safety of western North Carolina, where they settled in the region between the Catawba and Yadkin Rivers. On September 22, 1755, the Reverend Hugh McAden, an itinerant Presbyterian minister, encountered these refugees as he traveled through what is now Iredell County, near the site of present-day Center Presbyterian Church (Foote 1846). As McAden recorded in his journal:

> …came up with a large company of men, women, and children, who had fled for their lives from the Cow or Calf pasture in Virginia; from whom I received the melancholy account, that the Indians were still doing a great deal of mischief in those parts, by murdering and destroying several of the inhabitants, and banishing the rest from their houses and livings, whereby they are forced to fly into desert places (McAden cited in Foote 1846, p. 168).

In April 1758, the Hanover Presbytery in Virginia granted a request from Rocky River Presbyterian Church in western North Carolina that Craighead become their pastor (McGeachy 1954; Spence 1954). With this appointment in hand, Craighead moved his family across the Blue Ridge to the foothills of North Carolina. Thus began the final and most famous phase of Alexander Craighead's ministry, which was to establish him as the foremost minister in the North Carolina Piedmont for the last 8 years of his life. In addition to preaching at Rocky River, Craighead took over as pastor for another congregation on Sugar Creek near the town of Charlotte. Here in the Backcountry of the Carolina Piedmont, Craighead seems to have finally found a place he could call home, away from the interference of royal authority and religious hierarchy (Foote 1846):

> In Carolina, he found a people remote from the seat of authority, among whom the intolerant laws [of the English] were a dead letter, so far divided from other congregations, even of his own faith, that there could be no collision with him, on account of faith or practice; so united in their general principles of religion and church government, that he was the teacher of the whole population, and here his spirit rested. Here he passed his days; here he poured forth his principles of religious and civil government, undisturbed by the jealousy of the government, too distant to be aware of his doings, or too careless to be interested in the poor and distant emigrants on the Catawba [River].
>
> Mr. Craighead had the priviledge [*sic*] of forming the principles, both civil and religious, in no measured degree, of a race of men that feared God, and feared not labor and hardship, or the face of man; a race that sought for freedom and property in the wilderness, and having found them rejoiced,—a race capable of great excellence, mental and physical, whose minds could conceive the glorious idea of Independence, and whose convention

> announced it to the world, in May 1775, and whose hands sustained it in the trying scenes of the Revolution (Foote 1846, p. 187).

Craighead's teachings were highly influential in the Mecklenburg settlement. He taught that God must be worshipped every day in the home and every Sunday in the church, in strict accordance with the Holy Bible and the Westminster Confession (White 1911). His lessons and sermons also maintained the importance of civil liberty and separation of church and state:

> He continued to claim that the British colonial government had no right nor authority to take away his privileges as an ordained officer in the church. He taught his people that they, as homebuilders and as defenders of the Western Carolina country, had the right to manage their home affairs—a right which the governor of the colony could not take from them (White 1911, pp. 76–77).

This unrelenting hostility to the colonial government and the Church of England caused Craighead to break with the Rocky River congregation in 1760, when two of the church's trustees began cooperating with Lieutenant Governor Arthur Dobbs. These two men, Nathaniel Alexander and Robert Harris, had agreed to serve on a commission appointed by Governor Dobbs to settle the long-standing colonial boundary dispute between North and South Carolina. Craighead's suspicion of the colonial government caused him to resign his pastorate at Rocky River and to devote his energies solely to Sugar Creek. His suspicions were later confirmed when the two trustees were awarded title to the Rocky River Church property by Governor Dobbs (McGeachy 1954; Thompson 1963).

During the early 1760s, Craighead helped establish several other Presbyterian congregations in the area between the Catawba and Yadkin Rivers, and he preached at all of them. From 1758 until his death in 1766, he was the only established minister in colonial Anson and Mecklenburg counties, which at that time encompassed much of western North Carolina (Foote 1846; Scoggins 2012; Spence 1954; White 1911). In 1764, Governor Dobbs wrote to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in London requesting that they send over a minister to help establish the Church of England in Mecklenburg County. The Society accordingly dispatched the Reverend Andrew Morton from England, and he arrived in North Carolina in 1766. Reverend Morton experienced firsthand the depth of the anti-British, anti-Anglican spirit in the Carolina Backcountry (Saunders 1890). The Reverend James Reed at New Bern wrote the Secretary of the SPG in July 1766 informing him of the difficulties in promoting the Established Church in western North Carolina:

> Mr. Morton arrived here about the 18th of last Month from the Northward and stayed with me to refresh himself a few days, then proceeded to Brunswick to wait upon the Governor and from thence intended to [visit] Mecklenburgh [*sic*] County.—But on his arrival at Brunswick, he was very creditably, and I believe, very truly informed, that the inhabitants of that County evaded the Vestry Act by electing the most rigid dissenters for Vestrymen who would not qualify; *that the county abounded with Dissenters of various denominations and particularly with Covenanters Seceders Anabaptists and New Lights; that he would meet with a very cold, if any reception at all[,] have few or no hearers and lead a very uneasy life*—Such disagreeable relations quite discouraged Mr. Morton from

> proceeding any further—He therefore thought proper with the Governor's consent to return and settle in Northampton County in the Northern part of this province where I flatter myself he will be kindly received, be of real service, and meet with the venerable society's approbation… (Reed cited in Saunders 1890, pp. 241–242, emphasis added).

In a letter to the Secretary of the SPG dated August 25, 1766, Morton gave his own testimony about his aborted journey into the Carolina Backcountry:

> From Newbern I pursued my Journey to Cape Fear where I received such Intelligence as discouraged me from proceeding any further—*There I was well informed that the Inhabitants of Mecklenburg are entire dissenters of the most rigid kind—That they had a solemn leage [sic] and covenant teacher settled among them. That they were in general greatly averse to the Church of England—and that they looked upon a law lately enacted in this province for the better establishment of the Church as oppressive as the Stamp Act and were determined to prevent its taking place there, by opposing the settlement of any Minister of the Church of England that might be sent amongst them*—In short it was very evident that in Mecklenburg County I could be of little use to the honourable Society and I thought it but prudent to decline embroiling myself with an infatuated people to no purpose and trusting that the Venerable Society, upon a just representation of the matter would not be dissatisfied with my conduct (Morton cited in Saunders 1890, pp. 252–253, emphasis added).

The "Solemn League and Covenant teacher" was, of course, the Reverend Craighead, whose hostility to the British Crown and the Anglican Church was obviously well known as far east as the Cape Fear River. Although Craighead died in March 1766, word of his passing had not yet reached the eastern cities, and his reputation was enough to persuade Anglican preachers like Morton to remain in the more hospitable coastal settlements. Craighead's lifelong opposition to British authority earned him the posthumous title "Father of Independence" in Mecklenburg County and his legacy continued long after his death (Davidson 1951; Scoggins 2012). Four years before the beginning of the American Revolution, members of Craighead's congregations in western North Carolina joined other Backcountry settlers in the Regulator movement to protest unfair taxes and regulations, and they fought against troops of the royal governor William Tryon at the Battle of Alamance in May 1771 (Hanna 1902; Leyburn 1962; Scoggins 2012). Most of the men who signed the Mecklenburg Resolves (also known as the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence) on May 20, 1775, were members of Craighead's congregations, and the list of the names at the end of that document reads like a who's who of prominent Mecklenburg County Presbyterians (Craighead 1876; Davidson 1951; Scoggins 2012). One of Craighead's most famous students was Brigadier General William Lee Davidson, who commanded a brigade of North Carolina troops during the American Revolution (Davidson 1951; Scoggins 2012). Craighead's son Robert served as a captain in the Mecklenburg County militia during the war and fought in several battles. Another son, Thomas Brown Craighead, was the pastor at the Waxhaw Presbyterian Church in upper South Carolina during the early years of the Revolution, and his anti-British sentiments forced him to flee to Virginia when the British occupied South Carolina in 1780 (Howe 1870; Scoggins 2012).

New Monsters and Presbyterian Dogs in the South Carolina Upcountry

The western border between North and South Carolina was a source of heated dispute between the two colonies during the 1760s, and the boundary west of the Catawba River was not settled until 1772. From a religious and cultural standpoint, however, there was little difference between the settlements along the disputed border in the Carolina Piedmont; both regions were heavily settled by Scotch-Irish and northern British Protestants with little love for the Crown or the Established Church. This was a critical time in the South Carolina Backcountry, as tensions with the government in Charleston were erupting into armed conflict known as the Regulator War. The royal government of South Carolina had done almost nothing to protect the Backcountry settlers from the squatters, outlaws, rustlers, and highwaymen known as *banditti* who infested the lawless frontier. There were no courts, no sheriffs, and very little in the way of law and order to protect the early settlers. In 1768, tensions erupted as Backcountry settlers took the law into their own hands and formed vigilante protection groups called Regulators. Matters soon escalated, and anti-Regulator groups known as Moderators were organized to counter the violence of the Regulators. The government finally stepped in, arrested the Regulator leaders, and peace was restored. The end result of this was the Circuit Court Act of 1769, by which South Carolina established district courts in the Backcountry to enforce the law (Leyburn 1962; Scoggins 2005; Woodmason 1953).

As in North Carolina, the Great Awakening had also populated the South Carolina Backcountry with a variety of conflicting religious sects. Scotch-Irish Presbyterians from the north of Ireland were the dominant sect, but there were also Baptists, Methodists, German Reformed, Dutch Reformed, Quakers, and the Awakened Protestants known as New Lights, a term applied somewhat indiscriminately to Congregationalists, Baptists, and Methodists who had embraced the revivalist fervor of Jonathan Edwards, George Whitefield, and other evangelistic preachers. There were no Anglican churches, only Presbyterian and Baptist meeting houses and rural camp grounds where traveling ministers preached in the open to whomever showed up to hear them (Leyburn 1962; Woodmason 1953).

One of the most prolific of these missionaries was the Reverend Charles Woodmason, an Anglican itinerant who preached in the northernmost settlements of South Carolina from 1766 to 1772. He kept a journal detailing much of his travels, and also preserved many of his sermons, and these documents form a valuable (if highly prejudiced) window into the religious and political turmoil that beset the region during this period. Woodmason was a loyal Englishman and a devout Anglican, and the condition of the South Carolina Backcountry shocked and distressed him. He was troubled by the economic conditions of the settlers, many of whom he characterized as desperately poor, and even more dismayed by what he considered the deplorable state of religion and the almost total absence of the Established Church (Woodmason 1953). "Church people" like Woodmason in

the Southern Backcountry complained bitterly about the innumerable sects that were active in the area during and after the Great Awakening:

> [1765] In the Country are 8 Presbyterian Meetings [meeting houses], supply'd with Ministers from Scotland, who form a Presbytery, and govern their Members after the Plan of the Scotch Kirk. Most of these congregations are in decay tho' strongly supported from Home…Methodism has been endeavor'd to be introduc'd in Carolina, but has made no Progress: They run to hear *Whitfield* [*sic*] out of Curiosity only, as an Orator, but will not adopt his Principles, or admit his Pupils…As to North Carolina, the State of Religion therein, is greatly to be lamented—If it can be said, That there is any Religion, or a Religious Person in it…Africk [Africa] never more abounded with New Monsters, than Pensylvania [*sic*] does with New Sects, who are continually sending out their Emissaries around. One of those Parties, known by the Title of *New Lights* or the *Gifted Brethern* [*sic*] (for they pretend to Inspiration) now infest the whole Back Country, and have even penetrated South Carolina (Woodmason 1953, pp. 74–78).

> [January 1767] I returned and preached the 27th in my Way back at Lynch's Creek to a great Multitude of People assembled together, being the 1st Episcopal Minister they had seen since their being in the province—They complain'd of being eaten up by Itinerant Teachers, Preachers, and Imposters from New England and Pensylvania—Baptists, New Lights, Presbyterians, Independents, and an hundred other Sects—So that one day You might hear this System of Doctrine—the next day another—next day another, retrograde to both—Thus by the Variety of Taylors who would pretend to know the best fashion in which Christs Coat [*sic*] is to be worn none will put it on—And among the Various Plans of Religion, they are at Loss which to adapt, and consequently are without any Religion at all (Woodmason 1953, p. 13)

> [April 1767] Returned to Pine Tree [Camden], and gave Sermon as usual on Sunday April 5th. The Reason why my Congregation here is not larger, am told is That there are a Gang of Baptists or New Lights over the [Wateree] River to whom many on that Side resort—And that on Swift Creek 10 Miles below, a Methodist has set up to read and preach ev'ry Sunday—Both of them exceeding low and ignorant persons—Yet the lower Class chuse [*sic*] to resort to them rather than to hear a Well connected Discourse (Woodmason 1953, p. 20).

> [May 1767] At P. D. [Peedee River] the Sheriff and people of Anson County in North Carolina attended and conducted me up thither, and treated me with great Civility…A numerous Body of People attended at the Court House where I celebrated Divine Service and baptiz'd about 60 Children…They had ne'er seen an Episcopal Minister before. A Number of Well dressed people there—seem'd more an English than Carolina Congregation—A large Body of Baptists and New Lights with their Teachers attended—Wanted to preach before me, and to enter into Disputes—found them exceeding Vain and Ignorant—They rode down the Road 10 Miles with me to escort me, asking Questions on Divinity all the Way. I found their Reading to be of no greater Extent than the Pilgrims Progress and Works of John Bunyan (Woodmason 1953, pp. 21–22).

> [June 1768] As to Itinerant Ministers You must understand that all (or greatest Part) of this Part of the Province w[h]ere I am, has been settled within these 5 Years by Irish Presbyterians from Belfast, or Pensylvania and they imagin'd that they could secure this large Tract of fine Country to themselves and their Sect. Hereon, they built Meeting Houses, and got Pastors from Ireland, and Scotland. But with these there has also a Great Number of New Lights and Independents come here from New England, and many Baptists from thence, being driven from, and not able to live there among the Saints….' Tis these roving Teachers that stir up the Minds of the People against the Establish'd Church, and her Ministers—and make the Situation of any Gentleman extremely uneasy, vexatious, and disagreeable…Among these Quakers and Presbyterians, are many concealed Papists—

> They are not tolerated in this Government—And in the Shape of New Light Preachers, I've met with many Jesuits. We have too here a Society of *Dunkards* [German Baptists or "Dunkers"]—these resort to hear me when I am over at Jackson's Creek.

> Among this Medley of Religions—True Genuine Christianity is not to be found. And the perverse persecuting spirit of the Presbyterians, displays it Self much more here than in Scotland…These Sects are eternally jarring among themselves—The Presbyterians hate the Baptists far more than they do the Episcopalians, and so of the Rest—But (as in England) they will unite altogether—in a Body to distress or injure the Church establish'd (Woodmason 1953, pp. 41–43).

> [August 1768] The Congregation [at Camden] confirm'd to Me the Report, that the Anabaptists should threat to whip me, if I came any more on that Side of the River to preach (Woodmason 1953, p. 58).

Woodmason was especially hostile to the Scotch-Irish Presbyterians, and they returned that hostility in kind. His comments—often exaggerated or distorted for effect—reflect the ethnic and religious prejudice that he shared with many upper class Englishmen regarding people from the "Celtic fringe" of Britain and Ireland. On virtually every page of his journal, he rails against the Presbyterians in general and those from the north of Ireland in particular:

> [January 1767] I was obliged to travel upwards—having engaged my Self for next Sunday at the Settlement of Irish Presbyterians called the Waxaws [Waxhaws], among whome [*sic*] were several Church People…This is a very fruitful fine Spot, thro' which the dividing Line between North and South Carolina runs—The Heads of P. D. [Peedee] River, Lynch's Creek and many other Creeks take their Rise in this Quarter—so that a finer Body of Land is no where to be seen—But it is occupied by a Sett of the most lowest vilest Crew breathing—Scotch Irish Presbyterians from the North of Ireland—They have built a Meeting House and have a Pastor, a Scots Man among them…He wants to introduce Watts' Psalms in place of the barbarous Scotch Version—but they will not admit it…They never heard an Episcopal Minister, or the Common Prayer, and were very curious (Woodmason 1953, pp. 13–14).[2]

> [June 1768] For altho' [the Chief Justice of South Carolina] was a Gentleman of Ireland, yet he abominated these Northern Scotch-Irish and they are certainly the worst Vermin on Earth (Woodmason 1953, p. 50).[3]

> [September 1768] …above 30,000£ Sterling have lately been expended to bring over 5 or 6000 Ignorant, mean, worthless, beggarly Irish Presbyterians, the Scum of the Earth, and Refuse of Mankind, and this, soley to ballance [*sic*] the Emigration of People from Virginia, who are all of the Established Church (Woodmason 1953, pp. 60–61).

---

[2] The pastor at the Waxhaw Meeting House was the Reverend William Richardson, who married one of the daughters of Rev. Alexander Craighead. "Watts' Psalms" is a reference to the works of Rev. Dr. Isaac Watts, an Anglican minister and hymnist who published a psalter for the Church of England and wrote many well-known hymns, including "Joy to the World." The Scottish Presbyterians preferred their own Scottish psalter, which was written in the lowland Scots dialect.

[3] Charles Shinner was chief justice of South Carolina from 1761 until his death in 1768. A native of Ireland and a friend of Woodmason, he was himself the victim of English prejudice because of his Irish birth. A British newspaper article, reprinted in South Carolina, called him "'an *Irishman* of the lowest Class' and the son of a tradesman, who had risen '*through a Series of those various Shifts and Changes which chequer the Lives of* NEEDY ADVENTURERS'" (cited in Woodmason 1953, p. 292n).

Faced with such attitudes from the Church of England's only representative in the South Carolina Backcountry, the Scotch-Irish settlers responded with their own brand of frontier justice. Wherever Woodmason preached, the Presbyterians and Baptists did their best to disrupt his services, frustrate his plans, bar him from meeting houses, and turn the populace against him.

> [February 1767] I had appointed a Congregation to meet me at the Head of Hanging Rock Creek—Where I arriv'd on Tuesday Evening—Found the Houses filled with debauch'd licentious fellows, and Scot Presbyterians who had hir'd these lawless Ruffians to insult me, which they did with impunity—Telling me, they wanted no D—d Black Gown Sons of Bitches among them—and threatening to lay me behind the Fire, which they assuredly would have done had not some travellers alighted very opportunely, and taken me under Protection…the Service was greatly interrupted by a Gang of Presbyterians who kept hallooing and whooping without Door like Indians (Woodmason 1953, pp. 16–17)

> [March 1767] In the Morning came a large Body of people, 2/3 of them Presbyterians—They had prepared a Band of Ruffians as before to make disturbance—But a Neighboring Magistrate came to the Service and officiated as Clerk, bringing with Him a party of the Catawba Indians—These poor Wretches behaved more quiet and decent than the Lawless Crew—who kept (as before) a great Noise without Door; The Indians resented their affronts and fought with several of them, which only made more Noises. I went home to the Magistrate's House, and from thence next day to visit the Presbyterian Minister according to an Invitation made me when he was at my House at Pine Tree—We address'd some of the Elders, and represented the Insolence of some of their Congregations. They disown'd all Proceedings and the authors of them—tho' twas very visible that they set them on (Woodmason 1953, p. 20).

> [December 1767] This Day we had another Specimen of the Envy Malice and Temper of the Presbyterians—They gave away 2 Barrels of Whisky to the Populace to make drink, and for to disturb the Service—for this being the first time that the Communion was ever celebrated in this Wild remote Part of the World, it gave a Great Alarm, and caus'd them much Pain and Vexation.[4] The Company got drunk by 10 oth Clock [*sic*] and we could hear them firing, hooping, and hallowing like Indians. Some few came before the Communion was finish'd and were very Noisy—and could I have found out the Individuals, would have punish'd them (Woodmason 1953, p. 30).

> [June 1768] Such is their attachment to their [Scottish] Kirk:—Some call me a Jesuit—and the Liturgy the Mass—I have observ'd what Tricks they would have play'd on Christmas Day, to have disturbed the People. I will mention another.

> Not long after, they hir'd a Band of rude fellows to come to Service who brought with them 57 Dogs (for I counted them) which in Time of Service they set fighting, and I was obliged to stop—In Time of Sermon they repeated it—and I was oblig'd to desist and dismiss the People. It is in vain to take up or commit these lawless Ruffians—for they have nothing, and the Charge of sending them to Charlestown, would take a Years salary—We are without any Law, or Order—And as all the Magistrates are Presbyterians, I could not get a Warrant—If I got Warrants as the Constables are Presbyterians likewise, I could not get them serv'd—If serv'd, the Guard would let them escape… Another Time (in order to disapoint [*sic*] me of a Congregation, and to laugh at the People) they posted a Paper,

[4] In spite of what Woodmason would have us believe, the Presbyterians, Baptists and other Protestant sects in the Southern Backcountry also celebrated communion, although perhaps not as frequently as Woodmason would have liked.

> signifying, That the King having discovered the Popish Designs of Mr. Woodmason and other Romish Priests in disguise, to bring in Popery and Slavery, had sent over Orders to suspend them all, and to order them to be sent over to England so that there would be no more preaching for the future. This was believed by some of the Poor Ignorants, and kept them at home…
>
> What I could not effect by Force—or Reason—I have done by Sarcasm—for at the Time when they sent the fellows with their Dogs, one of the Dogs followed me down here [to Camden]—which I carried to the House of one of the principals—and told him that I had 57 Presbyterians came that Day to Service, and that I had converted one of them, and brought Him home—I left the Dog with him—This Joke has made them so extremely angry that they could cut my Throat—But I've gained my Aim, having had no disturbance from them since—for if a Presbyterian now shews his face at Service, our People ask him if he is come to be *Converted*. So Shame has driven them away (Woodmason 1953, pp. 45–46).

Although such behavior as Woodmason describes seems outrageous to modern sensibilities, one must keep in mind that Woodmason undoubtedly exaggerated his accounts and colored them with language calculated to rouse the religious ire of his fellow Anglicans. Furthermore, Woodmason appears to have been oblivious to the intense religious and social persecutions that the Presbyterians in Ulster had endured at the hands of the Church of Ireland during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, especially Queen Anne's Test Act of 1703 that required all public office holders, regardless of religious conviction, to subscribe to the Anglican sacraments. He also failed to take into account the many centuries of warfare, famine, and death that the people of Scotland, Ireland, and Wales had suffered while England endeavored to subjugate those countries to the English Crown. Woodmason and his Anglican brethren were the heirs to over 1,000 years of England's militant imperialism against its Celtic neighbors, and the Celts were people with long memories. Woodmason left South Carolina in 1772, seeking appointments in Virginia and Maryland, and returned to England in 1774, where he spent his final years in obscurity. When the predominantly English troops of the British army invaded the Carolina Backcountry in 1780, they found that their staunchest opponents were the same settlers from Scotland, Ireland, and Wales who had made Woodmason's life so miserable (Fischer 1989; Hanna 1902; Hudson 1973; Leyburn 1962; Woodmason 1953).

Awakened Rebels in the Carolina Backcountry

One of the less obvious aspects of the Great Awakening that materialized in the Carolina Backcountry was the influence of the Presbyterian-founded College of New Jersey and its dynamic president, the Reverend John Witherspoon. Numerous ministers who came to preach in the Carolina Piedmont in the years preceding the Revolution were graduates of the College of New Jersey and had been highly influenced by the democratic principles of Reverend Witherspoon. Many of his students also became officers in the American army during the war or held

high-ranking positions in the state governments and the Continental Congress. The effects of his teachings and his inspirational guidance echoed throughout the founding years of the new republic (Calhoon 2002; Howe 1870; Kidd 2007, 2010).

John Knox Witherspoon was born at Gifford, East Lothian, Scotland in 1723 and was reputedly a descendant of the Scottish reformer John Knox, who was also born in East Lothian only a few miles from the Witherspoon residence.[5] Witherspoon studied at the University of Edinburgh and was ordained as a Presbyterian minister in the Church of Scotland in 1745, where he soon became an Evangelical opponent of the so-called Moderate Party of the Scottish Kirk. The Moderates were an intellectual and secularizing product of the Scottish Enlightenment that opposed the more fundamentalist Reformed Presbyterians, and stressed conduct over creed, a looser adherence to the Westminster Confession, and a more Anglican-style church hierarchy that included ministerial appointments by the nobility and landed gentry. This latter policy was bitterly opposed by conservative Presbyterians who insisted that ministers should be called by their congregations, not appointed by wealthy landowners (Howe 1870; Maclean 1877).

In 1768, Witherspoon accepted an invitation to become President and head professor of the fledgling College of New Jersey, a Presbyterian establishment that educated many of colonial America's ministers and politicians and would eventually become Princeton University (Calhoon 2002; Kidd 2007, 2010; Maclean 1877). He quickly proved himself able to straddle the divide between evangelism and orthodoxy:

> On becoming President of the College of New Jersey…he reached out to New Side Presbyterians—who considered him one of their own because of his long leadership of the evangelical party in Scotland—and to the Old Side, whose aversion to revivalism he quietly shared, to find common religious ground…Witherspoon sought middle ground between Calvinist dogmatism and secular enlightenment cosmopolitanism…His reputation for orthodoxy may have impressed the Princeton Trustees who recruited him in 1767, but it was his well-practiced role as a cosmopolitan evangelical on which he drew when he arrived at Princeton and set about educating American Presbyterians about their faith and their intellectual heritage (Calhoon 2002, pp. 124–125).

Witherspoon had many friends among the evangelicals of the Great Awakening, including George Whitefield and the famous Presbyterian physician Dr. Benjamin Rush of Philadelphia. He took an early and decisive role in the struggle for American independence; he served in the Continental Congress and he was the only minister to sign the Declaration of Independence (Calhoon 2002; Kidd 2010).[6] Calhoon suggests that it was his ability to successfully incorporate

---

[5] Author Michael C. Scoggins can trace his paternal ancestry back to the Giffords of Scotland, a Norman French family who were granted lands in East Lothian during the reign of King David I of Scotland (d. 1153). The family became Presbyterian during the Scottish Reformation.

[6] Witherspoon's influence on the Declaration of Independence was profound. After the Declaration was signed, Horace Walpole of the British Parliament remarked, "There is no use crying about it. Cousin America has run off with a Presbyterian parson, and that is the end of it" (Walpole cited in Leyburn 1962).

theology, philosophy, and politics into Princeton's curriculum that made him immensely popular with his students and his peers. He notes that "…making all three appropriate at the same time, was a revolutionary achievement, not just revolutionary because Witherspoon was signer of the Declaration of Independence and almost all of his students in the College of New Jersey [were] staunch patriots, but also revolutionary in thinking that theology, philosophy, and politics were engines of behavior, and all three engines of the same kind of behavior" (Calhoon 2002, p. 126). Calhoon goes on to observe:

> In his celebrated Revolutionary sermon, *The Dominion of Providence over the Passions of Men*, preached in Princeton, May 17, 1776, on the occasion of the Continental Congress's call for a day of fasting and repentance, Witherspoon did not forecast the vote for independence he would cast in the Continental Congress forty-five days later; instead, his sermon subjected the process of revolutionary consensus-building to moderate Calvinist criticism. Providence was the means by which God restrained human passions and used 'the cunning and cruelty of oppressive and corrupt ministers and…the inhumanity of brutal soldiers…to promote the glory of God.' In the divine calculus of providence, persecution backfired on tyrannical rulers by inspiring the faithful to superhuman discipline; piety in the midst of military victory alone inoculated the soldiers of Christ from overweening pride in their hour of triumph; and, most significantly, God was the source of the abundant hope and assurance of success which made the legions of the righteous a force to be reckoned with…the sermon illustrated Witherspoon's intuitive understanding of political moderation as a compound of caution and risk. Hard won during a quarter century of close quarters combat with Edinburgh's self-proclaimed moderates, that insight equipped Witherspoon to entertain the idea that God in His Providence might well smile on, and support, the colonists' effort to resist British encroachments on their liberty (Calhoon 2002, pp. 127–128).

Witherspoon's students filled the ranks of the Continental Army (several of his divinity students were army chaplains), the seats of the Continental Congress, and the pulpits of Presbyterian churches throughout the 13 colonies. Among his better known graduates were Vice President Aaron Burr, President James Madison, nationalist poet Philip Freneau, Attorney General William Bradford, Judge Hugh Henry Brackenridge (who served as Washington's army chaplain during the war), Lieutenant Colonel Henry "Light Horse Harry" Lee of the Continental cavalry (father of General Robert E. Lee), and Charles Lee, the younger brother of Light Horse Harry, who succeeded Bradford as United States attorney general (Kidd 2010; Maclean 1877; Peterson 1985).[7] "Ten of his former students became cabinet officers, six were members of the Continental Congress, 39 became Congressmen, and twenty-one sat in the Senate. His graduates included 12 governors, and when the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America met in 1789, 52 of the 100 and 88 delegates had studied under Witherspoon. The limited-government philosophy of most of these men was due in large measure to Witherspoon's influence" (Peterson 1985, p. 1).

[7] Aaron Burr came by his Presbyterian credentials naturally. He was the son of the Reverend Aaron Burr Sr., a Presbyterian minister and the second President of the College of New Jersey. His mother, Esther Edwards, was the daughter of the Calvinist theologian Jonathan Edwards, a founder of the Great Awakening (Boatner 1994; Purcell 1993).

Graduates of the College of New Jersey, both before and after Witherspoon became president, also made their way into the Carolina Backcountry, where they were influential ministers and leaders during the Revolution. Among them was the Reverend David Caldwell, who for 60 years was one of the preeminent Presbyterian clergymen in the North Carolina Piedmont. Caldwell was the son of Scottish immigrants and grew up in the Scotch-Irish community of Lancaster County, Pennsylvania. His wife was Rachel Craighead, one of the daughters of the Reverend Alexander Craighead of Mecklenburg County. Although Caldwell graduated the College of New Jersey prior to Witherspoon's ascendancy, he was greatly influenced by Witherspoon's teachings and after the war he founded his own "log college" in North Carolina, modeled after his alma mater and using Witherspoon's lectures as textbooks (Calhoon 2002; Caruthers 1842).

In 1766, Caldwell was installed as pastor of the Buffalo and Alamance Presbyterian Churches in Guilford County, North Carolina, which were still divided over the Old Side-New Side controversy (Caruthers 1842). After reconciling these differences, he was soon caught up in the Regulator movement of 1771, when Backcountry farmers, including most of Caldwell's parishioners, openly rebelled against the oppressive taxes leveled by Lieutenant Governor William Tryon. Caldwell attempted to serve as a mediator between Tryon and the Backcountry rebels, only to witness Tryon execute many of the movement's leaders, including two Awakened religious mystics, an English Baptist named Benjamin Merrill and a Welsh Protestant named James Pugh (Calhoon 2002; Leyburn 1962).

> Standing near a makeshift gallows, [Caldwell] heard Pugh speak of the righteousness of his Regulator cause and condemn the way office holders, beholden to the coastal aristocracy, gouged Backcountry farmers, Caldwell's parishioners among them, for such essential government services as recording deeds and surveying land tracts. Warming to his theme, Pugh mentioned by name Edmund Fanning, the worst abuser of political power in the backcountry, only to have one of Fanning's cronies kick away the box on which the condemned man stood on tip toes, leaving him dangling from the hangman's noose, his defiant words wafting through the silent air. The horror of that moment stayed with Caldwell for the rest of his life (Calhoon 2002, p. 131).

The Regulator movement and the subsequent Battle of Alamance in May 1771, where Tryon's government troops crushed the rebels, had a profound effect on Caldwell. In early 1776, two Presbyterian ministers from New Jersey, Elihu Spencer and Alexander McWhorter (another graduate of the College of New Jersey), visited Caldwell at the request of one of North Carolina's Congressional delegates, seeking support for the Revolutionary cause in the Backcountry (Calhoon 2002; Kidd 2007). Caldwell penned a 7,000-word jeremiad entitled "The Character and Doom of the Sluggard," taken from Proverbs 12:24, which states that "the slothful shall be under tribute" (Calhoon 2002).

> Caldwell detailed the understandable but nonetheless inexcusable sinfulness of political indifference and the wickedness of cowering before a tyrant. In this way Caldwell responded, with all of his pent up feeling, to Spencer and McWhorter's difficult question as to whether religious folk in the "back parts" of North Carolina had acquired, in the

aftermath of the Regulation, "a temper of mind" which now unhinged their fighting spirit (Calhoon 2002, p. 133).

As the British army would later find out, the Regulator War had not unhinged the fighting spirit of western North Carolina. Most of the Regulators would go on to become Whigs, or rebels, fighting for American independence. The martial spirit of the North Carolina Backcountry would manifest itself throughout the coming Revolution, both on its on soil, in campaigns in South Carolina and Georgia, and by providing hundreds of troops to serve in the Continental Army under George Washington. Caldwell led his parishioners throughout the Revolution and served in North Carolina's two Constitutional conventions in 1788 and 1789, where as an anti-Federalist he voted against ratification (Calhoon 2002; Kidd 2007).

Witherspoon's graduates included several other influential Presbyterian ministers who preached in the Carolina Backcountry during the war, who will be discussed more fully below. One of his students was the Reverend Samuel Doak, who ministered to the "Overmountain" settlements in the Watauga River country of eastern Tennessee, which prior to 1790 was considered part of North Carolina (Draper 1881; Gilchrist 2003). Another student was the Reverend Thomas Brown Craighead, the son of Alexander Craighead, who graduated from Princeton in 1778, supplied several churches in western North Carolina, and became pastor of the Waxhaw Presbyterian Church in present-day Lancaster County, South Carolina in 1779 (Caruthers 1842; Craighead 1876; Howe 1870; Scoggins 2012). Other Witherspoon students who preached in the South Carolina upcountry and who led their congregations against the British during the Revolution included the Reverend John Simpson, pastor of the Upper and Lower Fishing Creek Churches in Chester County and Bethesda Church in York County, and the Reverend Joseph Alexander, who ministered at Bullock's Creek Church and supplied Beersheba Church, both in York County, during the war (Howe 1870; Scoggins 2005).

Following the outbreak of armed conflict with Great Britain in the early summer of 1775, the South Carolina Provincial Congress sent its own evangelistic mission into the Backcountry seeking support for the Revolution, led by a prominent low-country planter and Continental Congressman named William Henry Drayton. The ecclesiastical component of this mission included two Protestant ministers from Charleston whose backgrounds were firmly rooted in the Great Awakening. One was the Reverend William Tennent III, a Provincial Congressman, third-generation Presbyterian minister, pastor of the Independent Presbyterian Church in Charleston, graduate of the College of New Jersey, and the son and grandson of the New England Awakening leaders whose names he shared. The other minister was the Reverend Oliver Hart, a self-taught Baptist preacher who grew up in Pennsylvania in the 1740s during the height of the Great Awakening, listening to the sermons of George Whitefield, the Tennents, Jonathan Edwards, and Abel Morgan. Hart was pastor of the Baptist Church in Charleston and a staunch friend of the militantly independent Separate Baptists in the Backcountry. Drayton could not have chosen two men better suited to persuade the Backcountry residents to support the Revolution (Benedict 1813; Kidd 2007; Scoggins 2005).

The mission met with mixed success. In the predominantly German and Swiss settlements in the middle Orangeburg and Saxe-Gotha Districts, they found little support. In the westernmost Ninety-Six District, they found friends among the Ulster Presbyterians and Separate Baptists, but met considerable resistance among mainstream Baptists and Anglicans. Their warmest reception came when Tennent visited the Scotch-Irish Presbyterians between the upper Broad and Catawba Rivers, in what are now York, Chester, and Lancaster counties. Here he found a people who shared his Scottish Presbyterian ancestry and generally detested the English Crown and Church—many of the same people who had caused the Reverend Woodmason so much trouble only a few years before (Kidd 2007; Scoggins 2005). In August 1775, Tennent crossed the Broad River into the New Acquisition District, so-called because it had been officially acquired from North Carolina following the boundary survey of 1772—the area that includes all of modern day York County and parts of Cherokee and Lancaster counties. Here the population was overwhelmingly Scotch-Irish and Presbyterian, including many Covenanters. Addressing a standing room only crowd at the Reverend Joseph Alexander's Bullock's Creek Meeting House on the east side of the Broad River, Tennent procured the New Acquisition's heartfelt pledges of support for the Revolution, and he helped the local militia regiment organize several companies of "Volunteer Horse Rangers." After returning to Charleston and hearing Drayton's report, the Provincial Congress had a very good idea of where the people of the Backcountry stood on the subject of American independence (Kidd 2007; Scoggins 2005). The stage was set for revolution in the Southern Backcountry and an all-out holy war between Britain and the Awakened rebels along the Appalachian frontier.

Holy War Comes to the Southern Backcountry

From 1775 until 1780, the Revolutionary War in the Carolina Backcountry was much like the war along the Appalachian frontier in the other Atlantic colonies. The rebels, or Whigs as they called themselves, controlled the state governments, but in the Backcountry there were large numbers of disaffected loyalists or Tories, along with hostile Indian tribes who generally supported Britain in the hope that a British victory would halt the expansionist policies of colonial settlers. Backcountry rebels served as Continental soldiers, state troops, and militiamen, fighting British soldiers along the coast and in the North, and skirmishing with loyalists and Indians in the interior. The war was both a political struggle for independence and a civil war that pitted Whigs against Tories and divided families, communities, and congregations into rebels and loyalists. Presbyterians from Scotland and Ireland formed the bulk of the Whig troops in the Backcountry. Many Anglicans, Methodists, Baptists, and German Protestants remained neutral or, if staunchly loyal to the Crown, fled to British-controlled East Florida to escape Whig vengeance. The war had yet to take on a profoundly religious overtone.

In May 1780, however, the British army finally succeeded in capturing Charleston, the capital of South Carolina, along with an entire American army stationed there, and began a heavy-handed occupation of the Carolina Backcountry. Crown forces immediately initiated a program of “counterinsurgency” directed against these Backcountry rebels. British soldiers confiscated food, cattle, and horses; imprisoned or hanged rebel leaders; terrorized their wives and children; and plundered their homes. They also arrested Presbyterian ministers, burned their meeting houses, and profaned their holy books.

This punitive campaign created a tremendous backlash among the Scotch-Irish; they began to regard the American Revolution not just as a war for independence, but as a holy war. Presbyterian clergymen preached fiery sermons encouraging their congregations to “fight to the death,” and their rhetoric was couched in eloquent Old Testament phraseology. The Presbyterians identified themselves as God’s chosen people, the Israelites, while they cast the British and their loyalist allies in the role of classic Biblical villains—Egyptians, Canaanites, Philistines, and Assyrians. For the next 3 years, Backcountry militiamen up and down the Carolina frontier waged an intense and bloody partisan war against British and loyalist troops. The Revolution in the Carolina Backcountry thus foreshadowed the nineteenth-century and twentieth-century guerilla wars in Napoleonic Spain, Nazi-occupied Europe, postwar Latin America, and Cold War Indochina. At the same time, the conflict’s religious overtones (particularly in the Southern Backcountry) gave it characteristics in common with other holy wars throughout history, from the Roman occupation of Celtic Britain and the medieval Crusades to the more recent conflicts in the Middle East.

David Versus Goliath: Buford’s Massacre and Huck’s Defeat

The groundwork for the religious war in the Carolinas was laid on May 29, 1780 at a crossroads in the Waxhaw community of north-central South Carolina. The Waxhaws, as the area was known (from the name of an old Indian tribe that formerly inhabited the region), had been heavily settled by Scotch-Irish Presbyterians from the frontiers of Pennsylvania and Virginia during the 1750s and 1760s. Many of these settlers had fled the Appalachian Mountain settlements following the French and Indian defeat of General Braddock’s British army on the Ohio River in July 1755. In the Carolina Backcountry, the settlers were relatively safe from the bloodshed of the French and Indian War, although there was still conflict with the Cherokee Indians. By 1755, the Waxhaw settlers had erected a Presbyterian meeting house; the community grew and became the starting point for further expansion to the west and south. When the Revolutionary War began, the people of the Waxhaws, like most of the Scotch-Irish communities in the Backcountry, generally supported the Whig cause. The minister for the Waxhaw

congregation in 1780 was the Reverend Thomas Brown Craighead, the son of Alexander Craighead and a graduate of John Witherspoon's College of New Jersey (Craighead 1876; Howe 1870; Leyburn 1962; Scoggins 2005).

After the American army in Charleston surrendered to the British on May 12, 1780, the British commander-in-chief, Sir Henry Clinton, turned over command to his subordinate, Lieutenant General Charles, Earl Cornwallis, and returned to the more civilized environs of New York. As Cornwallis advanced into the Backcountry toward Camden, he learned that a regiment of American Continental reinforcements from Virginia was retreating toward North Carolina after the surrender of Charleston. Although they were Continental soldiers, these men were for the most part new recruits led by officers with little or no battle experience. Cornwallis dispatched an aggressive and capable young cavalry commander, Lieutenant Colonel Banastre Tarleton, with his British Legion provincial regiment and a detachment of the 17th Light Dragoons to intercept the American troops, commanded by Virginia Colonel Abraham Buford. Tarleton overtook Buford's retreating force in the Waxhaw community of modern Lancaster County, South Carolina on the afternoon of May 29. The resulting hand-to-hand battle would come to be known as Buford's Massacre; of Buford's 350 men, 113 were killed during the battle and another 150 were wounded, most so badly that they could not be transported to the British base at Camden. Tarleton lost five men killed and 14 wounded out of a total force of 270 men (Bass 1961; Scoggins 2005; Tarleton 1787).

Most of the wounded American soldiers were transported to the Waxhaw Presbyterian Meeting House some 10 miles distant, to be tended by the local populace (Scoggins 2005; Tarleton 1787). Their wounds were primarily inflicted by British cavalry sabers and infantry bayonets, and as later writers would describe it, "unarmed men were hewed in pieces" (Howe 1870, pp. 536–537). The scene at the Waxhaw Meeting House shocked and dismayed the local men and women who came to the aid of these wounded soldiers; although the war had been raging for 5 years, this type of butchery was unknown and unprecedented, especially at the hands of professional British troops. Tarleton and his men were accused of executing American soldiers who had grounded their arms and surrendered (Ellet 1854; Scoggins 2005). Tarleton himself, in his subsequent memoirs, referred to the battle as "a slaughter" and noted that his men were "stimulated…to a vindictive asperity not easily restrained" (Tarleton 1787, pp. 30–31). While it has become fashionable for modern historians to dispute the alleged massacre of Buford's men, the important point is the effect that the battle and the American casualties had on the upcountry Scotch-Irish Presbyterians (Boatner 1994; Scoggins 2005).

> Coming so soon after the shock of Charleston's surrender, the total defeat of Buford's command at the Waxhaws stunned the Backcountry. Even worse for the British cause, the belief that Buford's men had been cut down after they asked for quarter soon resulted in the battle becoming known as "Buford's Massacre," and Whigs throughout the Carolinas began referring to Tarleton as "Bloody Ban" and "Butcher Tarleton." Within a short period of time, the catch phrase "Tarleton's Quarter," meaning "no quarter at all," became the battle cry of the Backcountry (Scoggins 2005, pp. 45–46).

Lord Cornwallis and the British army arrived in Camden, the northernmost town in the South Carolina Piedmont, on the first of June and established their headquarters. Cornwallis then dispatched provincial troops to occupy several strategic points in the Backcountry and establish fortified outposts there, ostensibly to subdue the scattered rebel militiamen who were still in arms. He also instructed his officers to offer protection to loyalists, neutrals, and former rebels who would swear allegiance to King George and serve in the loyalist militia. During the first 2 weeks of June, British troops secured forward outposts at Fort Ninety-Six on the Saluda River (in modern Greenwood County), Rocky Mount on the Catawba River (modern Fairfield County), and Long Bluff on the Pee Dee River (modern Chesterfield County) (Bass 1961; Tarleton 1787).

Lord Cornwallis and his second-in-command, Lieutenant Colonel Francis, Lord Rawdon (a member of the Anglo-Irish nobility), expected cooperation and submission from the Backcountry settlers. This was not to be. As Lieutenant Colonel Tarleton wryly noted in his memoirs, "The sentiments of the inhabitants did not correspond to his lordship's expectations: He there learned what experience confirmed, that the Irish were the most averse of all other settlers to the British government in America" (Tarleton 1787, p. 86).

While the Battle of the Waxhaws did not specifically target the Scotch-Irish Presbyterians in the Backcountry, the events that followed did. The first manifestation that the war was taking a religious turn was the flight of two of the most prominent and respected Presbyterian ministers in the upper Broad and Catawba River settlements, both of whom were graduates of John Witherspoon's College of New Jersey. Soon after the British occupied Camden, the Reverend Thomas Craighead abandoned his congregation in the Waxhaws and fled to Virginia, never to return. Reverend Craighead undoubtedly expected to be arrested by the British, since his family's anti-Anglican and anti-royalist sentiments were well known throughout the region (Howe 1870).

Perhaps even more distressing to the Whigs in upper South Carolina was the loss of the Reverend Joseph Alexander, the beloved pastor of the Presbyterian congregation at Bullock's Creek Meeting House, situated on the Broad River in the New Acquisition District (modern York County). Reverend Alexander had taken post at Bullock's Creek in 1774, just before the outbreak of hostilities. The Alexanders were influential Scotch-Irish Whigs who lived in adjacent Mecklenburg County, North Carolina; they included the reverend's uncles Hezekiah and John McKnitt Alexander and his cousins Charles, Ezra, Abraham, and Adam Alexander. These men worshipped at Sugar Creek Presbyterian Church near Charlotte, where they grew up under the tutelage of the Great Awakening's anti-British firebrand, Alexander Craighead. They were also active in the Whig militia and had signed the Mecklenburg Resolves in May 1775, publicly declaring their independence from Great Britain and their opposition to the monarchy of King George III (Wheeler 1851). The South Carolina Presbyterian historian, Dr. George Howe, later described Reverend Alexander in these terms:

> He was an ardent and fearless patriot. Filled with a sense of his country's wrongs, he did not scruple to advocate its cause in public and private. He was obnoxious therefore to those who favored the royal authorities, but at all times possessed the warm affections of his own people. The few men that were at home and the lads that were not absent from home at the time on public service, habitually repaired to church on Sabbath mornings with their rifles in hand, and around what was known in the next generation as the 'Old Log meeting-house,' guarded the minister and the worshipping congregation while he preached (Howe 1870, p. 431).

Major Joseph McJunkin, a Whig militiaman and Presbyterian elder from Union County, South Carolina, noted in his memoirs that Joseph Alexander's "known zeal for liberty, and activity in exhorting this people to union in the cause of their country, had made him so obnoxious to the British and Tories, that he had been compelled, after the fall of Charleston, to leave the State…" (McJunkin cited in O'Neall 1843, p. 33). Around the end of May or the first of June 1780, Reverend Alexander evacuated Bullock's Creek to live among his kinfolk in Mecklenburg County, which had not yet been invaded by the British. He did not return home until the spring of 1781, following the definitive British defeat at the Battle of the Cowpens. In Alexander's absence, several of the Whig militia regiments from the upcountry, including the New Acquisition regiment from York County, the Fair Forest regiment from Union County, and the Spartan regiment from Spartanburg County, assembled at the Bullock's Creek Meeting House, took a vote, and unanimously resolved to continue the fight against the British invaders. As more than one veteran later recalled, the upcountry Presbyterians were convinced that God was on their side and would lead them to ultimate victory, just as he had once helped the ancient Hebrews triumph over the idol-worshipping Egyptians, Canaanites, and Philistines (Craig 1854; Hill 1921; McJunkin 1837, 1840; O'Neall 1843).

During the first week of June 1780, a veteran British army officer began establishing a fortified position at the site of a colonial trading post called Rocky Mount on the Catawba River, deep in rebel territory. Lieutenant Colonel George Turnbull was a native of Scotland who had served in the British army for over 30 years. He distinguished himself in battle during the Northern Campaigns of the American Revolution and as a reward was given command of a British provincial regiment known as the New York Volunteers. After extensive service with the British army in New York, Turnbull and his regiment came south and participated in the capture of Savannah and Charleston. Along with a company of Turnbull's New York Volunteers, Lord Rawdon also detached a troop of dragoons or cavalrymen from Banastre Tarleton's British Legion to garrison Rocky Mount. Commanded by a Philadelphia lawyer of German parentage named Christian Huck, these British dragoons were veterans of the battle for Charleston and Buford's Massacre at the Waxhaws (Scoggins 2005; Tarleton 1787; Winn 1812).

Captain Christian Huck, whose name was often spelled "Hook," was originally trained as an attorney and had enjoyed a lucrative practice in Philadelphia before the war (Ousterhout 1987; Scoggins 2005). During the British occupation of Philadelphia, Huck and many of his acquaintances openly declared their loyalty to

King George. As a consequence, they were branded as traitors by the state of Pennsylvania. After the British abandoned Philadelphia in June 1778, the Pennsylvania government confiscated the loyalists' property and banished them from the state. Having lost their homes, reputations, and livelihoods, the Philadelphia loyalists joined the British army at New York and offered their services to the Crown. Most of them received officers' commissions in the British provincial corps, which was composed primarily of American colonists and recent European immigrants who wished to serve in the king's army (Katcher and Youens 1973; Scoggins 2005). Huck became an officer in a provincial infantry unit called Emmerick's Chasseurs, but later transferred to the cavalry and became a troop commander in the British Legion under Lieutenant Colonel Tarleton (Sabine 1966; Scoggins 2005).

For reasons that are still not entirely clear, Huck arrived in the South Carolina Backcountry with an intense dislike for the Scotch-Irish Presbyterians. While animosity toward the rebels is certainly understandable from a man who had lost everything at their hands, his widely reported hatred of the Presbyterians in the Backcountry is more difficult to explain. There was a large population of Scotch-Irish settlers in the Pennsylvania counties of York, Chester, and Lancaster (from which the counties in the South Carolina Backcountry later took their names), and like their cousins in the Carolinas they almost universally supported the war for independence.[8] While Huck and his friends had certainly suffered persecution at their hands, his animosity may have been part of a more general attitude among upper class Pennsylvanians toward an ethnic group that was often regarded as "the scum of the earth." Regardless of the cause, Huck displayed his contempt for the Scotch-Irish and their religion in every way possible, and his attitude and actions were long remembered by the people who felt his wrath (Ramsay 1785; Sabine 1966; Scoggins 2005).

One of the duties that made Huck and his troopers especially loathsome to the local populace was foraging. The British army in general, and the cavalry in particular, needed large quantities of food and fodder for men and horses. While the British could bring in salt, rum, gunpowder, ammunition, and other military supplies through the port at Charleston, they were forced to scavenge for provisions in the field, which meant confiscating wheat, corn, oats, cattle, pigs, and horses from Backcountry plantations. Loyalist plantation owners were given receipts for their goods, but known rebels were lucky if their plantations were not left in flames by the foraging British troops (Stedman 1794; Tarleton 1787).

Meanwhile, the local Whig militia companies were not sitting idly by. During the first week of June, the Whigs retaliated by attacking two different public assemblies where loyalist militia officers were actively recruiting men to join Turnbull's

[8] The depth of Scotch-Irish support for the Revolution in Pennsylvania was apparent even to foreign military officers. A German Hessian officer serving in the British army, Captain Johann Heinrichs, wrote to a friend in January 1778, "Call this war, dearest friend, by whatever name you may, only call it not an American Rebellion, it is nothing more nor less than an Irish-Scotch Presbyterian Rebellion" (Heinrichs 1898, p. 137).

command. The first attack, led by Captain John McClure of Fishing Creek in Chester County, took place on June 6, 1780 at Alexander's Old Field near the modern town of Great Falls on the Catawba River. It was a surprise attack at dawn, Indian style, and the loyalists were quickly routed. McClure and his company of 30 militiamen, including a number of former Continentals, were all Scotch-Irish Presbyterians from the congregations at the Upper Fishing Creek and Catholic Meeting Houses, where the Reverend John Simpson was pastor. Simpson, another student of John Witherspoon at the College of New Jersey, also supplied the Bethesda Meeting House further north on the South Fork of Fishing Creek in the New Acquisition District, present-day York County (Craig 1854; Ellet 1854; Howe 1870; Scoggins 2005).

Immediately following the battle at Alexander's Old Field, McClure's company was joined by a company of Scotch-Irish Presbyterians from the Bethesda congregation led by Colonel William Bratton. Bratton was a veteran of 5 years of warfare and one of the most experienced militia officers in the upcountry. On the tenth of June, McClure and Bratton attacked another loyalist assembly at Mobley's Meeting House, situated in a Baptist settlement on the Little River in Fairfield County. Once again, the Whigs used their frontier Indian tactics and the loyalists were defeated and dispersed. These actions alarmed Colonel Turnbull at Rocky Mount, and he resolved to use the troops at his command to put an end to the rebel incursions (Scoggins 2005; Winn 1812).

Turnbull was busy trying to assemble enough horses to mount a company of his New York Volunteer infantry, commanded by Lieutenant William Adamson, so they could accompany Huck's cavalry on patrol. He was also recruiting mounted loyalist militia from the region, but he was less than impressed with their abilities. Although Turnbull was a native of the Border region of lowland Scotland, 34 years of service in the British army and 5 years of warfare against rebellious Americans had left him with little sympathy for the descendants of the lowland Scots and northern British border clans who populated the Carolina frontier—regardless of whether they were loyalists or rebels. Turnbull's own ancestors were "border reivers" who crisscrossed the Anglo-Scottish border during the turbulent sixteenth century, engaging in endless cattle raids and blood feuds for which they were justifiably infamous. He was understandably less than enthusiastic to find the progeny of these same clans now ranged against him in the struggle for control of the Backcountry (Fraser 1971; Scoggins 2005; Scoggins et al. 2011).

In several letters to Lord Cornwallis written during June and July 1780, Turnbull made no secret of his dislike for the Carolina frontier and his contempt for the people whom he called "bounty Irish," meaning immigrants from the north of Ireland who had settled on bounty land grants from the king. "There is an Irish settlement at Turkey and Bullock Creek [York County]," he wrote Cornwallis in early June. "I do believe those fellows would be much the better for some troops to keep them in order for a little, they have become very violent." In a follow-up letter the next day, he described the South Carolina Backcountry as "the worst Spot" in the province and "the Neck of Rebellion." On another occasion he sarcastically referred to "my good friends the Bounty Irish" who infested the frontier settlements. "I wish I could say something in their favor," he complained.

"I believe them to be the worst of the Creation—and nothing will bring them to reason but severity." He went on to note that "my friends the Irish above are perhaps the greatest Skum of Creation," using language almost identical that that employed by Charles Woodmason 12 years earlier (Turnbull cited in Scoggins 2005, pp. 185–196).

Following the skirmishes at Alexander's Old Field and Mobley's Meeting House, Turnbull dispatched Captain Huck with his troop of cavalry and a company of loyalist militia to disperse the rebel militia units commanded by Colonel Bratton and Captain McClure. Turnbull knew that the rebels were camped at the Upper Fishing Creek Meeting House, where the pastor, Reverend Simpson, had been eloquently encouraging his congregation to resist the British occupation (Craig 1854; Ellet 1854; Scoggins 2005). Simpson "was distinguished throughout the country for the zeal with which, at the earliest period of the struggle, he espoused the cause of liberty," noted the nineteenth-century historian Elizabeth Ellet (1854, p. 217). Unlike some of his fellow ministers, however, Simpson did not just preach rebellion from the pulpit and then flee north at the first sign of trouble. As the South Carolina audited accounts for Revolutionary War service clearly demonstrate, on June 10, 1780 the reverend shouldered his rifle and joined one of the Whig militia companies from upper Fishing Creek (Scoggins 2005). Ellet describes what happened next:

> The Rev. John Simpson was regarded [by the British] as the head and counsellor of the band of heroes who had so signally defeated the enemy at [Alexander's] Old Field and Mobley's—and it was determined that his punishment should be speedy. In pursuance of this resolution, a [British] party took their way to the church, where they expected to find the pastor with this assembled congregation, intending, as was believed at the time, to burn both church and people, by way of warning to other 'disturbers of the King's peace' (Ellet 1854, p. 217).

Huck and his men arrived at Fishing Creek Meeting House early on the morning of Sunday, June 11, 1780. They were disappointed to find that McClure, Bratton, Simpson, and the rest of the local Whig militia had already departed, perhaps tipped off that the British were on the way. According to Colonel Turnbull's after-action report to Cornwallis, Huck's loyalist militiamen spotted "two men with Rebell Uniforms" running across a wheat field and opened fire; they wounded one man and killed the other (Turnbull cited in Scoggins 2005, p. 188). Local historians from the Fishing Creek community told a much more gruesome tale: that Huck's men shot down an innocent 17-year-old boy named William Strong for no other crime than that he was reading his Bible on a Sunday morning. According to local tradition, the officers then proceeded to hack his body to pieces with their swords while his mother vainly pleaded for them to stop (Ellet 1854).

The South Carolina state archives confirm that both William Strong and his older brother Christopher were members of the local militia, so Turnbull's report is certainly accurate in that respect. But it also seems just as likely that Strong was unarmed and that the loyalist militia took some pleasure in the affair. The killing of young William Strong reverberated throughout the Fishing Creek community like the tolling of a bell, and both Huck and his officers would soon be held to account for it (Scoggins 2005).

Huck then proceeded to the home or "manse" of Reverend Simpson. As Simpson's wife, Mary Remer Simpson, and her children fled out the back door and into the woods, the provincials and loyalist militia plundered the house, set it on fire, and then torched an outbuilding containing the minister's library (Ellet 1854). Several period sources also state that the loyalists burned the Fishing Creek Meeting House (Scoggins 2005; Winn 1812). It was the first of several Presbyterian meeting houses in South Carolina that British and loyalist soldiers would consign to flames during the following months. While the Crown troops may have hoped that such actions would punish the rebels and bring them back into the fold, the effect was exactly the opposite. The deliberate destruction of Presbyterian meeting houses, and the persecution of ministers and their families, would turn the war in the Backcountry into a holy war, with the Presbyterians identifying themselves as God's chosen people and their enemies as Old Testament heathens (Scoggins 2005). The British historian William Gordon, in his 1788 study of the American Revolution, had no doubts about the effect of Huck's actions:

> During his command, he in a very particular manner displayed his enmity to the presbyterians, by burning the library and dwelling-house of their clergyman, and all bibles containing the Scotch translation of the psalms, which is held in the highest veneration by the generality of the Scotch and Irish presbyterians, and their descendants, through the United States. These proceedings inspired the numerous devout people of the district with an unusual animation. They…opposed the British with the enthusiasm of men called upon to defend, not only their civil liberties, but their holy religion (Gordon 1788 III, p. 389).

On the same morning that Huck's troopers destroyed the Reverend Simpson's manse, library, and meeting house, another Backcountry minister was preaching a fiery sermon against the British invasion of South Carolina. The Reverend William Martin was a Reformed Presbyterian who led five shiploads of Scotch-Irish immigrants from Ballymoney in County Antrim of the Ulster Province to the South Carolina upcountry in 1772. Martin's congregation was composed of Covenanters, descendants of the hardline Scottish reformers who had sworn blood oaths against the English Crown, and the Church of England during the Scottish Reformation. After settling in the lower part of Chester County, they established a Covenanter meeting house on Rocky Creek (Ellet 1854; Howe 1870). Not surprisingly, when the Revolution began Martin was a staunch Whig, "and he did not scruple to use his influence in the cause of the colonists" (Craig 1854, p. 1). John Craig, a militiaman in the New Acquisition regiment, recalled Reverend Martin as a vocal opponent to British rule, much like the Reverend Alexander Craighead had been 20 years earlier:

> The…men who fought and suffered with me from the Districts of York and Chester were composed of the Presbyterian denomination of Christians. Rev. Mr. Martin from the north of Ireland, who emigrated with my father, a Presbyterian minister or Covenanter with many hearers who came over to America to get rid of British laws and their tyrannical government, settled in the lower edge of Chester District, S. C., and there formed a congregation. When the British attempted to enforce the duties on tea and other oppressions, he with his band of heroes stood true to the cause of liberty. It was fortunate they had such a patriotic pastor, who was calculated to direct them in the way to contend against that tyranny from which he had so lately fled (Craig 1854, p. 1).

When word of the Waxhaw massacre reached the Covenanters, they clamored for action, and on Sunday, June 11, 1780, Reverend Martin left no doubt about what they should do:

> 'My hearers,' he said, in his broad Scotch-Irish dialect—'talk and angry words will do no good. We must fight! As your pastor—in preparing a discourse suited to this time of trial—I have sought for all light, examined the Scriptures and other helps in ancient and modern history, and have considered especially the controversy between the United Colonies and the mother country. Sorely have our countrymen been dealt with, till forced to the declaration of their independence—and the pledge of their lives and sacred honor to support it. Our forefathers in Scotland made a similar one, and maintained that declaration with their lives; it is now our turn, brethren, to maintain this at all hazards.' After the prayer and singing of the Psalms—he calmly opened his discourse. He cited many passages from Scriptures to show that a people may lawfully resist wicked rulers; pointed to historical examples of princes trampling on the people's rights; painted in vivid colors the rise and progress of the reformation—the triumph of truth over the misrule and darkness of ages—and finally applied the subject by fairly stating the merits of the Revolutionary controversy.[9] Giving a brief sketch of the events of the war from the first shedding of blood at Lexington, and warming with the subject as he went on, his address became eloquent with the fiery energy of a Demosthenes. In a voice like thunder, frequently striking with his clenched fist the clapboard pulpit, he appealed to the excited concourse, exhorting them to fight valiantly in defence of their liberties. As he dwelt on the recent horrid tragedy—the butchery of Buford's men, cut down by the British dragoons while crying for mercy—his indignation reached its height. Stretching out his hand towards Waxhaw—"Go see," he cried—"the tender mercies of Great Britain! In that church you may find men, though still alive, hacked out of the very semblance of humanity: some deprived of their arms—mutilated trunks: some with one arm or leg, and some with both legs cut off. Is not this cruelty a parallel to the history of our Scottish fathers, driven from their conventicles, hunted like wild beasts? Behold the godly youth, James Nesbit—chased for days by the British for the crime of being seen on his knees upon the Sabbath morning!" etc. To this stirring sermon the whole assembly responded. Hands were clenched and teeth set in the intensity of feeling; every uplifted face expressed the same determination, and even the women were filled with the spirit that threatened vengeance on the invaders. During the interval of divine worship they went about professing their resolution to do their part in the approaching contest; to plough the fields and gather the crops in the absence of the men—aye, to fight themselves, rather than submit. In the afternoon the subject was resumed and discussed with renewed energy—while the appeals of the preacher were answered by even more energetic demonstrations of feeling (Ellet 1854, pp. 124–126).

[9] Examples of Old Testament 'bad rulers' include Jabin the king of Canaan in Judges 4:23–24 ("So God subdued on that day Jabin the king of Canaan before the children of Israel. And the hand of the children of Israel prospered, and prevailed against Jabin the king of Canaan, until they had destroyed Jabin king of Canaan"); Jehoshaphat the king of Judah in II Chronicles 19:2 ("And Jehu the son of Hanani the seer went out to meet him, and said to king Jehoshaphat, Shouldest thou help the ungodly, and love them that hate the Lord? Therefore is wrath upon thee from before the Lord"), the anonymous kings of Proverbs 16:12 ("It is an abomination to kings to commit wickedness, p. for the throne is established by righteousness"), and the unnamed king of Israel addressed in Hosea 10:15 ("So shall Bethel do unto you because of your great wickedness, p. in a morning shall the king of Israel utterly be cut off").

Martin's congregation soon received word about the destruction of Reverend Simpson's manse and meeting house on Fishing Creek, which further inspired them to action. The local militia captains had no trouble recruiting men for the Whig cause. The following day, however, as the men of Rocky Creek assembled for militia drill, they were attacked by British dragoons from Rocky Mount, apparently tipped off by a "Scotch loyalist" named Montgomery. The dragoons killed or captured several of the militiamen, including their captain, John Land, whom they cut down as he resisted. The troopers then set out for the Covenanter meeting house on Rocky Creek. They found Martin at his home, arrested him, burned the meeting house, and took the reverend back to Rocky Mount as a prisoner. He was later transferred to the jail at Camden, where he was interrogated by Lord Cornwallis and imprisoned for 6 months. Either as a condition of his release or for his own safety, Martin then went to Mecklenburg County and remained there until after Cornwallis surrendered at Yorktown in October 1781 (Ellet 1854; Howe 1870; Scoggins 2005).

Meanwhile, following their retreat from Fishing Creek, the Whig militia companies under Bratton and McClure camped at Hill's Iron Works on Allison Creek in York County. Here they joined forces with the New Acquisition militia regiment commanded by Colonel Andrew Neel and Lieutenant Colonel William Hill, both members of the Bethel Presbyterian congregation in northern York County (Winn 1812; Ellet 1854; Hill 1921; Scoggins 2005). The minister at Bethel during this period was the Reverend Francis Cummins, also a devoted patriot; according to Dr. Howe, Reverend Cummins "was several times in the army, and was engaged in several battles" during the Revolutionary War (Howe 1870, p. 519).

The proprietor of the iron works, William Hill, was a Presbyterian and an ardent Whig. Although he had only recently become a militia officer, he had actively supported the South Carolina government since the beginning of the war by manufacturing muskets, rifles, cannon, and cannon balls, as well as agricultural implements and household wares for the local populace. After receiving the reinforcements from Fishing Creek, the New Acquisition regiment set out from the iron works on June 15 and attacked a Tory settlement on the Broad River where a company of loyalist militia was organizing. The loyalists, commanded by a former colonial militia officer named Matthew Floyd, had also erected a fortified blockhouse called Floyd's Fort on King's Creek, a tributary of the Broad River (Hill 1921; Lambert 1987; Scoggins 2005).

Unaware that the Whigs were even then on the march, Floyd and his men set out for Rocky Mount to offer their services to the king. Floyd reported to Colonel Turnbull with 30 loyalists early on June 15, only to learn later that day that the Whigs had attacked his settlement in his absence and were "tearing everything to pieces," which included raiding his plantation and destroying his property. Hearing this, Turnbull resolved to send Captain Huck and his dragoons, supported by mounted loyalist militia under Floyd's son Captain Abraham Floyd, to punish the rebels and destroy Hill's Iron Works. He also instructed Huck to make a retaliatory sweep through the Whig settlements on Turkey Creek and Bullock's Creek, where Reverend Alexander's Presbyterian congregation resided (Scoggins 2005).

On June 17, while the New Acquisition regiment was still at the Broad River celebrating their victory, Huck arrived at the iron works with his dragoons and militia. He found only a small garrison guarding the encampment. After a brief skirmish, the Whig militiamen fled. Huck killed several of the Whigs and captured several more, then proceeded to lay waste to the iron works. As Colonel Hill later noted in his memoirs, the British "destroyed all the property they could not carry away. Burned the forge, furnace, grist and saw mills together with all other buildings even to the negro huts, and bore away about 90 negroes all which was done before Col. Niel returned with the army to camp" (Hill 1921, p. 8).

Following the destruction of Hill's Iron Works, the remnants of the Whig militia regiments from York, Chester, Lancaster, Union, and Spartanburg counties retreated into North Carolina and began assembling a militia brigade. They elected Colonel Thomas Sumter, a former Continental officer, to be their brigadier general (Hill 1921; McJunkin 1837, 1840; O'Neall 1843; Scoggins 2005; Winn 1812). Sumter had fled his own home on the Santee River in May as Tarleton marched toward the Waxhaws. The British Legion burned Sumter's plantation as they passed by, for no other reason than that Sumter had served in the South Carolina Continental line, although he had retired from active service in 1779 (Bass 1961).

Huck's actions further inflamed the sentiment of the Backcountry. Dr. Maurice Moore, whose father served in the Fishing Creek militia, recalled that the destruction of Hill's Iron Works "was a great calamity to the Whigs and a general misfortune to the farmers for 40 or 50 miles around; many of them expected that they would have to return to the wooden plough" (Moore 1859, p. 6). Huck followed up the destruction of the iron works with a sweep through western York County, where he skirmished with local militiamen, killing and capturing several more (Scoggins 2005).

Before leaving the area, however, Huck tried one more tactic, which was to be long remembered throughout the upcountry. He made camp at a well-known crossroads on upper Fishing Creek and sent word into the community to meet him there. Huck's stated purpose was, as William Hill later recalled, to "make terms with them, and put them in the King's peace" (1921, p. 9). By this time, most of the younger men were in Sumter's camp in North Carolina, and the assembly was attended chiefly by men who were too old for militia duty. Instead of reasoning with the men, however, Huck launched into a blasphemous, profanity-laced tirade that is described in the memoirs of at least half a dozen different Whig veterans from the area. In each case, the descriptions are filled with colorful Old Testament imagery, with Huck cast in the role of infamous Biblical villains (Scoggins 2005).

Colonel William Hill left what is probably the earliest written account of Huck's meeting at the Fishing Creek crossroads in his 1812 memoirs:

> Accordingly they met [Huck], he undertook to harangue them on the certainty of his majesty^{s}. Reducing all the Colonies to obedience, and he far exceeded the Assyrian Gen^{ls} who we read of in ancient writ in blasphemy by saying that God almighty had become a Rebel, but if there were 20 Gods on that side, they would all be conquered, was his expression—Whilst he was employed in this impious blasphemy he had his officers & men taking all the horses fit for his purpose, so that many of the aged men had to walk many

miles home afoot—This ill behaviour of the enemy made an impression on the minds of the most serious men in this little band and raised their courage under the belief that they would be made instruments in the hand of Heaven to punish this enemy for his wickedness and blasphemy—and no doubt the recent injuries that many of their families received from the said Hook and his party had an effect to stimulate this little band to a proper courage (Hill 1921, p. 9).

Hill's statement recalls a specific story in the Old Testament, which he likely heard preached by one of the Presbyterian ministers in the New Acquisition. As recounted in Chaps. 18 and 19 of the Second Book of Judges, the Assyrian king Sennacherib sent his generals Tartan, Rabsarus, and Rabshakeh to conquer Jerusalem, during the days of the Judean King Hezekiah (circa 690 BC). Standing outside the walls of Jerusalem, General Rabshakeh taunted the people of Judah in their own language, telling them not to trust Hezekiah or their Hebrew God to deliver them from the military might of the Assyrian army. Instead, he mocked the power of foreign gods and ordered the Judeans to surrender to the king of Assyria:

Hath any of the gods of the nations delivered at all his land out of the hand of the king of Assyria?… Who are they among all the gods of the countries, that have delivered their country out of mine hand, that the Lord should deliver Jerusalem out of mine hand?… Behold, thou hast heard what the kings of Assyria have done to all lands, by destroying them utterly; and shalt thou be delivered? (II Kings 18:33, 35; II Kings 19:11, KJV).

The parallels between Huck's speech and that of the Assyrian general Rabshakeh would have been obvious to anyone well versed in the Old Testament. To the devout Presbyterians of the Backcountry, the British were the Assyrians—the enemies of God—and the Scotch-Irish were the Judeans, the chosen of God.

Richard Winn was a former Continental officer from Fairfield County who joined Colonel Bratton's battalion prior to the attack on Mobley's Meeting House, and became one of Sumter's most active field officers. He too recalled Huck's depredations and the effect they had on the local Presbyterian congregations:

….Capt Huck with his party burnt Hill's Iron Works, on their way they burnt the Meeting House of the Rev[d.] Mr. Simpson who was at the head of a large Presbyterian Congregation. The people in that quarter [of] Fishing Creek immediately cried out they wanted no protection from such a set as burnt Churches & the word of God & Billy Hill's Iron Works. The consequence of this was Mr. Simpson & about 80 of his Church took up arms and joined Gen[l]. Sumter. By this you will see, out of evil cometh good (1812, p. 28).

Major Joseph McJunkin was an officer in the Fair Forest regiment who heard about Huck's blasphemous escapades when he joined Sumter's Brigade in June:

A Capt. Hook, of the British, who had the command of a troop of horse, was sent by Col. Turnbull from Rocky Mount up into York District, to punish the Presbyterian inhabitants of that place, which he did with a barbarous hand, by killing men, burning churches, & driving off the ministers of the gospel to seek shelter amongst strangers. And his intention was to collect the dirty Tories. He, this mighty Hook, defied all the rebels (as he called the Americans) saying, that if they were as numerous as the trees of the forest, & if Jesus Christ was to come down & head them, that he could destroy them…(McJunkin 1840, pp. 209–210).

> Huck's cruelty and profane boasts excited the banished Whigs from that neighborhood to such a pitch, that they demanded to be led against him…. When this profane and impious boast was rehearsed to the pious and pure-hearted Irish Presbyterians, they determined, with one voice, "to cross the Catawba, and try his metal" (McJunkin cited in O'Neall 1843, p. 34).

One of the Irish Presbyterians from the New Acquisition who was present that day at the Fishing Creek crossroads was Daniel Collins, a native of County Waterford, Ireland who had served with the British provincial troops during the French and Indian War. Collins had stayed out of the war so far, but after hearing about the burning of Reverend Simpson's manse and meeting house, the destruction of Billy Hill's Iron Works, and witnessing firsthand Huck's "rough and insulting manner" at the Fishing Creek crossroads, he came home resolved to fight (Collins 1859). Collins' son, James, was a 16-year-old boy at the time. In his autobiography, James Collins recalled his father's anger:

> I must here relate the expression of my father, when he returned from Lord Hook's exhibition. My step-mother asked him thus: "Well Daniel, what news?" My father replied, "Nothing very pleasant. I have come home determined to take my gun and when I lay it down, I lay down my life with it;" then turning to me said, "my son you may prepare for the worst; the thing is fairly at issue. We must submit and become slaves, or fight. For my part I am determined—tomorrow I will go and join Moffit" (1859, pp. 12–13).

John Moffit (or Moffat, or Moffet) was the captain of the local Whig militia company in the upper Bullock's Creek area of York County, where the Collins family resided (Collins 1859; Scoggins 2005). Like many Scotch-Irish settlers in the Backcountry, the Moffits were descendants of the infamous "border reivers" who had once roamed the lawless territory between England and Scotland (Fraser 1971). In the true spirit of his ancestors, Captain John Moffit was an experienced militiaman and a skilled partisan leader who had been successfully resisting the British since the beginning of the war. The next day, Daniel Collins and his young son James both joined Moffit's militia company and took up the fight against the British (Collins 1859; Scoggins 2005).

Following this assembly, Huck sent an express to Rocky Mount informing Turnbull that he had defeated "150 rebels" and completely destroyed the iron works (Scoggins 2005). In addition to confiscating horses and grain, Huck also took African-American slaves from the local populace so they could be used as laborers and officers' servants at Rocky Mount and Camden (Hill 1921; Scoggins 2005). Huck continued his "reign of terror" in the area of present-day York and Chester counties for three more weeks. In early July, Turnbull received fresh intelligence that Bratton, McClure, and many of Sumter's men had been dismissed from their camp on the Catawba River to return home, check on the wheat harvest, and recruit additional men for the militia. Sensing an opportunity to capture some of these rebel leaders at their homes, as well as to capitalize on the wheat harvest, Turnbull dispatched Huck on a third expedition into the upper districts of the Catawba and Broad Rivers (Scoggins 2005).

On the evening of July 10, Huck set out with his troop of 35 dragoons, 20 mounted infantry of the New York Volunteers under Lieutenant William

Adamson, and 50 or 60 mounted loyalist militiamen under Colonels Matthew Floyd and James Ferguson (Scoggins 2005; Scoggins, Smith and Wilson 2011; Tarleton 1787). Huck worked his way north, stopping at numerous Whig plantations along the way to confiscate wheat, and horses and arrest any rebel militiamen he encountered. Late on the evening of July 11, he and his men arrived at the Bratton plantation in southern York County. Bratton had already left for Sumter's camp, but Huck interrogated Bratton's wife Martha and tried unsuccessfully to persuade her to pressure her husband into joining the loyalist militia. One of the Tory militiamen even threatened Martha's life with a reaping hook, but she was saved when Lieutenant Adamson, the senior officer of the New York Volunteers, intervened and disciplined the Tory (Scoggins 2005; Scoggins et al. 2011).

Huck imprisoned Mrs. Bratton and her children in the attic of their home, and then moved about 300 yards southeast to the plantation of James Williamson, a neighbor of the Brattons. Williamson and his family were also members of the Bethesda congregation, and Williamson's sons were serving in Bratton's militia battalion at the time. The British and Tory troops camped at Williamson's for the night; believing that no rebels were in the vicinity, the loyalists posted only a few token sentinels, who soon fell asleep (Scoggins 2005; Scoggins et al. 2011).

Unknown to Huck and his officers, the Whigs in Sumter's camp had been alerted to his mission. Over the course of July 11, express riders scoured the countryside, rounding up as many militiamen as they could on short notice. Late that night, a detachment of about 200 men set out from Sumter's camp, including companies commanded by Bratton, McClure, Winn, Neel, Hill, and Colonel Edward Lacey, a veteran militia officer from upper Turkey Creek in Chester County. During the forced march into the New Acquisition District some men dropped out, so by the time the Whigs arrived at Bratton's plantation early on the morning of the twelfth, their number was down to about 140. Learning that Huck was actually encamped at Williamson's, the Whigs divided their force into two main contingents, with Bratton and Neel attacking from the west while McClure and Lacey attacked from the east (Scoggins 2005).

The battle began at daybreak on July 12, and the British were caught completely by surprise. Huck, true to character, was busy threatening the unarmed Williamson family with death and destruction when the first shots of the battle rang out. According to Dr. David Ramsay, a veteran of the South Carolina Continental line, "At the very moment this unexpected attack was made, a number of women were on their knees vainly soliciting captain Huck for his mercy in behalf of their families and property" (Ramsay 1785 II, p. 135). Finding themselves surrounded, most of the Crown troops surrendered after taking heavy casualties. Colonel Floyd abandoned his men and fled the battlefield on horseback; Colonel Ferguson stood his ground and was shot down at point blank range in retaliation for the killing of William Strong by his Tory militiamen. Lieutenant Adamson of the New York Volunteers fell off his horse and was mortally wounded by a tree sapling that impaled him through the chest; he died at Camden later that summer. Huck tried to rally his men, but found to his dismay that these Backcountry militiamen were not Buford's untrained Continentals, and that cavalry charges

were ineffective against frontier veterans who fought Indian style, using trees and fence lines for cover. As Huck spurred his horse and tried to break out of the trap, several riflemen fired simultaneously and brought him down with two bullets in the back of his skull. He was dead before he hit the ground (Scoggins 2005; Scoggins et al. 2011).

The Battle of Williamson's Plantation, or Huck's Defeat as the Whigs preferred to call it, lasted perhaps 15 minutes. When it was over, 30 British and loyalist soldiers lay dead and another 50 were prisoners, most of whom were also wounded. The Whigs suffered one casualty. Huck's Defeat sent a shock wave through the British command in South Carolina. For the Whigs in Sumter's Brigade, however, it was a great victory and a tremendous morale booster. For the first time since the fall of Charleston, Backcountry militiamen had defeated trained British provincials, including the blasphemous "swearing captain" Christian Huck and his "bloodthirsty" British Legion dragoons. To the settlers in the Backcountry, Huck's Defeat was payback for the massacre at the Waxhaws and all the depredations that the British had perpetrated on upcountry homesteads and families during June and July. The victory also brought dozens of new recruits into Sumter's camp; by the end of the month, he had 600 men under his command, including many experienced veterans of the early phases of the war in the Carolinas (Scoggins 2005).

Finally, the Scotch-Irish Presbyterians in the Backcountry interpreted Huck's Defeat as a sign that God was with them and would punish their enemies, and they filled their descriptions of the battle with Old Testament imagery. They also interpreted Huck's death as divine retribution for his cruelty and blasphemy. Sumter's militiamen awarded the credit for killing Huck to John Carroll, an expert rifleman from the Bethesda congregation. Joseph McJunkin noted that, just before the battle began, old James Williamson had read a chapter from the Bible "and prayed for the destruction of that vile man, Capt. Huck. Scarcely was the prayer uttered when the roar of arms was heard! The Whigs, under the leading of 'their Lord and Master,' swept Huck's followers from the battlefield. He himself fell under the well-directed aim of John Carroll" (McJunkin cited in O'Neall 1843, p. 34). In another memoir, McJunkin poetically compared John Carroll to the Israelite hero David, which of course cast Captain Huck in the role of the Philistine giant Goliath:

> …a little David by the name of John Carroll, of York, slew [Huck] by drawing a bow at a venture, while he was harnessing his men, & placed two leaden arrows in his head so fatal that this mighty man fell with his face across the threshold of liberty, & like Dagon broke in pieces (McJunkin 1840, p. 210).[10]

The reference to Dagon further reinforces the Biblical analogy, since Dagon (or Dagan) was a pagan deity worshipped by the Sumerians, Amorites, Assyrians, Babylonians, and Philistines; he is mentioned numerous times in the Old Testament (Beebe 1970; Smith 1914). The Philistines had several temples to Dagon, including the temple at Gaza which the Israelite hero Samson famously destroyed

[10] The story of David and Goliath is found in I Samuel, Chap. 17.

as his last dying act, shattering the idol of Dagon in the process.[11] Militia veteran John Craig also employed a Davidic simile when he stated that John Carroll "claimed [Huck's] armour and David like, took it and wore it" (Craig 1854, p. 1). In the Old Testament account, David killed Goliath and then cut off Goliath's head with the giant's own sword. "And David took the head of the Philistine, and brought it to Jerusalem, but he put [Goliath's] armour in his [own] tent" (Judges 16:21–31). The "armour" that Craig referred to was Huck's uniform and equipment, probably including his officer's gorget and his sword, which according to local tradition remained in the Carroll family for generations (Moore 1859; Scoggins 2005).

At the end of July, Sumter felt that his brigade was strong enough to take on the British fort at Rocky Mount. Unfortunately for Sumter and his men, however, Rocky Mount was too well fortified for their small arms to inflict any serious damage, and Sumter had no artillery with which to reduce its walls. The following week he attacked the British camp at Hanging Rock, located at the intersection of two important colonial roads. Unlike Rocky Mount, Hanging Rock was not heavily fortified, so Sumter fared better this time, inflicting heavy casualties on the Crown troops. Although the British still controlled Camden and Ninety-Six, they were forced to abandon both Rocky Mount and Hanging Rock. Sumter would go on to suffer both defeat and victory several times over the course of the next year, but he continued his offensive and remained a major thorn in Cornwallis' side. Meanwhile, another British force of provincials and militia was working its way up the western frontier of South Carolina and would present an even larger menace to the upcountry Scotch-Irish than Huck and his war band had done (Bass 1961; Scoggins 2005; Tarleton 1787).

The Sword of the Lord and Gideon: The Battle of King's Mountain

Shaped much like a human footprint, King's Mountain is an elongated mountain ridge straddling the border between southwestern North Carolina and northwestern South Carolina. It is an unlikely place for a Revolutionary War battle, but events in the summer and fall of 1780 conspired to make it the site of one of the most celebrated American victories of the war. Following the surrender of the Continental army at Charleston in May 1780, the British high command came up with a plan to conquer the Carolinas and Virginia and bring the war to a quick end. This plan included establishing fortified outposts in the South Carolina Backcountry and recruiting large numbers of loyalists to swell the ranks of the British army. One of the key figures in this plan was Major Patrick Ferguson of the 71st

[11] Dagon also appears in Joshua 15:41, Joshua 19:27, I Samuel 5:2–7, and I Chronicles 10:8–10 (Old Testament) and I Maccabees 10:83 and 11:4 (Biblical Apocrypha).

Highland Regiment of Foot. Ferguson, like George Turnbull, was a career army officer from lowland Scotland who came south with the British expedition in 1780. He was a distinguished soldier and an excellent marksman, and in 1776, he had invented a rapid-fire breech-loading flintlock rifle that was the most advanced military small arm of its day. Fortunately for the Americans, the British army saw no need to replace its standard-issue Brown Bess musket with Ferguson's rifle, and the invention was largely ignored by the British general staff (Gilchrist 2003).

After the fall of Charleston, Clinton detached Ferguson from the 71st Highlanders and appointed him Inspector General of Militia in the Southern Provinces (Bass 1961; Draper 1881). Ferguson set out from Charleston through the western part of South Carolina with a battalion of about 100 northern provincial infantrymen known as the American Volunteers. Along the way, he actively recruited and trained the loyalist militia in the western Carolina Backcountry. By the time he arrived at Fort Ninety-Six in what is now Greenwood County, Ferguson had raised some 4,000 loyalist troops, although most of them did not accompany him on his march north. In August, Cornwallis made plans to advance up the east side of the Catawba River into Charlotte, and he ordered Ferguson to penetrate into western North Carolina as far as Gilbert Town (near modern Rutherfordton in Rutherford County), after which the two armies would link up and complete their subjugation of North Carolina (Draper 1881; Gilchrist 2003; Tarleton 1787).

Ferguson reached Gilbert Town on September 7, and many of the locals took the opportunity to renew their allegiance to the Crown. However, Ferguson was aware that the Whig militia in the Backcountry was steadily gaining strength and had already won several important victories over loyalist and provincial troops at Williamson's Plantation (Huck's Defeat), Cedar Springs, Earl's Ford, Thicketty Fort, and Musgrove's Mill during July and August. Of particular concern to Ferguson were the militiamen from the North Carolina mountains commanded by Colonel Charles McDowell and his brother Major Joseph McDowell, and the frontier militia from the "over-mountain" settlements on the Watauga River in eastern Tennessee (then still part of North Carolina) under Colonel Isaac Shelby. Shelby and McDowell, along with Colonel Elijah Clarke from Georgia, had defeated the Backcountry loyalists several times during July and August, most recently at Musgrove's Mill on the Enoree River (Laurens County, South Carolina) on August 19 (Draper 1881; Gilchrist 2003).

On September 10, Ferguson sent a warning across the Blue Ridge Mountains to Shelby and his men. He promised that "if they did not desist from their opposition to the British arms, he would march his army over the mountains, hang their leaders, and lay waste to their country with fire and sword" (cited in Draper 1881, p. 169).[12] This was a poor choice of words with which the threaten men whose ancestors had fought against invading armies since the days of the Roman Empire. Like Captain

[12] According to Draper, the primary sources for this oft-quoted threat are Col. Isaac Shelby's "King's Mountain Narrative," 1823; John Haywood's *Civil and Political History of the State of Tennessee* (1823); Shelby's statement in the *American Whig Review*, December 1846; and Gen. Joseph Graham's account in the *Southern Literary Messenger*, September 1845.

Christian Huck a few months earlier, Ferguson completely misjudged the determination of the Backcountry militia when faced with British aggression, and he grossly underestimated their skill and abilities in frontier warfare. He also failed to realize the depth of their religious convictions and their desire for what they considered to be righteous retribution. As Ferguson's modern biographer, Marianne McLeod Gilchrist, readily acknowledged, "Some of these 'Back Water' or 'Overmountain' men were of Ulster Protestant descent, and saw the campaign as a Calvinist holy war" (2003, p. 64). Ferguson, to his detriment, never realized that fact.

Colonel Shelby had already decided to attack Ferguson before Ferguson attacked him, and upon hearing of Ferguson's threats he immediately sent out a call for volunteers. Shelby dispatched messengers to militia commanders in eastern Tennessee and western Virginia to rendezvous at Sycamore Shoals on the Watauga River on September 25. Shelby and Colonel John Sevier, another leader of the over-mountain settlers, set out with about 250 men each to the rendezvous, where they were joined by Colonel William Campbell with 400 militiamen from southwest Virginia (Draper 1881; Gilchrist 2003). Historian Lyman C. Draper provided this description of Campbell's Virginians in his classic *King's Mountain and Its Heroes*:

> They were, almost to man, Presbyterians. In their homes, in the Holston Valley, they were settled in pretty compact congregations; quite tenacious of their religious and civil liberties, as handed down from father to son from their Scotch-Irish ancestors. Their preacher, Rev. Charles Cummins, was well fitted for the times; a man of piety and sterling patriotism, who constantly exerted himself to encourage his people to make every needed sacrifice, and put forth every possible exertion in defense of the liberties of their country.[13] They were a remarkable body of men, both physically and mentally. Inured to frontier life, raised mostly in Augusta and Rockbridge Counties, Virginia, a frontier region in the French and Indian war, they early settled on the Holston, and were accustomed from their childhood to border life and hardships; ever ready at the tap of the drum to turn out on military service; if, in the busiest crop season, their wives, sisters, and daughters could, in their absence, plant, and sow, and harvest. They were better educated than most of the frontier settlers, and had a more thorough understanding of the questions at issue between the Colonies and the mother country. These men went forth to strike their country's foes, as did the patriarchs of old, feeling assured that the God of battles was with them, and that He would surely crown their efforts with success. They had no doubts nor fears. They trusted in God—and kept their powder dry. Such a thing as a coward was not known among them (1881, pp. 242–243).

The mountain and over-mountain settlements of North Carolina and Tennessee were also largely composed of Scotch-Irish Presbyterians, as were the settlements in the South Carolina Backcountry (Draper 1881). Like their cousins in the Piedmont, they also had Presbyterian ministers who exhorted them to resist the British invaders, using imagery taken straight out of the Old Testament. Draper

[13] Rev. Charles Cummins was probably a relative of the aforementioned Rev. Francis Cummins, who preached in Mecklenburg County, NC from 1780 to 1782 and at Bethel Presbyterian Church in York County, SC, during 1782 and 1783.

recounts the most famous of these sermons, which would provide the Biblical tone for the King's Mountain campaign:

> Early on the twenty-sixth of September, the little army was ready to take up its line of march over mountains and through forests, and the Rev. Samuel Doak, the pioneer clergyman of the Watauga settlements, being present, invoked, before their departure, the Divine protection and guidance, accompanied with a few stirring remarks befitting the occasion, closing with the Bible quotation, 'The sword of the Lord and of Gideon;' when the sturdy, Scotch-Irish Presbyterians around him, clothed in their tidy hunting-shirts, and leaning upon their rifles in an attitude of respectful attention, shouted in patriotic acclaim: 'The sword of the Lord and of our Gideons!' (Draper 1881, p. 176).

As described in the Old Testament Book of Judges, Gideon was chosen by God to help the Israelites end the oppression of the Midianites and Amalekites, two Canaanite tribes who were as numerous as "grasshoppers for multitude, and their camels were without number," (Judges 6:5, KJV). Gideon, who lived c. 1160–1125 BC, bore a Hebrew name that translates as "destroyer," "slasher," or "cutter of trees" (Beebe 1970; Broomall 1990). Following God's instructions, Gideon took only 300 men to attack the numerically superior host of the enemy army, thus ensuring that the subsequent victory could not be attributed to Israelite military superiority:

> And he divided the three hundred men into three companies, and he put a trumpet in every man's hand, with empty pitchers, and lamps within the pitchers….And the three companies blew the trumpets, and brake the pitchers, and held the lamps in their left hands, and the trumpets in their right hands to blow withal; and they cried, 'The sword of the Lord, and of Gideon.' And they stood every man in his place round about the camp: and all the [enemy] host ran, and cried, and fled. And the three hundred blew the trumpets, and the Lord set every man's sword against his fellow, even throughout all the host: and the host fled… (Judges 7:16, 20–22, KJV).

Not only did God grant Gideon an incredible victory against overwhelming odds, but he ensured that Gideon's men did not even have to fight; in the confusion of the night attack, the Midianites and Amalekites killed each other, thus demonstrating the power of God for all to see. And just as Gideon led his three handpicked companies against an much larger army of Canaanites, so the Whig colonels led their hand-picked companies against Ferguson's large force of British provincials and Tory militia.

Once again, the Presbyterian clergy in the Backcountry had successfully identified the British troops with the idol-worshipping pagans of the Old Testament, in this case the Midianites and Amalekites. The Reverend Doak chose well when he used the Gideon story as an allegory for the upcoming battle with the British army, and his use of this particular episode was no accident. Like the Reverend John Simpson of Fishing Creek and the Reverend Joseph Alexander of Bullock's Creek, Doak was a graduate of the divinity school at the College of New Jersey (now Princeton University). He was also a student and protégé of the college's president, John Witherspoon, the Scottish-born Presbyterian minister who served in the Continental Congress and signed the Declaration of Independence. Back home in his native Scotland, Witherspoon had been a leading figure

opposed to the growing secularization and "enlightenment" of Scottish society. Among Witherspoon's opponents in this intellectual battle of conservatism versus progressivism were Major Patrick Ferguson's family and their associates, including David Hume, Reverend John Home, Henry Home (Lord Kames), and James Burnett (Lord Monboddo) (Gilchrist 2003). Whether or not they realized it, there was a distinct clash of world views in the backgrounds of Doak and Ferguson that stretched all the way back to Reformation Scotland.

On September 30, the over-mountain men reached Colonel Charles McDowell's plantation at Quaker Meadows (near Morganton, North Carolina). Here they were joined by 160 Burke County and Rutherford County militiamen under Major Joseph McDowell and Colonel Andrew Hampton, and 350 men from the upper Yadkin River under Colonel Benjamin Cleveland and Major Joseph Winston. Since William Campbell and his Virginians had come the farthest distance to the rendezvous, the combined militia force elected Campbell to be their overall commander and then proceeded toward Gilbert Town, where they believed Ferguson was still camped (Tarleton 1787; Draper 1881).

Unknown to the Whigs, Ferguson left Gilbert Town on September 10 and spent about 2 weeks marching northwards into the mountains, recruiting loyalists and intimidating rebels along the way. He then began withdrawing south, gradually working his way back toward Gilbert Town, with Charlotte as his eventual goal (Draper 1881). Upon reaching Denard's Ford, about 8 miles from Gilbert Town, Ferguson posted another proclamation addressed "to the loyal inhabitants of North Carolina":

> Denard's Ford, Broad River,
> *Tryon County, October 1, 1780*
>
> GENTLEMEN—Unless you wish to be cut up by an inundation of barbarians, who have begun by murdering an unarmed son before the aged father, and afterwards lopped off his arms, and who by their shocking cruelties and irregularities, give the best proof of their cowardice, and want of discipline; I say, if you wish to be pinioned, robbed, and murdered, and to see your wives and daughters, in four days, abused by the dregs of mankind—in short, if you wish or deserve to live, and bear the name of men, grasp your arms in a moment and run to camp.
>
> The Backwater men have crossed the mountain; McDowell, Hampton, Shelby, and Cleaveland are at their head, so that you know what you will have to depend upon. If you choose to be p—d upon for ever and ever by a set on mongrels, say so at once, and let your women turn their backs upon you, and look out for real men to protect them.
> PAT. FERGUSON
> *Major 71st Regiment* (Ferguson cited in Wheeler 1851 II, p. 103).[14]

[14] Draper's later version (1881, pp. 203–204) differs slightly from Wheeler's, and substitutes the word "degraded" for Wheeler's lightly edited "pissed upon." Ferguson's reference to the alleged murder of an "unarmed son" by Whig militia bears a striking resemblance to the story that the Whigs told about the Tory murder of the "unarmed boy" William Strong at Fishing Creek Meeting House in June.

Ferguson's rhetoric reveals the same type of condescending attitude toward the Scotch-Irish that Woodmason and Turnbull had expressed: the Backcountry settlers were "the dregs of mankind" and "a set on mongrels," not "real men" like the Crown troops. While this proclamation may have inspired some loyalists to join Ferguson, it did an even better job of convincing men to take arms against him. After learning that the Backcountry militiamen were rallying in large numbers, Ferguson began to worry about the growing size of their army. On October 5, he wrote Cornwallis in Charlotte, asking for reinforcements:

> …I should hope for success against them myself; but, numbers compared, that must be doubtful. I am on my march towards you by a road leading from Cherokee ford, north of King's mountain. Three or four hundred good soldiers, part dragoons, would finish this business.[15] Something must be done soon. This is their last push in this quarter and they are extremely desolate and cowed (Ferguson cited in Gilchrist 2003, p. 66).

Still confident in the strength of his force, on October 6 he sent word to Cornwallis that "I arrived today at Kings Mountain and have taken a post where I do not think I can be forced by a stronger enemy than that against us. I have wrote for the militia assembling under Colonel Floyd to join me tomorrow evening if not destined for another service" (Ferguson cited in Gilchrist 2003, p. 66). This was the same Colonel Floyd who had fled the battlefield at Williamson's Plantation 3 months earlier; certainly not the best leader for Ferguson to place his hopes in, since Floyd's militia reinforcements never arrived.

Later Whig accounts quoted Ferguson as stating "that he was so well pleased with the goodness of his position as well as the courage and skill of his men, that he defied God Almighty and all the rebels that could be collected to drive him from that camp" (Ferguson cited in Hill 1921, p. 19). If true, then Ferguson must have taken lessons in blasphemy from Christian Huck. Ferguson established his camp on the southwestern end of the King's Mountain range, in what is now northwestern York County, South Carolina. What Ferguson did not know was that both Cornwallis and several of his senior officers were sick with fever and incapacitated. By the time they recovered sufficiently to come to his aid, it would be too late (Gilchrist 2003; Tarleton 1787).

The patriot army reached Gilbert Town on October 3 and found that Ferguson had left. As they moved south and attempted to pick up his trail, they were met by Colonel Edward Lacey from Chester County, South Carolina, who informed them that Ferguson had taken post on King's Mountain and that the South Carolina militia was ready to attack him. On October 5, the mountain and over-mountain militia linked up with some 400 North and South Carolina troops at Hannah's Cowpens in what is now Cherokee County, South Carolina. The North Carolina reinforcements were commanded by Colonel Frederick Hambright and Major William Chronicle from Lincoln County and Colonel William Graham and Major Joseph Graham from Mecklenburg County. The South Carolinians included men

[15] By "good soldiers," Ferguson meant trained British regulars, not the Tory militia that made up the bulk of his army.

from York County under Colonel William Hill, Lieutenant Colonel James Hawthorne, and Captain John Moffit; men from Chester County under Colonel Edward Lacey; and troops from Union, Spartanburg, and Laurens counties under Colonels Thomas Brandon, Benjamin Roebuck, and James Williams. Almost all of the men were mounted on horseback and were equipped with the highly accurate "long rifles" so popular on the frontier. At 8:00 PM on the night of October 6, about 900 of the best-equipped and best-mounted militiamen headed out for King's Mountain, leaving the rest to follow as quickly as possible (Draper 1881; Hill 1921; Moore 1859).

Like the North Carolinians and the Virginians, the South Carolina Whigs pursuing Ferguson felt that God supported their struggle against the British. At the Cowpens rendezvous, Colonel William Hill told some of his fellow officers "that [Ferguson] was now in So. Ca. & had been a bitter & cruel enemy, [and] that it appeared as if Heaven had sent those men from the mountains to punish so great & cruel [an] Enemy" (1921, p. 20). James Collins echoed Hill's sentiments in his autobiography:

> Ferguson was coming on with his boasted marksmen, and seemed to threaten the destruction of the whole country. The Tories were flocking to his standard from every quarter, and there appeared little safety for us; but as God would have it, a patriotic party sprung up about Hillsboro, North Carolina, under Colonels Campbell, Williams, Shelby, and Cleveland; Sevier, from the mountains, joined in, together with Hambright, and some other leaders (1859, p. 50).

Ferguson's decision to make his stand on King's Mountain was a poor one. The rugged terrain and steeply sloped sides of the mountain made standard British military tactics useless, while the numerous trees, boulders, and ravines provided plenty of cover for the frontier tactics of the Whigs. Ferguson compounded his mistake by failing to fortify his position and by not posting adequate sentinels. The Whigs marched through the night under rainy conditions, leaving no telltale dust clouds to mark their progress, and by noon of October 7 they had approached to within a mile of the mountain. Using tactics much like those employed earlier at Huck's Defeat, the rebels divided their forces and began to advance in columns on Ferguson's position (Boatner 1994; Draper 1881; Hill 1921).

At about 3:00 p.m., some of Ferguson's men spotted the rebels and fired the first shots of the battle. The Whigs held their fire and continued to fan out, surrounding the mountain on all sides. Then they began their advance up the slopes toward their enemies. Not used to firing downhill, the British and loyalists overshot the Whigs, and most of their initial volleys passed harmlessly above their attackers' heads. The Whigs, on the other hand, fired with deadly accuracy. Ferguson compounded his errors by ordering his provincials to make bayonet charges; each time they advanced, the Whigs fell back while thinning the ranks of Ferguson's best trained and most experienced soldiers. When the rebel militiamen reached the southern crest of the mountain, the loyalists retreated toward their campsite on the northeast end, where they soon came under attack from other Whig detachments advancing up the north slope of the mountain (Collins 1859; Draper 1881; Gilchrist 2003).

The Whigs continued to close in on the loyalists, all the while keeping up an unrelenting barrage of rifle fire. Ferguson, mounted on his horse, galloped back and forth, blowing a silver whistle and trying to rally his men as they fell back toward the open ground of their camp. Soon white flags began to appear on the ends of British bayonets, but Ferguson knocked them down each time with his saber. Dressed in a bright checkered shirt and sitting astride his horse, Ferguson made an excellent target for the Whig sharpshooters, and as he tried to break out of his encircled position he was shot from his saddle. At least a half a dozen Whigs claimed to have fired the shot that killed Ferguson, and when his body was later examined the men found that he had been hit by no less than eight to ten rifle balls (Draper 1881; Gilchrist 2003; Hill 1921; Tarleton 1787). James Collins later recalled, “On examining the body of their great chief, it appeared that almost 50 rifles must have been leveled at him, at the same time; seven rifle balls had passed through his body, both his arms were broken, and his hat and clothing were literally shot to pieces” (1859, p. 53).

Ferguson’s second-in-command, Captain Abraham De Peyster of the American Volunteers, now took over the disorganized loyalists, some of whom were trying to surrender while others continued to fight. De Peyster put up a white flag, but the scattered positions of the Whigs made communications difficult and men continued to fire on the British troops as they advanced up the mountain. Some of the Whigs, remembering the slaughter of Colonel Buford’s Continental soldiers at the Waxhaws, cried out “Give them Buford’s play” and “Remember the Waxhaws,” and continued to shoot down the surrendering loyalists. It took the Whig officers several long minutes to regain control of their men, and during that time many of the loyalists were gunned down by vengeful Whig militiamen (Draper 1881; Gilchrist 2003).

Altogether, the Battle of King’s Mountain lasted about an hour. The official American after-action report gave the following losses for the Crown troops. Out of a total of 1,125 provincial soldiers and loyalist militiamen, the provincials lost 20 killed, 35 wounded, and 78 prisoners, while the loyalist militia suffered 206 killed, 128 wounded, and 648 prisoners. The Whig losses numbered 28 killed and 60 wounded. These included Colonel James Williams from South Carolina, who was mortally wounded and died not long after the battle ended, and Major William Chronicle, commander of the North Carolina Partisan Rangers, also killed in action (Wheeler 1851). The following day at Gilbert Town, the Whigs held a trial where 12 Tory leaders were condemned to death, although only nine were actually hanged. Most of the provincial and Tory prisoners eventually escaped from the rebels and either returned home or rejoined the British army (Boatner 1994; Draper 1881; Gilchrist 2003).

Military historian Mark M. Boatner III, a second-generation West Pointer, retired army colonel, and veteran of World War II and Korea, has called the Battle of King’s Mountain “the Southern militia’s finest hour” and “the turning point of the war in the South” (1994, p. 582). The battle also demonstrated the British army’s weaknesses in frontier warfare, just like Braddock’s Defeat had done 25 years earlier. Sir Henry Clinton, the British commander-in-chief in North America, later referred to

the Battle of King's Mountain as "the first link of a chain of evils that followed each other in regular succession until they at last ended in the total loss of America" (Clinton cited in Boatner 1994, p. 582). Much of the blame for the British defeat must rest with Ferguson. As Boatner observed in his analysis of the battle:

> Ferguson's errors were political, strategic, and tactical, which is about as wrong as a soldier can get: he overestimated the Tory support and underestimated the patriot resistance in his area of responsibility; he failed to retreat when faced with defeat in detail; he failed to outpost Kings Mountain, failed to fortify it for frontier-style fighting, and failed to see that his position was "more assailable by the rifle than defensible with the bayonet," as Henry Lee expressed it (Boatner 1994, p. 582).

Nonetheless, Boatner also gives due credit to the Whig militiamen for their success:

> A large number of small units rallied quickly, achieved unity of command, and destroyed their enemy in a remarkably businesslike manner. One common denominator of militia victories was in evidence in this action: a considerable number of outstanding leaders; and the remarkable thing is how successfully they worked together....Bravery is another quality exhibited by the patriots, who sustained about 10 per cent casualties; considering the Indian-fighting, open-order nature of this action, this is a very respectable casualty figure and indicates that they worked for their victory (1994, p. 582).

The parallels between Huck's Defeat at Williamson's Plantation and Ferguson's Defeat at King's Mountain are numerous. In both instances, an arrogant, overconfident British commander marched into the Backcountry and stirred up a "hornet's nest" of resistance. In both cases, these officers antagonized the local population and insulted their leaders, their families, and their religious beliefs. Both leaders camped deep in enemy territory but failed to send out scouting parties, post adequate guards, or prepare proper defenses. And in both cases, the local Whig militia commanders recruited an *ad hoc* coalition of experienced frontier soldiers on very short notice, surrounded the enemy troops, cut off their retreat, and attacked without warning. Finally, in both cases, the British commander paid for his mistakes with his life and the lives of trained provincial soldiers whom the British army could not easily replace, while the Whigs casualties were extremely light.

The loss of Ferguson's corps forced Cornwallis to abandon his plans for an early victory in North Carolina, and he retreated with his army back to Winnsboro in Fairfield County, South Carolina, where he spent the next 3 months preparing for a second offensive (Boatner 1994; Tarleton 1787). After suffering an even more humiliating defeat at the Cowpens in January 1781, Cornwallis led his army into North Carolina and Virginia, where he was surrounded by the Washington's American army and the French fleet at Yorktown and forced to surrender in October 1781, almost exactly 1 year after the Battle of King's Mountain. The Whig victories in the Carolina Backcountry in 1780 and 1781 put an end to the Crown's hopes for a quick victory over the Americans in the Southern colonies. In short, the War for American Independence was won in the Southern Backcountry, not the Northern colonies.

Even after Cornwallis's surrender, however, the "civil war" between Whigs and Tories in the Backcountry continued unabated for another 2 years, as did the holy war between the Scotch-Irish Presbyterians and the British army (Scoggins 2005; Tarleton 1787). Both aspects of the war, civil and religious, would drag on until the final cessation of hostilities in October 1783, especially in South Carolina. The British continued to destroy Protestant meeting houses, hang rebel leaders, and plunder Whig plantations, while the Whigs waged an increasingly successful and unrelenting partisan war against the occupying Crown forces (Moultrie 1802; Scoggins 2005; Ramsay 1785).

Aftermath of the Holy War

The physical damage inflicted by the British and loyalist troops during the campaigns of 1780–1782 was gradually repaired during the two decades following the end of the war. Most of the Presbyterian meeting houses which the Crown troops burned were rebuilt after 1785. The emotional and spiritual scars of the British occupation were more difficult to erase. The holy war that raged in South Carolina between the Scotch-Irish Presbyterians and the Crown forces was burned into the consciousness of the Southern Backcountry settlers just like it was burned into their meeting houses and their plantations. It is doubtful that British soldiers who survived the war lost any sleep over their destruction of these religious shrines and family homes, given that the writings and memoirs of Lord Cornwallis, Banastre Tarleton, and other British field officers reveal no trace of remorse or regret over their actions against the rebellious colonists during the American Revolution.

On the other hand, the American veterans, their families, and their descendants never forgot what, in their view, were atrocities and war crimes. The sites of the burned Presbyterian meeting houses are now marked by South Carolina state historical markers that bear witness to the path of destruction left by the king's troops. The memoirs and reminiscences of the Scotch-Irish Presbyterians who survived the war never failed to describe how the British and Tories targeted their houses of worship, their ministers, their homes, and their families. Most of them also acknowledged that they never lost faith in their God or their people, and they knew in their hearts that God's will would be done. Lastly, they credited their ultimate victory and their hard-won American independence to God's support of their cause. Some of these comments have already been quoted in the pages above. A few more will suffice to close this study of the conflict that was both America's first civil war and its first holy war.

> **Dr. David Ramsay:** "The inhabitants of [the upcountry] of the State generally arranged themselves under the command of colonel Sumpter, and opposed the British with the enthusiasm of men called upon to defend not only their civil liberties, but their holy religion. The effects of this ardor were very sensibly felt" (1785 I, p. 136).

John Craig: "Many who may read the above account given by me of the difficulties and privations I and many of my friends and acquaintances encountered, may doubt its truth. I refer them to other histories respecting similar events. Our cause was a good one, and that nothing short of an Almighty Hand could have given us that which we were contending for, will appear to any reflecting mind. The race is not to the swift nor the battle to the strong; the Almighty was with us" (1854, p. 1).

Joseph McJunkin: "The few—the naked, the unarmed, the weak—were opposed to the many—the clothed, the armed and the strong. But they remembered, that 'the race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong,' but that its issues were with God, whose protecting care they had often experienced, and on which they firmly relied….above all, that firm reliance on God's protecting care, which had hitherto sustained them, was still their staff and support….for not only men, but God, warred against tyrants" (cited in O'Neall 1843, pp. 33–39).[16]

William Hill: "There was a Providence that overruled the actions of men, who brought forth means to carry forth the great work… That the present generation may copy after the laudable example of their forefathers and make use of all the means which God & nature hath given them—and to hold that independence purchased so, so dearly by their fathers, and have a proper trust in that Power who governs the affairs of nations, is the Prayer and wish of the author" (1921, pp. 4–5).

References

Bass, R. D. (1961). *Gamecock: The life and campaigns of General Thomas Sumter*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Beebe, H. K. (1970). *The Old Testament*. Belmont, CA: Dickenson Publishing Co.

Benedict, D. (1813). *A general history of the Baptist Denomination in America, and other parts of the world* (2 vols.). Boston: Lincoln and Edmands.

Boatner, M. M. III. (1994). *Encyclopedia of the American Revolution*. Mechanicsburg, PA: Stackpole Books.

Bridenbaugh, C. (1952). *Myths and realities: Societies of the colonial South*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.

Broomall, W. (1990). Topical index to the Bible. *The new open Bible study edition* (pp. 29–353). Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers.

Calhoon, R. M. (2002). The Scotch-Irish and political moderation. *The Journal of Scotch-Irish Studies, 1*(3), 122–141.

Caruthers, E. W. (1842). *A sketch of the life and character of the Rev. David Caldwell, D. D.* Greensboro, NC: Swaim and Sherwood.

Chalkley, L. (1965). *Chronicles of the Scotch-Irish settlement in Virginia* (3 Vols.). Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Company.

Collins, J. P. (1859). *Autobiography of a Revolutionary soldier* (revised by J. M. Roberts (Ed.)). Clinton, LA: Feliciana Democrat.

Craig, J. (1854). *Interesting narrative: The war in York and Chester*. Chester (South Carolina) Standard, March 16, 1854.

[16] The Biblical quotations by Craig and McJunkin are from Ecclesiastes 9:11 (KJV): "I returned, and saw under the sun, that the race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong, neither yet bread to the wise, nor yet riches to men of understanding, nor yet favour to men of skill; but time and chance happeneth to them all."

Craighead, J. G. (1876). *The Craighead family: A genealogical memoir of the descendants of Rev. Thomas and Margaret Craighead, 1658–1876.* Philadelphia: Privately printed.

Davidson, C. G. (1951). *Piedmont partisan: The life and times of Brigadier General William Lee Davidson*. Davidson, NC: Davidson Printing Company.

Draper, L. C. (1881). *King's Mountain and its heroes*. Cincinnati: P.G. Thomson.

Ellet, E. F. (1854). *The women of the American Revolution* (Vol. III). New York: Charles Scribner.

Fraser, G. M. (1971). *The Steel Bonnets: The story of the Anglo-Scottish Border Reivers*. London: Barrie and Jenkins.

Fischer, D. H. (1989). *Albion's Seed: Four British Folkways in America*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Foote, W. H. (1846). *Sketches of North Carolina, historical and biographical*. New York: Robert Carter.

Gaustad, E. S. (1966). *A religious history of America*. New York: Harper and Row.

Gilchrist, M. M. (2003). *Patrick Ferguson: 'A man of some genius'*. Edinburgh: NMS Publishing.

Gordon, W. (1788). *The history of the rise, progress, and establishment, of the independence of the United States of America* (4 Vols.). London: Privately printed.

Hanna, C. A. (1902). *The Scotch-Irish, or The Scot in North Britain, North Ireland, and North America* (2 Vols.). New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

Heinrichs, J. (1898). Extracts from the letter-book of Captain Johann Heinrichs of the Hessian Jäger Corps, 1778–1780. Tr. Julius F. Sachse. *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography, 22*(2), 137–170.

Hill, W. (1921). *Colonel William Hill's Memoirs of the revolution*. In A. S. Salley Jr. (Ed.). Columbia, SC: The State Company.

Holifield, E. B. (2003). *Theology in America: Christian thought from the age of the Puritans to the Civil War*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Howe, G. (1870). *History of the Presbyterian Church in South Carolina* (Vol. 1). Columbia, SC: Duffie and Chapman.

Hudson, W. S. (1973). *Religion in America: An historical account of the development of American Religious Life*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Katcher, P., & Youens, M. (1973). *The American Provincial Corps 1775–1784*. Reading, Berkshire: Osprey Publishing.

Kidd, T. S. (2007). *The Great Awakening: The roots of Evangelical Christianity in Colonial America*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Kidd, T. S. (2010). *God of liberty: A religious history of the American Revolution*. New York: Basic Books.

Lambert, R. S. (1987). *South Carolina loyalists in the American Revolution.* Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press.

Leyburn, J. G. (1962). *The Scotch-Irish: A social history*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Maclean, J. Jr. (1877). *History of the College of New Jersey: From its origin in 1746 to the Commencement of 1854* (2 Vols.). Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott and Co.

Matthews, L. B. (1967). *A history of Providence Presbyterian Church, Mecklenburg County, North Carolina*. Charlotte, NC: Brooks Litho.

McElwain, M. E. (1956). *Faith and works at Middle Octorara Since 1727: A history of Middle Octorara Presbyterian Church.* In S. P. McComsey (Ed.). Quarryville, PA: Sentinel Printing House.

McGeachy, N. R. (1954). *A history of Sugaw Creek Presbyterian Church*. Rock Hill, SC: Record Printing Company.

McJunkin, J. (1837). Reminiscences of the revolutionary war related by Maj. Joseph McJunkin, of the militia of South Carolina, written July 18th 1837. *Thomas Sumter Papers, Lyman C. Draper Manuscript Collection*, 23VV154-203. Madison, WI: Wisconsin Historical Society.

McJunkin, J. (1840). A Ms. statement of Maj. McJunkin as noted in his own handwriting, without date or address…. *Thomas Sumter Papers, Lyman C. Draper Manuscript Collection*, 23VV204-212. Madison, WI: Wisconsin Historical Society.

McWhiney, G. (1988). *Cracker culture: Celtic Ways in the Old South*. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press.

Moore, M. (1859). *The life of General Edward Lacey*. Spartanburg, SC: Douglas, Evins & Co.

Moultrie, W. (1802). *Memoir of the American Revolution* (2 vols.). New York: D. Longworth.

O'Neall, J. B. (1843). Revolutionary incidents: Memoir of Joseph McJunkin, of Union. *The Magnolia, or Southern Appalachian, 2*(1), 30–40.

Ousterhout, A. M. (1987). *A state divided: Opposition in Pennsylvania to the American Revolution*. New York: Greenwood Press.

Peterson, R. A. (1985). John Witherspoon: Animated Son of Liberty. *The Freeman.* Retrieved December 4, 2013, from http://www.fee.org/the_freeman/detail/john-witherspoon-animated-son-of-liberty#axzz2mXF60QNf

Purcell, L. E. (1993). *Who was who in the American Revolution*. New York: Facts on File.

Ramsay, D. (1785). *The history of the Revolution of South-Carolina* (2 Vols.). Trenton, NJ: Isaac Collins.

Sabine, L. (1966). *Biographical sketches of loyalists of the American Revolution* (2 Vols.). Port Washington, NY: Kennikat Press.

Saunders, W. L. (1888). *The Colonial records of North Carolina* (Vol. VI—1759 to 1765). Raleigh: Josephus Daniels.

Saunders, W. L. (1890). *The Colonial records of North Carolina* (Vol. VII—1765 to 1768). Raleigh: Josephus Daniels.

Scoggins, M. C. (2005). *The day it rained Militia: Huck's Defeat and the Revolution in the Carolina Backcountry, May–July 1780*. Charleston: The History Press.

Scoggins, M. C. (2012). A Revolutionary Minister: The life of the Reverend Alexander Craighead. *The Journal of Scotch-Irish Studies, 3*(3), 98–116.

Scoggins, M. C., Smith, S. D., & Wilson, T. S. (2011). *Defining the Williamson's Plantation: Huck's Defeat Battlefield*. Rock Hill, SC: Culture & Heritage Museums.

Smith, W. R. (1914). *Lectures on the religion of the Semites* (3rd ed.). London: Adam & Charles Black.

Spence, T. H, Jr. (1954). *The Presbyterian congregation on Rocky River*. Kingsport, TN: Kingsport Press.

Stedman, C. (1794). *The history of the origin, progress, and termination of the American War* (2 Vols.). London: Privately printed.

Tarleton, B. (1787). *A history of the campaigns of 1780 and 1781 in the Southern Provinces of North America*. London: T. Cadell.

Thompson, E. P. (1963). *Presbyterians in the South* (3 Vols.). Richmond, VA: John Knox Press.

Waddell, J. A. (1888). *Annals of Augusta County, Virginia, with reminiscences*. Richmond, VA: J. W. Randolph and English.

Wheeler, J. H. (1851). *Historical sketches of North Carolina from 1584 to 1851* (2 Vols.). New York: Lippincott, Grambo and Co.

White, H. A. (1911). *Southern Presbyterian leaders*. New York: Neale Publishing Company.

Wilson, H. M. (1954). *The Tinkling Spring, headwater of freedom: A study of the church and her people 1732–1952*. Verona, VA: McClure Press.

Winn, R. (1812). *General Richard Winn's Notes—1780*. Peter Force Papers, Series 7E, Reel 3 of 56. Washington, DC: Library of Congress.

Woodmason, C. (1953). *The Carolina Backcountry on the Eve of the Revolution: The Journal and Other Writings of Charles Woodmason, Anglican Itinerant.* In R. J. Hooker (Ed.). Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Chapter 6
Discussion and Conclusions

Introduction

The Great Awakening laid the ideological and psychological foundation on which the American Revolution was built (particularly in the Southern Backcountry). This anti-establishment religious revival not only had a profound theological impact in the Protestant world but it also spurred significant sociopolitical changes throughout colonial North America (especially among the marginalized members of society). However, this was not the first time that deeply held religious beliefs had fueled significant social upheavals. Cross-culturally and throughout time, religion has served as a powerful catalyst for revolution. To illustrate this point, the authors highlight the following examples: (1) the Celtic Druid revolt against Roman occupation of Britain (2) the Maji–Maji Rebellion and (3) the Mad Man's War. Lastly, the ethical ramifications of ignoring the role religion played in shaping human history are addressed.

Celtic Druid Revolt Against Roman Occupation of Britain

Britain was first invaded by Romans under Julius Caesar in 55 BC. The Romans conquered most of southern Britain during the reign of the Emperor Claudius in 43 BC. The Celtic Britons chaffed under Roman rule, and in 60 AD many of the British tribes rebelled against the Romans. The native Celtic priests, known as Druids, encouraged rebellion against the Romans from their religious center on the island of Mona (now Anglesey) off the western coast of Wales. The Romans regarded the Druids as a nationalistic threat, and the governor of Britain, Suetonius Paulinus, decided to invade Mona with Roman infantry and cavalry in order to quell what he regarded as the center of the rebellion (Snyder 2003).

As recounted by the Roman historian Tacitus, Suetonius "therefore prepared to attack the island of Mona which had a powerful population and was a refuge for fugitives… On the shore stood the opposing army with its dense array of armed

R. J. Chacon and M. C. Scoggins, *The Great Awakening and Southern Backcountry Revolutionaries*, SpringerBriefs in Anthropology and Ethics,
DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-04597-9_6, © The Author(s) 2014

warriors, while between the ranks dashed women, in black attire like the Furies, with hair dishevelled [*sic*], waving brands. All around, the Druids, lifting up their hands to heaven, and pouring forth dreadful imprecations, scared our soldiers by the unfamiliar sight, so that, as if their limbs were paralysed [*sic*], they stood motionless, and exposed to wounds" (Tacitus 1869, p. 269).

Suetonius urged his troops onward, berating them not to cower before "a troop of frenzied women." Spurred on by their general, the Roman soldiers attacked, destroyed the opposing British army and slaughtered the Druid priests. The troops then proceeded to cut down and burn the sacred oak groves where the Druids held their religious ceremonies, or as Tacitus put it, where they met to "cover their altars with the blood of captives and to consult their deities through human entrails" (Tacitus 1869, p. 269). Suetonius then turned his attention to an even larger rebellion in southeastern Britain, led by the Iceni tribe, and ruthlessly suppressed it as well, killing an estimated 100,000 Britons in the process (Snyder 2003).

Maji-Maji Rebellion

Beginning in the 1880s, Germany established colonial holdings in East Africa and in 1902, local native populations were compelled to grow and harvest cotton for export. These actions sparked a rebellion lasting from 1905 to 1907 (Iliffe 1967).[1]

After the German-held region experienced a drought in 1905, local leaders of the *Kolelo* cult began distributing a type of sacred water (i.e., war medicine) believed to be effective for use against Europeans.[2] Various cult "prophets" announced that the *Kolelo* spirit had made the following pronouncements: (1) Devotees were to cease further payment of taxes to white foreigners, (2) In mid-July, a great flood would soon come to destroy all whites and their supporters, (3) Seven lions would come to destroy the foreigners (Iliffe 1967; Werner 2007) and (4) Tribesmen were supposed to arm themselves with millet-stalks which would turn into rifles and they would be supplied with a certain medicine which would turn the enemy's bullets to water (*maji* in Swahili) (Werner 2007).[3] As such, followers were encouraged to "be not afraid, [for] Kolelo spares his black children" (cited in Iliffe 1967, p. 505).

[1] The forced production of cotton undoubtedly hindered the ability of local native framers to produce and harvest subsistence crops (Iliffe 1967).

[2] "This Kolelo was a huge serpent living in a cave in the mountains of Uluguru [in Tanzania]" (Werner 2007, p. 197).

[3] Maji–Maji water was anointed on the face, chest, and legs of those seeking protection from European bullets (Iliffe 1967).

Such prophesies emboldened native East African farmers who then (using spears along with bows and arrows) attacked German garrisons throughout the colony. However, Germany's use of modern weapons against rebel villages, the removal of livestock along with the destruction of agricultural fields and food storage, forced Maji–Maji rebels to capitulate in 1907 (Gellatelly and Kiernan 2003; Iliffe 1967; Pakenham 1992; Werner 2007).

Mad Man's War

Lasting from 1918 to 1921, this Hmong revolt sought liberation from French colonial rule in Southeast Asia. The movement's leader, Pa Chay, was known to regularly climb trees in order to receive military orders from heaven. To the French, Pa Chay's actions seemed like those of a mad man but to the Hmong, his leadership was believed to be divinely inspired (Fadiman 1997; Gunn 1990; Le Boulanger 1969; Lee 1986).

During this period, the Hmong were suffering under the heavy tax burden imposed on them by the French. In turn, Pa Chay claimed to be called by God to liberate his people from their colonial oppressors. He gained a reputation for having miraculous powers and used this fame to attract military support. Many of his followers believed that they were part of a "holy war" foretold in Hmong mythology. Moreover, rumors circulated that Pa Chay's army was protected by magic. Therefore, he was able to convince Hmong villagers located throughout Laos, Vietnam, and southern China to form a united front against French forces. Additionally, Pa Chay attracted other oppressed minorities, such as Mab Daum and Khmu, to the revolution. At its height, the rebellion encompassed 40,000 km^2 throughout Indochina. However, in 1921, Pa Chay was killed by a French-hired assassin, thus effectively ending the revolt (Fadiman 1997; Gunn 1990; Le Boulanger 1969; Lee 1986).

Religion as a Powerful Unifying Force

Interestingly, the Celtic Druid Revolt, the Maji–Maji Rebellion and the Mad Man's War employed religious rhetoric not only to foment resistance to oppressive occupying powers but to also unify disparate groups against a common enemy. For example, Celtic Druid ideology unified autonomous factions (which had previously battled against each other) in an attempt to free themselves from Roman rule (Freeman 2002). Maji–Maji beliefs enabled the uprising to bring together the region's culturally diverse tribal populations against German colonials (Iliffe 1967). Pa Chay's claims of having received supernatural guidance inspired groups

such as the Mab Daum and the Khmu to join the Hmong in the Mad Man's War against the French (Fadiman 1997; Gunn 1990; Le Boulanger 1969; Lee 1986).[4]

Colonial America's Awakened rebels, Celtic Druid revolutionaries, Maji–Maji instigators along with supporters of the Mad Man's War were able to form united fronts against their respective colonial oppressors. In all cases, shared belief systems provided the platform for the creation of strategic alliances. The Celtic Druid Revolt, the Maji-Maji Rebellion and Mad Man's War ultimately failed in achieving their respective objectives whereas the American Revolution succeeded (much to the chagrin of the British).

Ethical Ramifications of Excising Religion From History

In 1993, Nord published his *Religion & American Education: Rethinking a National Dilemma* documenting the origins of what has become a well-established practice of obfuscating religion's place in human affairs. Along these lines, other investigators report some very disturbing findings which support Nord's and our claims. For example, "[i]n one history textbook Joan of Arc is discussed without any mention of God or of her becoming a saint. In another, the pilgrim's first Thanksgiving Day is described without any reference to their thanking God for their survival in the new land" (Maitland Werner 1986). Moreover, in his research on American history texts, Paul Vitz notes that none of them "acknowledges, much less emphasizes, the great religious energy and creativity of the United States" (1986, p. 56).[5]

According to Nord, one of the reasons why religion is often marginalized, for example in history textbooks, stems from the fact that religion is controversial and therefore, "textbook publishers, eager to maximize profit, exile it [religion] to safe and distant places" (1995, p. 139). Nord also suspects that many textbook authors and publishers are sufficiently secular that they no longer consider religion as a relevant enough factor influencing human behavior, thus they can 'justifiably'

[4] Likewise, participation in a *hajj* (pilgrimage to Mecca) fosters solidarity among Muslim devotees of disparate ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds. "Wearing identical clothing, … concentrating on worshiping God defines the pilgrim's position during the days of pilgrimage. In the liminal state, between their previous lives of various occupations, nationalities, wealth and status, and their future lives as returned pilgrims, these men and women live and move as equals… The clothes mark the fact that all pilgrims are religiously equal… Pilgrims mingle with one another even while onboard ship or a plane as pilgrims, leaving ordinary social status aside" (Bowen 2002, p. 230). See also Fukuyama (2011) for how leaders used Islam to unify parts of the Middle East and North Africa.

[5] The authors wish to point out that not all contemporary academic works obfuscate religion's place in history. For example, Thomas Kidd's *God of Liberty: A Religious History of the American Revolution* (2010) provides a well-researched and respectful analysis of the role that religion played in shaping colonial America's socio-political milieu.

ignore religion. In short, for many secularized academics, "…religion is irrelevant to understanding the world" (1995, p. 159).

Survey data confirms Nord's assertions. Research indicates that intellectuals tend to be less religious than the general population. Additionally, some members of the intelligentsia view religion as a mere survival from a primitive state of humanity which should be stamped out. Moreover, it is the highly educated members of society who author textbooks, design university curricula, and thus, shape the next generation of scholars and educators (Nord 1995).[6]

This secularized ethos has spurred a very troubling trend in academia: a trend seeking to 'decontaminate' history by excising any references to religion from narratives. In the end, this action may indeed boost textbook sales by avoiding controversy. However, such 'sanitized' texts cannot, in good conscience, be classified as academic works. These publications are, in effect, forms of propaganda masquerading as history.

Chacon and Mendoza (2012) caution against tailoring research findings to further certain agendas. They show how the failure to accurately record what the data indicate will, in the long run, be hurtful to the study population purportedly being protected by such obfuscation. Moreover, they also document how the cover up of information will ultimately be damaging to academia in general. In summary, Chacon and Mendoza conclude that the failure on the part of scholars to report historical findings accurately, even if done with the noblest of intentions, is misleading and thus, patently unethical. Therefore, the authors call for social scientists to accurately disclose all materialistic and non-materialistic factors impinging on human behavior.

Nord astutely observes how "…it is almost always assumed that anyone who argues for taking religion seriously must have a religious (and probably fundamentalist) agenda" (1995, p. 8). We wish to assure the readership that neither Chacon nor Scoggins are religious fundamentalists. However, we strongly concur with the following statement: "…all students should receive a liberal education that takes seriously a variety of ways of making sense out of the world, religious ways included, if they are to be informed, reasonable, and responsible individuals" (Nord 1995, p. 8). As such, our goal is not to proselytize. Instead, we wish to encourage the production of rigorous and historically accurate scholarly works. However, in order to produce such works, religious factors should be properly taken into consideration in any historical analysis.

The authors wish to emphasize the following point: by highlighting the salient role that religion played in shaping America's colonial era history, the authors are not minimizing the many socioeconomic and/or political factors also operating at that time period. Additionally, our call to take religious factors seriously should not be taken as an attack on science or on modernity. We simply call for an

[6] The authors have also noted a growing trend among many of their academic colleagues to minimize and in some instances, to omit, the salient role that religion played in shaping human history, and we are not alone in this observation.

integrated approach within the social sciences. This approach is one that takes socioeconomic, geopolitical, *and* religious factors into consideration when attempting to understand past and present human behavior.

The authors also wish to reiterate that our goal is not to introduce a bias toward a particular religious tradition and/or mindset into our academic institutions (as some far right activists seemingly desire) nor do we wish to deny the important role that religion has played in human history (as some far left activists seemingly desire). We simply strive to accurately understand *why* human beings behaved in the ways they did. In order to arrive at a correct answer to that inquiry, the impact of materialistic factors (such as economics) *along with* the impact of non-materialistic factors (such as religion) should be given *full* consideration by scholars.

Lastly, we believe that the failure to accurately report the role that religion played in US history (particularly the Great Awakening's role in the American Revolution) constitutes a gross violation of professional protocols and ethical standards. We therefore concur with bioethicist Dreger (2011) who states: "Forms of 'scholarship' that deny evidence, that deny truth, that deny the importance of facts—even if performed in the name of good—are dangerous not only to science and to ethics, but to democracy. And so they are dangerous ultimately to humankind."

References

Bowen, J. (2002). *Religions in practice: An approach to the anthropology of religion*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Chacon, R., & Mendoza, R. (2012). *The ethics of Anthropology and Amerindian Research: Reporting on environmental degradation and warfare*. New York: Springer.

Dreger, A. (2011). Darkness's descent on the American Anthropological Association: A cautionary tale. *Human Nature*. Retrieved April 22, 2011, from doi:10.1007/s12110-011-9103-y.

Fadiman, A. (1997). *The spirit catches you and you fall down*. New York: Noonday Press.

Freeman, P. (2002). *War, women, and Druids: Eyewitness reports and early accounts of the ancient Celts*. Austin: University od Texas Press.

Fukuyama, F. (2011). *The origins of political order: From Prehuman Times to the French Revolution*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Gellatelly, R., & Kiernan, B. (2003). *The specter of genocide: Mass murder in historical perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gunn, G. (1990). *Rebellion in Laos: Peasants and Politics in a colonial backwater*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Iliffe, J. (1967). The Organization of the Maji Maji Rebellion. *The Journal of African History, 8*(3), 495–512.

Kidd, T. (2010). *God of Liberty: A religious history of the American Revolution*. New York: Basic Books.

Le Boulanger, P. (1969). *Histoire du Laos Français*. Farnborough: Gregg International.

Lee, G. Y. (1986). Ethnic minorities and national building in Laos: The Hmong in the Lao State. *Peninsule, 12*, 215–232.

Maitland Werner, L. (1986). Education: Religion lack in texts cited. *Science Section, New York Times*, *June 3, 1986*. Retrieved October 23, 2013, from http://www.nytimes.com/1986/06/03/science/education-religion-lack-in-texts-cited.html?pagewanted=all

Nord, W. (1995). *Religion and American Education: Rethinking a National Dilemma*. Raleigh: The University of North Carolina Press.

Snyder, C. A. (2003). *The Britons*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Pakenham, T. (1992). *The Scramble for Africa: White Man's conquest of the dark continent from 1876 to 1912*. New York: Harper Collins.

Tacitus. (1869). The Annals of Tacitus. In A. J. Church & W. J. Brodribb (Eds.), *The Agricola and Germania, with a revised text, English notes, and maps*. London: Macmillan and Co.

Vitz, P. (1986). *Censorship: Evidence of bias in our Children's texbooks*. Ann Arbor: Servant Books.

Werner, Alice. (2007). *Myths and Legends of the Bantu*. New York: NuVision Publications.

References

Adams, J. (1923). *Revolutionary New England* (pp. 1691–1776). Boston: Simon Publications.

Balmer, R. (1984). The social roots of Dutch pietism in the Middle Colonies. *Church History, 53*(2), 187–199.

Balmer, R. (2006). *Mine eyes have seen the glory: A journey into the evangelical subculture in America*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bass, R. D. (1961). *Gamecock: The life and campaigns of General Thomas Sumter*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Beebe, H. K. (1970). *The Old Testament*. Belmont, CA: Dickenson Publishing Co.

Beem, T., & Beem, A. (2008). *It's OK not to be a Seventh-day Adventist*. Charleston: Book Surge.

Benedict, D. (1813). *A general history of the Baptist denomination in America, and other parts of the world* (2 Vols). Boston: Lincoln and Edmands.

Bennett, R. (2002). *Four witnesses: The early church in her own words*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press.

Boatner III, M. M. (1994). *Encyclopedia of the American Revolution*. Mechanicsburg, PA: Stackpole Books.

Bonomi, P. (1986). *Under the cope of heaven: Religion, society, and politics in colonial America*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bowen, J. (2002). *Religions in practice: An approach to the anthropology of religion*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Boyer, P. (2008). The Puritans. *NOVA PBS Homepage*. Retrieved May 26, 2009, from http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/apocalypse/explanation/puritans.html

Bridenbaugh, C. (1952). *Myths and realities: Societies of the Colonial South*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.

Broomall, W. (1990). Topical index to the Bible. In *The new open Bible study edition* (pp. 29–353). Nashville: Thomas Nelson.

Bumsted, J., & Van De Wetering, J. (1976). *What must I do to be saved?: The Great Awakening in Colonial America*. Hindsdale: The Dryden Press.

Calhoon, R. M. (2002). The Scotch-Irish and political moderation. *The Journal of Scotch-Irish Studies,1*(3), 122–141.

Capoccia, T. (1986). Christian charity or the duty of charity to the poor, explained and enforced by Jonathan Edwards. *The Bible Bulletin Board*. Retrieved November 6, 2007, from http://www.biblebb.com/files/edwards/charity.htm

Caruthers, E. W. (1842). *A sketch of the life and character of the Rev. David Caldwell, D. D.* Greensboro, NC: Swaim and Sherwood.

Chacon, R., & Mendoza, R. (2012). *The Ethics of Anthropology and Amerindian Research: Reporting on environmental degradation and warfare*. New York: Springer.

Chalkley, L. (1965). *Chronicles of the Scotch-Irish settlement in Virginia.* (3 Vols). Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Company.

R. J. Chacon and M. C. Scoggins, *The Great Awakening and Southern Backcountry Revolutionaries*, SpringerBriefs in Anthropology 4,
DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-04597-9, © The Author(s) 2014

Coalter, M. (1986). *Gilbert Tennant, son of Thunder: A case study of continental Pietism's impact on the first Great Awakening in the Middle Colonies*. Westport: Greenwood Press.

Collins, J. P. (1859). *Autobiography of a revolutionary soldier*, Ed. J. M. Roberts, Clinton, LA: Feliciana Democrat.

Craig, J. (1854). Interesting narrative: The war in York and Chester. *Chester (South Carolina) Standard*. March 16.

Craighead, J. G. (1876). *The Craighead family: A genealogical memoir of the descendants of Rev. Thomas and Margaret Craighead, 1658–1876.* Philadelphia: Privately Printed

Davidson, C. G. (1951). *Piedmont partisan: The life and times of Brigadier General William Lee Davidson.* Davidson, NC: Davidson Printing Company.

Denison, B. (1998). Shakers. In W. Swatos (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of religion and society* (pp. 465–466). Walnut Creek: Alta Mira Press.

Divine, R., Breen, T. H., Fredrickson, G., & Hal Williams, R. (1984). *America: Past and present*. New York: Scott, Foresman and Company.

Draper, L. C. (1881). *King's Mountain and its heroes*. Cincinnati: P.G. Thomson.

Dreger, A. (2011). Darkness's descent on the American Anthropological Association: A cautionary tale. *Human Nature*. Retrieved April 22, 2011, from doi:10.1007/s12110-011-9103-y

Dyck, C. (2005). Anabaptism. In J. Lindsay (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of religion* (pp. 304–305). New York: Thompson Gale.

Ellet, E. F. (1854). *The women of the American Revolution* (Vol. III). New York: Charles Scribner.

Fadiman, A. (1997). *The spirit catches you and you fall down*. New York: Noonday Press.

Fraser, G. M. (1971). *The Steel Bonnets: The story of the Anglo-Scottish border reivers*. London: Barrie and Jenkins.

Freeman, Philip. (2002). *War, women, and Druids: Eyewitness reports and early accounts of the ancient Celts*. Austin: University od Texas Press.

Fischer, D. H. (1989). *Albion's seed: Four British folkways in America*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Foote, W. H. (1846). *Sketches of North Carolina, historical and biographical*. New York: Robert Carter.

Fukuyama, F. (2011). *The origins of political order: From prehuman times to the French Revolution*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Garbarino, M. (1977). *Sociocultural theory in anthropology*. Prospect Heights: Waveland Press.

Gaustad, E. S. (1966). *A religious history of America*. New York: Harper & Row.

Gaustad, E. S. (2005). George Whitefield. In J. Lindsay (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of religion* (pp. 9726–9727). New York: Thompson Gale.

Gellatelly, R., & Kiernan, B. (2003). *The specter of genocide: Mass murder in historical perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gibbs, L. (1971). The Puritan natural law theory of William Ames. *Harvard Theological Review,64*, 37–57.

Gilchrist, M. M. (2003). *Patrick Ferguson: A man of some genius*. Edinburgh: NMS Publishing.

Gillies, J. (2001). *Memoirs of the life of the Rev. George Whitefield*. Carlisle, MA: Applewood Books.

Gordon, W. (1788). *The history of the rise, progress, and establishment, of the independence of the United States of America.* (4 Vols). London: Privately printed.

Gunn, G. (1990). *Rebellion in Laos: Peasants and politics in a colonial backwater*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Hanna, C. A. (1902). *The Scotch-Irish, or the Scot in North Britain, North Ireland, and North America.* (2 Vols). New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

Hatch, E. (1973). *Theories of Man and Culture*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Hatch, N. (1989). *The democratization of American Christianity*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Heimert, A. (1966). *Religion and the American mind from the awakening to the revolution.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Heinrichs, J. (1898). Extracts from the letter-book of captain Johann Heinrichs of the Hessian Jäger Corps, 1778–1780. Tr. Julius F. Sachse. *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography,22*(2), 137–170.

Hill, W. (1921). *Colonel William Hill's memoirs of the Revolution*. Ed. A. S. Salley, Jr. Columbia, SC: The State Company.

Hines, M. (2006). The Great Awakening. *Church History for the Masses Home Page*. Retrieved October 15, 2006, from http://www.christianchronicler.com/history1/great_awakening.html

Holifield, E. B. (2003). *Theology in America: Christian thought from the age of the Puritans to the Civil War*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Howe, G. (1870). *History of the Presbyterian Church in South Carolina*, (Vol. 1). Columbia, SC: Duffie and Chapman.

Hudson, W. S. (1973). *Religion in America: An historical account of the development of American religious life*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Iliffe, John. (1967). The organization of the Maji Maji Rebellion. *The Journal of African History,8*(3), 495–512.

Jurgens, W. (1970). *The Faith of the Early Fathers* (Vol. I). Collegeville: The Liturgical Press.

Katcher, P., & Youens, M. (1973). *The American Provincial Corps 1775–1784*. Reading, Berkshire: Osprey Publishing.

Keating, K. (1988). *Catholicism and fundamentalism: The attack on "Romanism" by "Bible Christians"*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press.

Kidd, T. S. (2007). *The Great Awakening: The roots of evangelical Christianity in Colonial America*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Kidd, T. (2010). *God of liberty: A religious history of the American Revolution*. New York: Basic Books.

Kraus, M. (1928). *Intercolonial aspects of American culture on the eve of the Revolution*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Lambert, R. S. (1970). *South Carolina loyalists in the American revolution.* Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press.

Landsman, N. (1982). Revivalism and nativism in the Middle Colonies: The Great Awakening and the Scots community in east New Jersey. *American Quarterly, 34*(2), 149–164.

Lauchert, F. (2006). Pietism. *New Advent: Catholic Encyclopedia.* Retrieved October 15, 2006, from http://www.newadvent.org/catehn/12080c.htm

Le Boulanger, P. (1969). *Histoire du Laos Français*. Farnborough: Gregg International.

Lee, G. Y. (1986). Ethnic minorities and national building in Laos: The Hmong in the Lao state. *Peninsule,12*, 215–232.

Leigh Heyrman, C. (1997). *Southern cross: The beginnings of the Bible Belt*. New York: Alfred Knopf Inc.

Leigh Heyrman, C. (2000). The first Great Awakening. *TeacherServe Home Page. National Humanities Center Home Page.* Retrieved October 15, 2006, from http://www.nhc.rtp.nc.us/tserve/eighteen/ekeyinfo/grawaken.htm

Leyburn, J. (1962). *The Scotch-Irish: A social history*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Locke, J. (1959). *An essay concerning human understanding*. New York: Dover Publications Inc.

Lumpkin, W. (2005). Great Awakening. In H. Samuel., & L. Charles (Eds.), *Religion in the south* (pp. 354–356). Macon: Mercer University Press.

Maclean, J. Jr. (1877). *History of the College of New Jersey: From its origin in 1746 to the commencement of 1854*. (2 Vols). Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott and Co.

Maitland Werner, L. (1986). Education: Religion lack in texts cited. *Science Section, New York Times, June 3, 1986*. Retrieved October 23, 2013, from http://www.nytimes.com/1986/06/03/science/education-religion-lack-in-texts-cited.html?pagewanted=all

Malone, D. (2004). U.S. Civil War and Christian churches. In P.-F. Gabriel (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of religion and war*. New York: Routledge.

Matthews, L. B. (1967). *A history of Providence Presbyterian church, Mecklenburg County, North Carolina*. Charlotte, NC: Brooks Litho.

McElwain, M. E. (1956). *Faith and works at Middle Octorara since 1727: A history of Middle Octorara Presbyterian Church.* Ed. S. P. McComsey. Quarryville, PA: Sentinel Printing House.

McGeachy, N. R. (1954). *A history of Sugaw Creek Presbyterian Church*. Rock Hill, SC: Record Printing Company.

McJunkin, J. (1837). Reminiscences of the Revolutionary War related by Maj. Joseph McJunkin, of the militia of South Carolina, written July 18th 1837. *Thomas Sumter Papers, Lyman C. Draper Manuscript Collection*, 23VV154-203. Wisconsin Historical Society, Madison, WI.

McJunkin, J. (1840). A Ms. Statement of Maj. McJunkin as noted in his own handwriting, without date or address… *Thomas Sumter Papers, Lyman C. Draper Manuscript Collection*, 23VV204-212. Wisconsin Historical Society, Madison, WI.

McLoughlin, W. (1959). *Modern revivalism: Charles Grandison Finney to Billy Graham*. New York: The Ronald Press Company.

McLoughlin, W. (1967). The American Revolution as religious revival: 'The millennium in one country' religion and the American mind from the awakening to the revolution by Alan Heimert. Essay review. *The New England Quarterly,40*(1), 99–110.

McWhiney, G. (1988). *Cracker culture: Celtic ways in the old south*. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press.

Media Matters. (2005). Pat Robertson's contradictory theology. *Media Matters for America. May 2, 2005*. Retrieved October 15, 2006, from http://www.Mediamatters.org/items/200505020002

Melton, J. G. (2004). Shakers. In F. Salamone (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of religious rites, rituals and festivals* (pp. 392–394). New York: Routledge.

Miller, G. (1981). Revivalism. In K. Crim (Ed.), *Abingdon dictionary of living religions* (pp. 621–623). Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Miller, D. (1997). *Reinventing American Protestantism: Christianity in the new*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Minkema, K. (2002). Jonathan Edward's defense of slavery. *The Massachusetts Historical Review. Vol. 4(NA)*. Retrieved November 4, 2007, from http://www.historycooperative.org/journals/mhr/4/minkema.html

Moore, Maurice. (1859). *The Life of General Edward Lacey*. Spartanburg, SC: Douglas, Evins & Co.

Morgan, Edmund, & Morgan, Helen. (1953). *Stamp Act Crisis: Prologue to revolution*. Raleigh: University of North Carolina Press.

Moultrie, W. (1802). *Memoir of the American Revolution.* (2 Vols). New York: D. Longworth.

Nord, W. (1995). *Religion and American education: Rethinking a national dilemma*. Raleigh: The University of North Carolina Press.

O'Neall, J. B. (1843). Revolutionary incidents: Memoir of Joseph McJunkin of Union. *The Magnolia, or Southern Appalachian,2*(1), 30–40.

Ousterhout, A. M. (1987). *A state divided: Opposition in Pennsylvania to the American Revolution*. New York: Greenwood Press.

Pakenham, T. (1992). *The scramble for Africa: White man's conquest of the dark continent from 1876 to 1912*. New York: Harper Collins.

Peterson, R. A. (1985). John Witherspoon: Animated son of liberty. *The Freeman*. Retrieved December 4, 2013, from http://www.fee.org/the_freeman/detail/john-witherspoon-animated-son-of-liberty#axzz2mXF60QNf

Purcell, L. E. (1993). *Who was who in the American Revolution*. New York: Facts on File.

Ramsay, D. (1785). *The history of the Revolution of South-Carolina.* (2 Vols). Trenton, NJ: Isaac Collins.

Reid, T. (2003). Gilbert Tennet. *Evangelical Times, February 2003*. Retrieved June 21, 2007, from http://www.evangelical-times.org/Articles/Feb03/feb03a03.htm

Rudolph, E. (2005). William Law. In L. Jones (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Religion* (pp. 5324–5325). New York: Thompson Gale.

Sabine, L. (1966). *Biographical sketches of loyalists of the American Revolution*. (2 Vols). Port Washington, NY: Kennikat Press.

Saunders, W. L. (1888). *The colonial records of North Carolina* (Vol. VI, 1759–1765). Raleigh: Josephus Daniels.

Saunders, W. L. (1890). *The colonial records of North Carolina* (Vol. VII, 1765–1768). Raleigh: Josephus Daniels.

Schmotter, J. (1979). The irony of clerical professionalism: New England's congregational ministers and the Great Awakening. *American Quarterly, 31*(2), 148–168.

Scoggins, M. C. (2005). *The day it rained militia: Huck's defeat and the revolution in the Carolina backcountry, May–July 1780*. Charleston: The History Press.

Scoggins, M. C. (2012). A revolutionary minister: The life of the Reverend Alexander Craighead. *The Journal of Scotch-Irish Studies,3*(3), 98–116.

Scoggins, M. C., Smith, S. D., & Wilson, T. S. (2011). *Defining the Williamson's plantation: Huck's Defeat battlefield*. Rock Hill, SC: Culture & Heritage Museums.

Sherwood, S. (1776). *The Church's flight into the wilderness: An address on the times, containing some very interesting and important observations on scripture prophecies.* New York: S. Loudon.

Smith, W. R. (1914). *Lectures on the religion of the Semites* (3rd ed.). London: Adam & Charles Black.

Snyder, C. A. (2003). *The Britons*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Spence, T. H, Jr. (1954). *The Presbyterian congregation on rocky river*. Kingsport, TN: Kingsport Press.

Stearns, Monroe. (1970). *The Great Awakening: 1720–1760*. New York: Franklin Watts Inc.

Stedman, C. (1794). *The history of the origin, progress, and termination of the American war*. (2 Vols). London: privately printed.

Stein, S. (2005). Jonathan Edwards. In L. Jones. (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Religion* (pp. 2698–2701). New York: Thompson Gale.

Stoeffler, F. E. (2005a). Spener, Philipp Jakob. In L. Jones. (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of religion* (pp. 8679–8680). New York: Thompson Gale.

Stoeffler, F. E. (2005b). August Hermann Francke. In L. Jones. (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of religion* (pp. 3185–3186). New York: Thompson Gale.

Stout, H. (1986). *The New England soul: Preaching and religious culture in colonial New England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stout, H., & Onuf, P. (1983). James Devenport and the Great Awakening in New London. *The Journal of American History,70*(3), 556–578.

Tacitus. (1869). *The annals of Tacitus*. Ed. A. J. Church., & W. J. Brodribb. London: Macmillan and Co.

Tarleton, B. (1787). *A history of the Campaigns of 1780 and 1781 in the southern provinces of North America*. London: T. Cadell.

Thompson, Ernest Price. (1963). *Presbyterians in the South.* (3 Vols). Richmond, VA: John Knox Press.

Tudor, J. (1962). *Congregationalists in England, 1662–1962*. London: Independent Press.

Valkenburgh, S. (1994). 1740s-Jonathan Edwards and the Great Awakening. *The Society of Colonial Wars in the State of Connecticut*. Retrieved June 21, 2007, from http://www.colonialwarsct.org/1740_s.htm

Vitz, P. (1986). *Censorship: Evidence of bias in our children's textbooks*. Ann Arbor: Servant Books.

Waddell, J. A. (1888). *Annals of Augusta County, Virginia, with reminiscences*. Richmond, VA: J. W. Randolph and English.

Weber, N. A. (2007). Anabaptists. In *Catholic Encyclopedia*. New York: Robert Appleton Co. Retrieved June 6, 2007, from http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/01445b.html

Werner, A. (2007). *Myths and legends of the Bantu*. New York: NuVision Publications.

Wheeler, J. H. (1851). *Historical sketches of North Carolina from 1584 to 1851*. (2 Vols). New York: Lippincott, Grambo and Co.

White, H. A. (1911). *Southern Presbyterian leaders*. New York: Neale Publishing Company.

Williams, R. (1998). Great Awakenings. In W. Swatos, Jr. (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of religion and society* (p. 213). Walnut Creek: Alta Mira Press.

Wilson, H. M. (1954). *The tinkling spring, headwater of freedom: A study of the church and her people 1732–1952*. Verona, VA: McClure Press.

Winn, R. (1812). General Richard Winn's notes—1780. *Peter Force Papers, Series 7E, Reel 3 of 56*. Washington, DC: Library of Congress.

Wood, P. (1974). *Black majority: Negroes in colonial South Carolina from 1670 through the Stono Rebellion*. New York: Alfred E. Knopf.

Woodmason, C. (1953). *The Carolina Backcountry on the Eve of the Revolution: The Journal and Other Writings of Charles Woodmason, Anglican Itinerant.* Ed. R. J. Hooker. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Woods, T. (2005). *How the Catholic Church built Western Civilization*. Washington DC: Regnery Publishing Inc.

Index

A
American Revolution, 1, 2, 10, 35, 43, 47, 53, 55, 61, 72, 75, 79, 96, 101, 104, 106
Anabaptists, 17
Anglican Church, 51, 52, 58, 61, 62
Anglicans, 7, 51, 53, 66, 71
Anti-Catholicism, 44
Antichrist, 43, 46, 47, 49
Apocalypse, 16, 17

B
Babylon, 48
Baptism, 17
Baptist, 45, 53, 54, 62–65, 70, 71, 77
Battle of King's Mountain, 87–96
Battle of the Cowpens, 75
Battle of the Waxhaws, 74
Blue Ridge Mountains, 58, 59, 88
Book of Judges, 83, 90
Britain, 101, 101, 102
British Crown, 61
British, 44–46
British Empire, 48
British Parliament, 45, 67
Britons, 101, 102

C
Canaan, 72, 75, 90
Canaanites, 72, 75, 90
Carolina Backcountry, 51, 55, 59–62, 65, 66, 69–72, 76, 77, 88, 89, 95
Carolinas, 51–54, 72, 73, 76, 86, 87
Catholic Church, 43, 46, 47
Catholicism, 44, 46
Catholics, 51
Celtic, 1, 101, 103
China, 103
Christian Fundamentalist, 18
Christian, 56, 57, 75, 79, 86, 89, 92
Christianity, 1, 2, 11, 17, 24
Church of England, 16, 23, 44
Class conflict, 2
Congregationalists, 10, 13
Continental Army, 48, 68, 70
Continental Congress, 70, 91, 67, 68
Conversion, 15–17, 19, 21, 22, 24, 26, 35, 36, 38, 43

D
Devil, 47
Druid, 1, 101, 102

E
Early Church Fathers, 17
East India Company, 45
Egyptians, 72, 75
Emperor Claudius, 101
End of the world, 27
England, 2, 5, 10, 32, 53–60, 64, 66, 79
English, 43, 51–53, 55, 59, 63, 66, 69, 71, 79
Enlightenment, 1, 2, 5, 7, 16, 19, 20, 32
Ethics, 8
Evangelical, 33
Evangelist, 53, 56
Evil, 17, 29, 30

F
Faith, 8, 12
French, 43–45, 49, 103, 104
French and Indian War, 52, 58, 72, 84, 89
Fundamentalists, 105

R. J. Chacon and M. C. Scoggins, *The Great Awakening and Southern Backcountry Revolutionaries*, SpringerBriefs in Anthropology 4,
DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-04597-9, © The Author(s) 2014

G
German, 102, 103
Gideon, 87, 90
God, 6, 11, 12, 16–18, 22, 24, 26–29, 33, 36, 38, 39, 43, 47–49, 56, 59, 60, 68, 72, 75, 79, 82, 83, 86, 89, 90, 92, 93, 96, 97, 103, 104
God's chosen people, 48
Great Awakening, 1, 2, 5, 9, 13, 15, 27, 32, 33, 36–39, 43, 44, 51, 53, 56, 62, 63, 66, 67, 70, 74, 101, 106

H
Hell, 26
Hmong, 103, 104
Holy Bible, 56, 60
Holy war, 71, 72, 79, 89, 96
Huck's Defeat, 86, 88, 93, 95

I
Iceni tribe, 102
Indochina, 103
Ireland, 51, 52, 55, 63, 64, 66, 77, 79, 84
Irish, 51–53, 55, 62, 64, 74, 76–78, 80, 84, 86, 89, 92, 96
Islam, 104
Israel, 72, 86, 87, 90
Israelites, 48

K
Khmu, 103, 104
King George III, 49
Kolelo cult, 102

L
Laos, 103
Liberty, 44, 45, 46

M
Mab Daum, 103, 104
Mad Man's War, 1, 101, 103
Mahi-Mahi Rebellion, 1, 101–104
Mark of the beast, 46
Mennonites, 52
Methodism, 53, 54, 63
Middle East, 104
Millennialism, 43, 48
Modernity, 105
Moravians, 52

N
New England, 5, 10, 35
New Lights, 23, 35
North Africa, 104
North Carolina, 51, 52, 54, 55, 59–61, 63, 69–71, 73, 74, 82, 87–89, 91, 95

O
Old Lights, 23, 31
Old Testament, 48, 72, 79, 82, 83, 86, 87, 90
Oppression, 47
Orthodox, 55
Orthodox Christian, 17

P
Pa Chay, 103
Papists, 45, 63
Patriots, 49
Philistines, 72, 75, 86, 87
Pietism, 11, 12, 15
Pilgrimage, 104
Pilgrims, 104
Pope, 45, 47
Popery, 44–47
Presbyterian, 7, 23, 48, 51, 52
Protestant, 1, 2, 5–9, 12, 17, 23, 28, 36, 38, 47, 52, 56, 62, 69–71, 89, 96, 101
Protestant Reformation, 51
Protestant Reformers, 17
Protestantism, 17, 22
Puritans, 7

Q
Quakers, 52, 62, 63
Quebec Act of 1774, 45, 47

R
Rebellion, 48
Rebels, 69, 71, 72, 74, 76–79, 81, 83, 85, 91–94
Rebirth, 17
Regulator Wars, 53
Religion, 101, 103–106
Revival, 1, 2, 5, 13, 18, 34, 38
Revivalism, 13, 20, 24
Revolutionary War, 49
Roman Catholic, 17
Roman Catholicism, 44
Roman Empire, 89
Romans, 101

S
Sacraments, 5, 7, 17
Salvation, 11–13, 16, 17, 21, 24, 26, 31
Scotch-Irish, 51–53, 55, 59, 62, 64, 65, 69, 71, 72, 74, 76, 77, 79, 80, 83, 84, 86, 89, 90, 96
Scotland, 51, 56–58, 63, 64, 66, 67, 75, 77, 80, 84, 88, 91
Second Coming, 17
Seven Years' War, 43–45
Shakers, 29
Sinner, 16, 17
Slavery, 28
South Carolina, 51, 53, 60–62, 64, 66, 70, 73–76, 78, 79, 81, 82, 85–89, 92, 94–96
Southern Backcountry, 1, 2, 5, 11, 53, 63, 71, 72, 95, 96, 101
Spanish, 43, 44
Stamp Act of 1765, 44
Suetonius Paulinus, 101

T
Tacitus, 101, 102
Tanzania, 102
Tea Act of 1773, 45
Tyranny, 44, 46, 47, 48

U
Ulster, 15, 51–53, 55, 66, 71, 79, 89
Uluguru, 102
United States, 104

V
Vietnam, 103

W
Wales, 101
Westminster Confession, 57, 60, 67
Wickedness, 69, 83

Z
Zion, 49