Carlisle Awakened:

A Study of Revival, Reform & Retreat in a Pennsylvania Town, 1815-1848

By

Patrick Sidney Kelly

Submitted in partial fulfillment of Honor Requirements for the Department of History

Dr. Matthew Pinsker, Supervisor

Dr. John Osborne, Reader

May 11, 2009

Acknowledgments

While I take pride in the subsequent work, I could not have completed it on my own. Professor Matthew Pinsker, my adviser, did much to make it possible. Without Professor Pinsker's guidance, comments, and flexibility, I could never have completed the thesis. Without his suggestion to read Paul Johnson's book, I could never have even started it. Thanks also to Professor Osborne, who gave valuable comments on the work in progress as the second reader.

I am grateful to the staffs of Dickinson College's Archives and Special Collections and the Cumberland County Historical Society's Library. All I met were helpful and knowledgeable, and made mountains of local history accessible and useful. Thanks to all the staff at both excellent local archives for making Carlisle's history manageable.

My thanks to the friends and family who supported me in this endeavor. Their insightful questions helped me think about the project in new ways, and led to a richer final product. Special thanks to those who read some of the work in progress as they provided valuable perspective on the work from outside of it.

The continuing Communications Revolution also deserves mention. From the proliferation of pamphlets, to the microfilm preservation of aging newspapers, to the now numerous online databases providing easy access to archived books and articles from across the nation and the world, technological improvements have changed how we communicate. They have also made this project much easier than it once would have been. All of these technical improvements are the products of human innovation, and the huge amounts of information available the product of colossal human efforts; my thanks to all of those involved in both.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction

"The revivals sometimes encouraged interdenominational cooperation and a sense of collective moral responsibility, but they were also a divisive force that split denominations and even tore individual congregations apart."

–Daniel Walker Howe[1]

The Second Great Awakening was one of several drastic changes in U.S. history between the War of 1812 and the Mexican War (1846-1848). This period of heightened revivalism and religious activism came about as the modern two-party political system developed, industrialists constructed an expanding national infrastructure of canals, railroads, and telegraph lines, and as Manifest Destiny pushed the nation's borders even further westward. Yet how these developments influenced each other and redefined America during this period remains the subject of ongoing debate. Historians such as Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr. and Charles Grier Sellers have argued that the most important dynamic during the period was the interaction between the expansion of market capitalism and protests against its development embodied by the rise of Andrew Jackson's populist Democratic Party. [2] Daniel Walker Howe's Pulitzer Prize winning survey *What Hath God Wrought* (2007) offers a notable alternative, explicitly rejecting the labels of "market revolution" and "Jacksonian democracy." [3] Howe argues that improvements in transportation and communication redefined the American experience more than Jackson and the rise of his Democratic Party.

[1] Daniel Walker Howe, *What Hath God Wrought : The Transformation of America, 1815-1848* The Oxford History of the United States (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 187.
[2]See Arthur M. Schlesinger, *The Age of Jackson*, (Boston: Little, Brown and company, 1945) and Charles Grier Sellers, *The Market Revolution: Jacksonian America, 1815-1846* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991);
[3] Howe, 856.

Howe claims that the Democratic Party was not fully the people's party, and that organization and communication better defined the age.

Carlisle, Pennsylvania provides a good test of Howe's thesis in some of the same ways that Paul Johnson's landmark community study *A Shopkeeper's Millennium* (1978) offers an illustration of the once-dominant market thesis. Johnson's monograph examines the consequences of the construction of the Erie Canal on religious revivalism in Rochester, New York. The canal led to swift growth. Rochester's population grew from barely more than a thousand to ten times that in a few decades and demonstrated the anxieties sometimes generated by nineteenth-century market turbulence. Johnson connects those market anxieties to an upswing in religious fervor. [4] Carlisle did not have so sudden a transformation or such a clear explosion of anxieties, but it also experienced religious revival. One of the nation's larger and more diverse inland towns until 1840, Carlisle had long served as a crossroads and resting place for those traveling westward before it underwent religious revival and reform in the early nineteenth century. [5] This thesis will explore that period of religious revival in Carlisle, utilizing local church records, other organizational records, county tax assessments, local newspapers, pamphlets, and the personal papers of the chief participants. The focal event for this study will be the 1833 heresy trial of local Presbyterian minister George Duffield. What this study reveals is that the sweeping communications revolution and subsequent transformation of the United States between 1815 and 1848, which Howe describes so well for the nation at large, proved more ambiguous in Carlisle. The

[4] Paul E. Johnson, *A Shopkeeper's Millennium*, (New York: Hill and Wang, 1978), 13.
[5] U.S. Bureau of the Census, "Table 6. Population of the 90 Urban Places: 1830," U.S. Bureau of the Census, http://www.census.gov/population/www/documentation/twps0027/tab06.txt, accessed on 29 January 2009. U.S. Bureau of the Census, "Table 5. Population of the 61 Urban Places: 1820," U.S. Bureau of the Census, http://www.census.gov/population/www/documentation/twps0027/tab05.txt, accessed on 29 January 2009.

transformation and process of modernization that Howe details was real in Carlisle, but also limited by the contentiousness brought about by all of the improved forms of communication.

Daniel Walker Howe positions his synthesis of the period most directly in opposition to the works of Schlesinger and Sellers. Howe states that Arthur Schlesinger Jr's *The Age of Jackson* (1945) "…considered the distinguishing feature of the period the spread of democracy through class conflict spearheaded by industrial workers."[6] Charles Grier Sellers' *The Market Revolution* (1991) revised Schlesinger's argument by claiming that class conflict was caused by the unwelcome introduction of the market. At the time of its publication, Sellers's work filled a void in the field, according to historian Jill Lepore, because there had been no recent synthesis of the innovative social and micro history of the preceding decades since Schlesinger's well-known study.[7] The Sellers conception of the market revolution quickly proved influential, but in the last few years, three major alternative approaches have also emerged. Sean Wilentz argues for the rise of American democracy as the fulfillment of Jefferson's vision for America, and does not interpret the events of the antebellum nation in light of a market revolution at all.[8] Howe emphasizes the massive improvements in communication, and consequently in organization and democracy, that transformed the nation during the period. Most recently, David Reynolds in *Waking Giant: America in the Age of Jackson* (2008), argues that the defining characteristics of the time were optimism and gullibility.[9] This thesis stands apart from the debate over the market revolution entirely.

---

[6] Howe, 856.
[7] Jill Lepore, "Vast Designs," *The New Yorker* (29 October, 2007).
[8] Lacy K. Ford, "Democracy and Its Consequences in Antebellum America: A Review Essay," *Journal of Southern History* 74, no. 1 (2008): 125-138. *America: History & Life*, EBSCO*host* (accessed February 16, 2009).
[9] James Grant, "Vibrant, Turbulent Young America," *The Wall Street Journal* (27 September, 2008).

Howe argues that the "Jacksonian consensus" oversimplifies the many conflicts of the era and that Sellers' market thesis is particularly unfounded. Instead of a period shaped by a single class conflict, Howe conceives of the early republic as a contentious place, and that the many debates of the era were facilitated by improvements in communication. These improvements allowed information to be transmitted as never before. [10] Howe quotes Frederick Douglass in support of his argument. "Thanks to steam navigation and electric wires," reported Douglass, "…a revolution cannot now be confined to the place or the people where it may commence, but flashes with lightning speed from heart to heart, from land to land, until it has traversed the globe."[11] This revolution was not just about new technology but also the result of expanded and more vibrant grassroots organizations. These improvements contrast with Sellers' conception of the era as one of class conflict, by detailing the positive consequences of the era's social and economic transformations. Widespread revivals and expanding religious and reform societies provide evidence for a major part of Howe's objection to Sellers' argument.[12] Howe's sweeping examination of the Second Great Awakening illustrates the ambition of his revisionist thesis.

The Second Great Awakening was a complex group of events that brought thousands of people into churches and drastically changed American culture in the first few decades of the nineteenth century. Religious efforts did much to expand literacy and denominations formed the largest national organizations in the country. According to historian Mark Noll, Americans in the 1840s received on average about three letters per year from the Post Office, but heard on average about six Methodist sermons. This form of communication, conducted

[10] Howe, 2-3.
[11] Frederick Douglass, *North Star*, April 28, 1848 quoted in Howe, 848.
[12] Daniel Feller, "Review: The Market Revolution Ate My Homework," (*Reviews in American History*, September, 1997), 410.

largely by traveling circuit preachers, did much to bring information across the nation. As Noll points out, the Methodist Church had nearly as many clergy as the Post Office had employees.[13] Religious institutions, such as the Methodist Church, played a larger role than the federal government in bringing information between places and transmitting ideas in general. Religion even permeated education. All colleges of the era were religiously affiliated, except the Army Academy at West Point, and even that school experienced a revival among its students.[14] Yet these same awakenings also caused much division within churches, communities, and families, seemingly unifying as they divided.[15] The most searing divisions within the nation's churches would largely come over slavery in the years leading up to the Civil War.

The complex conception of the era's conflicts advocated by Howe is fundamentally incompatible with an all-encompassing perception of the era as one of class conflict. Sellers argues that changes in the marketplace encouraged participation in politics through acts of protest. The centralizing force of the market was directed by business elites in order to accumulate more wealth, and was strongly opposed by rising Jacksonian democracy, which united common people against the elite market.[16] Howe's challenge to the market thesis rejects Sellers' notion of the market as something feared by the yeoman farmer and dismisses the premise that the Democratic Party was truly the people's party. Howe emphasizes the positive effect the market had on life, and argues that the vast majority of Americans were willing participants in the market's expansion.[17]

---

[13] Mark Noll, *America's God*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2002, 200-01.
[14] Glenn Robins, *The Bishop of the Old South: The Ministry and Civil War Legacy of Leonidas Polk*, (First ed. Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 2006), 32.
[15] Howe, 193-195.
[16] Sellers, 427.
[17] Howe, 849.

Howe's interpretive dispute with Sellers shows itself clearly in their competing interpretations of the Second Great Awakening. The Awakening was a self-conscious effort to restore the country to Christian piety and devotion. Yet Sellers frames the issue in economic terms by noting that, "Under peaking market pressures in the 1820s and 1830s, Americans found religious salvation more compelling than political salvation."[18] Sellers views religious revivals in reaction to the disruption of the market economy. The revivalism was at first antinomian in his telling, which meant that the revivals avoided focus on sin and emphasized personal freedom. According to his interpretation, revivalists co-opted these forces into a more moderate religion that assuaged the guilt of the exploitive middle class, making the Democratic Party the only outlet for anti-market feeling. In contrast, Howe argues that religious revivals and reform efforts such as the fight against intemperance were means of improving life, particularly for women. [19] He depicts marketplace changes in similarly positive fashion. At issue is whether religious change should be described as a way to better tolerate the disorder of life after the market revolution, or as a part of an expanding communications revolution that was helping to empower individuals and instigate reform.

Religion certainly improved the life of Charles Grandison Finney, probably the best known figure of the Awakening, a lawyer's apprentice who was born again and converted thousands of others. Both Sellers and Howe provide brief narratives of Finney's life and deeds within the wider context of the times. Sellers argues, however, that Finney's revivals owed their success to the need to restore social order. He writes, "Finney offered businessmen who surrendered to maternal altruism both domestic and social tranquility."[20] According to Sellers, Finney converted those who felt alienated by growing markets and the

[18] Sellers, 202.
[19] Lepore.
[20] Sellers, 230.

resulting changes in daily life.[21] Yet by Howe's reckoning, Finney owed his success to his "new measures," plain language, charismatic personality, his comfort with the middle class, and his willingness to receive female assistance.[22] Finney embodies for Howe the power of new communicative methods and attitudes, while for Sellers his revivals were yet another way for the middle class to assert control.[23] The historians agree that Finney was a successful proselytizer, and draw largely on the same evidence, but their differing emphases give insight into their attitudes towards the awakening.

Sellers and Howe both utilize Paul Johnson's *A Shopkeeper's Millennium* (1978) to help guide their description of social consequences of revivals and to assess Finney, who led one of his most famous revivals in Rochester. Johnson's work provides much evidence for the sort of market revolution that Sellers describes in his broader narrative. Sellers expands on Johnson's argument when he writes, "Only by a headlong flight into domesticity, benevolence, and feeling could they [the middle class] tolerate the market's calculating egotism."[24] Finney's statements appealed particularly to this group, and it was by means of its middle class popularity that revival religion became such a large part of society. Yet what had been utilized mostly without commentary or criticism by Sellers, Howe approaches more cautiously. [25] Howe describes the workers who flocked to Finney's revivals not as being pushed into doing so from above, as Johnson and Sellers do, but rather from being motivated for their own gain, and gives in his footnote on the Rochester revivals two other accounts of the social characteristics of revivalism in upstate New York.[26] Johnson himself states that he

[21] Sellers, 228-229.
[22] Howe, 172-173.
[23] Howe, 173-174.
[24] Sellers, 202.
[25] Sellers, 202 & 467.
[26] Howe, 174.

cannot draw conclusions about why people were drawn to revivals, but suggests it had much to do with Finney's appeal to the middle class.[27] Johnson's study makes extensive use of local church and government records, providing a model for doing local history of the Awakening.

Histories of nineteenth-century Carlisle have paid most attention to the town's successes and improvements and have generally ignored the town's revivals and its leading revivalist, George Duffield. The most in-depth social history of the town during this period exists in a dissertation which ends its study of Carlisle in 1810.[28] Yet this study immediately presents a challenge for the market thesis because it describes the rise of the market town of Carlisle in the years preceding the War of 1812 and in a fashion that did not produce extensive class conflict. Earlier local histories seem almost entirely blind to conflict in the town's past and existed more to glorify than to explain.[29] Conway Wing's *History of Cumberland County, Pennsylvania* (1879), was the first substantial work of local history, and its study of Carlisle's history is a progressive one which describes the community's improvements over time. Other local history has been largely genealogical in orientation, telling the tales of great local men and their successes. The Cumberland County Historical Society has published papers on particular events during the Second Great Awakening, but none on the period as a whole. One recent unpublished manuscript by William T. Swaim details a critical event for this study—George Duffield's heresy trial by the Carlisle Presbytery—but it does not place this event in context, and is mostly a regurgitation of the

[27] Johnson, 140-141.
[28] Judith Anne Ridner, *"A handsomely improved place": Economic, social, and gender-role development in a backcountry town, Carlisle, Pennsylvania, 1750-1810*, (Ann Arbor: UMI, 1995).
[29] Edward W. Biddle, "Carlisle," *History of Cumberland County, Pennsylvania*, (ed. Conway P. Wing, Philadelphia: J.D. Scott, 1879).

notes of one of Duffield's opponents.[30] There is currently no modern study of the Second Great Awakening in Carlisle, especially one that examines the story in light of the recent interpretive debates over the Awakenings causes and its effects.

This project attempts to explore the full context of the Awakening in Carlisle by imitating some of Paul Johnson's methods. This thesis will describe the state of the town before and after Duffield's pivotal heresy trial in an attempt to define the nature of the larger social and economic transformation. Johnson relied on surviving church records from Rochester's churches, a public registry, newspaper notices, and septennial tax lists to determine the social, religious, and political composition of Rochester's revival.[31] Carlisle lacks any occupational register until 1850, but triennial tax lists and the septennial census provide occupational information. Fewer churches offer extant records, but some significant corresponding material exists.[32] For this project, I was able to create a database of more than twenty-five hundred records (See Appendix A for details).The focal point of Johnson's study was to examine the social composition of Finney's 1831 revival. The focal point of this study of Carlisle attempts to sketch a social portrait of the 1832-3 Duffield heresy battle, while also exploring exactly how much the community transformed as a result of the general period of revival and the widespread experimentation with reform.

The battle over George Duffield illustrated the Awakening's complicated story in Carlisle. Duffield, a slight man of boundless energy and equally limitless will, was a powerful, emotive preacher. He was the grandson of the chaplain of the First Continental

[30] William T. Swaim, *Disruptions of the Presbyterian Church and Dickinson College by George Duffield III, 1816-1833* (unpublished manuscript, 1983 CCHS). This opponent is George Armstrong Lyon.
[31] Johnson, 158-204.
[32]Only two church membership lists, First & Second Presbyterian, will be extensively utilized in this study of Carlisle. The most severe limitation of the records is on studying women and, who were rarely heads of household, which is the only category of person found in governmental records until the 1850 Federal Census.

Congress, also a George Duffield, who had been Carlisle's first Presbyterian minister. Duffield III had been a gifted student, graduating from the University of Pennsylvania and seminary before he turned twenty-one. After preaching in Carlisle, the church was so impressed that they selected him over John Williamson, a Cumberland County minister who had been seeking the position. Williamson later wrote the charges against Duffield in 1832.[33] Duffield's strong personality had its drawbacks and contradictions. He appeared arrogant and extremely unwilling to apologize or step back from any statement he made, but his diaries reveal his substantial anxiety over his faith.[34] Duffield was a successful organizer and motivator. He initiated Sunday schools in Carlisle in 1818, and helped reorganize Dickinson College in 1820.[35] At the same time, Duffield antagonized many of those with whom he coordinated these efforts. In his own church, he had difficulty accepting popular will, but at the same time he criticized the Methodist church for being undemocratic.[36] Duffield was both a unifying and dividing force. To the extent that Duffield could appeal to the masses, he was popular, but he earned enemies among prominent members of his church for his emotional revivalism.

Duffield's emotionalism upset some of Carlisle's best. His two most prominent opponents were Andrew Blair and his cousin George Armstrong Lyon.[37] Both men had supported early reform efforts, such as Bible distribution, Sunday schooling, and a strict code of discipline among members of First Presbyterian Church. They made an unlikely duo. Lyon's namesake and great uncle was the famous Colonel George Armstrong, while Blair was the son of a shoemaker. Lyon had been educated at Dickinson College, and was a

[33] Swaim, 8.
[34] George Duffield, untitled Diaries, 31 October 1828-15 February 1836, Dickinson College Library.
[35] Sellers, "The Duffield Years."
[36] Swaim, 20.
[37] George Armstrong Lyon drop file, DCA. Lyon was also a direct descendant of George Duffield I.

member of Carlisle's bar, while Blair had only four summers' schooling.[38] Lyon was much more like his cousin than Blair. Duffield and Lyon had married wealthy women from distant places, both were independently wealthy; each was a leader who rarely took charge directly. Duffield and Lyon, while influential in the management of the College and the Bible Society, were only secretaries in either, and when they were in conflict, each attacked the other indirectly.[39] Both were able communicators as Lyon wrote letters and kept notes and Duffield preached sermons and published anonymous pamphlets. While it seems natural enough for these two stubborn and similar people to have a growing enmity, Blair appears to be an unusual participant in the conflict. By all accounts, Blair was a kind man, given to soft control over his children, and generous with others. Despite these qualities, he too was unable to tolerate remaining in Duffield's church. This is especially unusual given that Blair was just the sort of self-made, wealthy man other accounts of the Awakening identify with the New Light. Blair embodies the unusual nature of Carlisle's anti-revivalism: it was the shopkeepers who eventual slowed the Awakening.[40]

This thesis will argue that although the Second Great Awakening was a transformative event in many of the ways that historian Daniel Howe describes, in the community of Carlisle its results were ambiguous and just as much a product of individual leadership, or failures of leadership, as they were of a broader communications revolution. Local evangelicals certainly sought to improve their community in a variety of ways and

---

[38] Ibid; Miriam Woods Blair, *Andrew Blair, a Progressive Thinker, 1789-1861*, (Hamilton Library Association: Carlisle, 1951), 6.

[39] They left each other several passive-aggressive notes after Duffield suspected Lyon of authoring an anonymous criticism of his sermon. Each claimed to have called on the other, and unfortunately not found the other home to speak about the problem. George Duffield to George A. Lyon, "re: Pained people believe Lyon wrote piece by "H," August 24, 1831 and Lyon, George A. to Duffield, George "re: Article by "H," not author, but defends author's views," August 26, 1831, [etc.], MC 2006.1, Folder 1-2, DCA; Sellers, "The Duffield Years."

[40] Blair was a tanner, but he did own a shop, as well as a distillery. Cumberland County Tax List, 1820, Cumberland County Historical Society.

relied on many if not all of the latest technological tools, but still found themselves divided over priorities and tactics. George Armstrong Lyon, Andrew Blair, and George Duffield each attempted to make their church, college, and community better, but fundamental differences led to conflict. It is this conflict and division that Howe alludes to when he says that revivals "…were also a divisive force that split denominations and even tore individual congregations apart."[41] Carlisle provides a compelling example of what made this force divisive, and the consequences of this division in the organization of the community.

[41] Howe, 187.

Chapter 2: Revival Rising

What brought the fires of revivalism into an interior Pennsylvania town? The community does not seem exceptional, or even similar to the sort of communities other narratives depict being transformed by religious energies. The borough was the fifty-sixth largest urban area in the nation in 1820, and up to 1815 had been home to a notable college.[42] The town was, while large, not unusual for the interior of Pennsylvania. It boasted a population of German and English speakers, a handful of slaves, and a growing free black community.[43] None of these features were atypical of a town for the state, but they were unusual in the nation as a whole. Pennsylvania, unlike most other states, did not have, nor had it ever had, an established church. Churches were accustomed to the competition that was so novel in New England. By both Howe's and Sellers' accounts, Connecticut disestablishment was a major cause of the Second Great Awakening's heightened revivalism.[44] Pennsylvania, with no history of establishment and few Yankee migrants, was not particularly affected by this disestablishment. Tying the revivalism to the market revolution also seems difficult. Carlisle, unlike the new canal towns of upstate New York, had long been connected to the national market without much surface anxiety or disturbance. The composition of Carlisle makes it appear an unlikely location for extensive revivals when following the model presented in other narratives, and yet there were many over the years. A deeper analysis of the town's emerging structure provides an explanation of how it could be the seat of such religious fervor, and also hints at why it would not last.

---

[42] Sellers, "The Duffield Years." Dickinson College closed in 1815, in large part due to the difficult personality of President Atwater.
[43] Milton Embick Flower and Lenore Embick Flower, *This Is Carlisle,* (Harrisburg, Pa: J. Horace McFarland Co, 1944), 4.
[44] Howe, 164-165; Sellers, 203.

The emerging nineteenth-century market did not disrupt Carlisle. Informal trading had long taken place on the town square, and in 1823, a market house was constructed in the square, putting commerce at the center of local life along with government and religion.[45] Carlisle's central location in the Cumberland Valley made it ideal for local trade, and the borough was within a day's travel to the Susquehanna River and subsequent access to national markets. While turnpikes had helped transform Carlisle into a trading center, the inefficiency of turnpikes in the early republic also made the town a vital center of production. Turnpikes were a costly way to transport goods, and made inland settlement prohibitively expensive unless coupled with significant local production. More than just a hub for travel and trade, Carlisle became a center of the valley's industry because of its location. This mixture of industry and trade made for a very diverse local economy.[46]

The local economy in 1820 was already part of a vibrant and expanding national market. The occupation most commonly listed in tax records, 'merchant,' was essential to the town's life.

These often wealthy men connected area farmers to the wider world. As a county seat, Carlisle was also home to many wealthy lawyers. The highest value occupations outside of law and trade were butchery and tanning. Both of these services, along with distilling,[47] allowed the value of agricultural goods to be concentrated in easily transported forms. Farmers could feed livestock with their surplus to let them walk it to market, and then sell the meat for essential locally produced goods. The hides could then be tanned into leather and sold further afield, or used in the local shoe industry. Shoes, with their easy division of labor,

[45] Flower, 35.
[46] Cumberland County Tax List, 1820, Cumberland County Historical Society.
[47] Distilling is under-reported as an occupation because few seem to have worked distilling full time, but there were 8 stills reported in the 1820 Tax List. Wealthy residents, like Andrew Blair, owned stills as an additional source of income.

were easily produced in large towns, and Carlisle was no exception. By 1820, Carlisle was clearly a growing place, given the employment in construction and the number of undeveloped lots held by local residents. Between brick makers, brick layers, masons, and carpenters, more than ten percent of taxable men worked in construction. Ridner's doctoral study of Carlisle culminating in 1810 also shows a growing town with an expanding market. This expansion clearly continued in 1820 along similar lines.[48] Trade and industry fueled Carlisle's growth, and though these were the signs of growing market capitalism there seemed to be no public outcry. Carlisle had grown by 1820 to be the nation's fifty-sixth largest town, and the market made it so.

Table 2.1: Carlisle's Top 12 Occupations, 1820

Occupation	*Mean Valuation*	*% of Heads of Household with Listed Occupation*[49]
Merchant	$3161.74	7.3%
Innkeeper	$789.11	6.9%
Carpenter	$545.78	6.9%
Attorney	$2865.06	6.5%
Shoemaker	$170.86	5.3%
Doctor	$585.45	4.2%
Weaver	$361.70	3.8%
Blacksmith	$916.00	3.4%
Tailor	$245.22	3.4%
Mason	$340.63	3.1%

[48] Judith Anne Ridner, *"A handsomely improved place": Economic, social, and gender-role development in a backcountry town, Carlisle, Pennsylvania, 1750-1810*, (Ann Arbor: UMI, 1995).
[49] 42% of those listed in the 1820 tax list have no listed occupation.

Tanner	$3046.29	2.7%
Butcher	$2811.86	2.7%

Source: Cumberland County Tax List, 1820, Cumberland County Historical Society.
Notes: Butchers have a significantly wealthy outlier (Carlisle's wealthiest man) leading to an inflated mean valuation.

The rapidly growing town was a disorderly place during the early national period. The community endured periodic rioting. The most notorious of these riots were political. One had been over the ratification of the Constitution in 1788, and while there was an observable class correlation, it was not necessarily a market driven conflict.[50] A major protest had taken place in 1814 over the war with Britain, and an 1820 protest was similarly political. The congressional representative was hanged in effigy shortly following the 1820 Missouri Compromise, which allowed for the further expansion of slavery. This was unpopular in Pennsylvania, and Carlisle residents let this be known with their protest. None of these major protests concerned the national bank, tariffs, or other primarily economic issues, and protests were far from the worst threat to order in the town. There was a surprising absence of basic municipal organization. Fire jeopardized local safety and economic well being in ways that seemed to overwhelm community leaders. Fires had destroyed parts of the college, churches, and many structures throughout the town. The borough had grown large enough by 1818 to support two fire companies, but controlling these fires proved repeatedly difficult. In February 1821, a substantial portion of the borough burned, despite the presence of the two fire companies. According to one report, "the

[50] Saul Cornell, "Aristocracy Assailed: The Ideology of Backcountry Anti-Federalism," *The Journal of American History* 76, no. 4 (March, 1990): 1148-1172.

difficulty of forming lines could scarcely be surmounted, until a sufficient number of ladies appeared…"[51]

As this report suggests, Carlisle women often rose to leadership in the challenges of addressing particular social and religious needs. Women organized the first grassroots religious society in Carlisle. The Female Bible Society, founded in 1814 by people recorded only as "ladies," raised funds to distribute Bibles among Cumberland County's poor. The society became an auxiliary to the American Bible Society a few years later, donating $140 to the national organization in 1816.[52] Part of a national movement for Bible distribution, this society, despite its fundraising, escaped notice in Carlisle for some time. The editor of the *American Volunteer*, Carlisle's Democratic paper, wrote an editorial noting the national trend toward Bible societies in early 1818, and calling upon locals to form one. The author had noticed that a letter for the Female Bible Society in the Post Office, and wondered whether there really was such a society in Carlisle at the time.[53] Eventually, local men did realize there had been a Bible society in Carlisle for years, and acted to gain control. No mention is ever made of who led the society in its female incarnation, but once male leadership was elected, a notice appeared in the *Volunteer*.[54] This society had many local worthies in its leadership, including George A. Lyon and other prominent Presbyterians, but only one minister: George Duffield.

The young minister, a recent arrival in town, played a substantial role in the reorganized Bible Society, as well as the church he came to lead. In town on business for his

[51] "Carlisle Fire," *Providence Patriot, Columbian Sun,* (Providence, RI: February 28, 1821), 19th Century Newspapers.
[52] John B Romeyn, "From The Christian Herald," *The Christian's Weekly Monitor; or, Sabbath Morning Repast,* (January 1817), 3-7, American Periodicals Series Online.
[53] "Bible Societies," *American Volunteer,* (Carlisle, Pa: January 18, 1816), 4.
[54] "Auxiliary Bible Societies," *American Volunteer,* (Carlisle, Pa: April 17, 1817), 4.

father in 1815, he likely did not suspect it would be his home for almost twenty years.[55] He preached a sermon at the Presbyterian Church, which was seeking a new minister, and soon after was called to be their pastor. The church had been won over by his powerful preaching. Twenty-two years old at the time, Carlisle's church was Duffield's first full time ministry. The emotional and energetic man almost immediately set about making drastic changes to the place. He restricted the membership of the Presbyterian Church to only those who attended service every Sunday and acted as moral exemplars; he frequently expelled members for bad behavior. Despite his strictness, the church grew substantially, and became substantially more diverse.[56]

The Presbyterian Church in Carlisle had long been the town's largest, but it was still composed largely of economic elites before Duffield's arrival. The seventeen men whose tax evaluation can be tied to their church membership were evaluated at double the town average. Over the coming years, more of the less wealthy landowners were brought into church. As has been noted by Johnson, non-landowners were unlikely to join a church, and the same seems to be the case for men in Carlisle. The women who joined Duffield's church may have been poorer still, as three of those who converted after his arrival were without real property.[57] The church also grew to include a group that had previously had little involvement in its life: college students. After a student's death on Dickinson's campus, a revival led to a massive influx of student converts in 1823. Nearly twenty of these students went on to become ministers, indicating that Duffield's impact was not restricted merely to increasing the numbers of his own denomination.

[55] Sellers, "The Duffield Years"
[56] Swaim 20.
[57] Tax evaluations less than $100 are unlikely to have any real property (land), while for those evaluated at less than $50, it was a certainty.

Table 2.2: First Presbyterian Converts Taxable Valuation, by Year

Year	*Mean Valuation*	*Taxed Persons*	*Total Converts*	*With a Taxed Spouse*	*Mean Valuation of Taxed Spouse*
1816	$3161.74	17	201	4	$2,339.25
1817	$789.11	9	88	17	$934.12
1818	$545.78	9	57	4	$797.75
1819	$2865.06	2	40	1	$25.00
1820	$170.86	1	45		
1821	$585.45	6	29	2	$324.00
1822	$361.70	1	19		
1823	$916.00	3	120	2	$16.50

Source: Cumberland County Tax List, 1820, Cumberland County Historical Society; First Presbyterian Membership Roll, 1815-1832, Dickinson College Archives.
Notes: In 1816, Duffield audited church membership, leading to 201 members added on the membership list that year. Total church members compared to church members with tax records is very small: the majority of the membership is female, or otherwise not the head of household, and can't be conclusively linked to a head of household.[58]

George Duffield also did much to promote education. In 1816, he established Sunday Schooling in Carlisle, the first organized, public effort to promote literacy in the borough. Building on the work on the Bible Society, which helped provide everyone a Bible to read, Sunday school helped all to read it. The effect this schooling had on children seems to have represented something like a cultural revolution, according to one account that states: "In more than one instance has the pleasing sight been enjoyed, when children, through the instruction received at Sabbath school…have administered a rebuke to thoughtless parents, or

[58] I'm considering guessing based on surname (and averaging the valuations for each surname), but that seems substantially less reliable. On the other hand as it stands now even though I've checked for similar names, I get data on only ~10% of First Presbyterian's membership.

communicated encouragement to such as were inclined to seek the way of truth."[59] This educational opportunity was not restricted to children. Local blacks of all ages were afforded free access to learn to read through Sunday schooling. Carlisle's black population seized the opportunity. Literacy may have been more important than the religious lesson attached. One man, in his enthusiasm for learning to read, missed a prayer meeting to attend additional lessons. He reportedly found being able to spell and read a more powerful religious experience than prayer itself.[60]

This cooperation between education and religion was tested in another endeavor as well. Dickinson College reopened in 1820, largely due to the efforts of Duffield, according to historian Charles Coleman Sellers. The college had been in decline after its first president died, and after an unsuccessful replacement, the institution reemerged, with state funding, at the behest of Duffield, as well as George A. Lyon and other local notables.[61] The college, despite its state support, was still affiliated with the Presbyterian Church, and all but one of its professors was also a Presbyterian minister. The religious college only became more so after Duffield's 1823 revival, leading to mounting pressure from the state to change its charter. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania had never had an established church and was likely embarrassed by its financial support for a religious institution in a time of disestablishment. Yet Duffield grew more adamant in his view that the college should train ministers first, and provide a scientific education as a distant second.

The fast growing borough of Carlisle underwent significant improvement, expansion, and organization in the years following the War of 1812. Duffield served at the head of many

[59] "Extract of a Report from Carlisle, Pennsylvania, April 1818," *The Religious Intelligencer,* (Oct 17, 1818) 3, 20, American Periodicals Series.
[60] Ibid.
[61] Sellers, "The Duffield Years."

of these improvements. Yet not everything Duffield attempted resulted in success: his effort to have a local religious paper to rival the political ones ended in failure after two years. He was not a great compromiser, and as he grew emboldened by his successes and embittered by his failures, conflict escalated. Even early reactions to Duffield were not entirely positive, as the *Volunteer* ridiculed him as the "popular," i.e. vulgar, preacher.[62] He also slandered the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1828, his primary rival for the souls of Carlisle's residents, leading to an anonymous attack on him in a pamphlet. Duffield's religious enthusiasm caused its first dispute and controversy with those outside of his denomination.[63] His religious view, as well as how he supported the organizations he instigated, made him an increasingly controversial figure in Carlisle.

[62] "The Popular Preacher," *American Volunteer*, (Carlisle, Pa: March 4, 1818), 2.
[63] *An Appeal to the Christian Public from Unprovoked Attacks of Rev. George Duffield*, (William & James Underwood: Carlisle, 1828), CCHS. *A Review of "An Appeal to the Christian Public from Unprovoked Attacks of Rev. George Duffield*," (Herald Office: Carlisle, 1828), CCHS.

Chapter 3: Duffield on Trial

By 1831, after almost fifteen years of Duffield's pastorship, some leaders of his church had had enough. Despite Duffield's successes in expanding their church, reopening the college, and organizing religious benevolence, he had grown to frustrate several of his elders and most important parishioners. They blamed him for the college's decline and desperate financial state, perhaps unfairly, as state funding had been cut, and a local network of limited means had replaced the national one that had supported the college in its earliest days. Their other grievances had more weight: Duffield had replaced the Sunday evening service with a prayer meeting, adopted a new, evangelical hymnal without the church's consent, and ceased taking a leadership role in the Sunday school he had initiated.[64] All of these grievances, however, were insufficient: the majority of the church still held Duffield in great esteem. Because of a controversial book he had written on theology, Duffield received a correctional hearing, and later a trial, before the Carlisle Presbytery. Duffield's trial led to the division of Carlisle's Presbyterians into two churches and the wealthiest parishioners joined the new church. This book was mostly a pretext for trying Duffield, because his personality and behavior had presented real problems for his community. However, the work was an expression of the opinions that guided Duffield's controversial actions and help illuminate the theological divisions among Presbyterians.

Leading men had begun to organize against Duffield because of problems managing Dickinson College. Duffield's church divided not only because of a religious dispute but also because of a dispute over the management of the college. Even though Dickinson received state aid, the majority of its trustees and professors were Presbyterians. It is thus unsurprising

[64] William T. Swaim, *Disruptions of the Presbyterian Church and Dickinson College by George Duffield III, 1816-1833,* (unpublished manuscript, 1983, CCHS), 20.

that dispute over the College may have contributed to the animosity which led first to a correctional hearing and ultimately to a formal heresy trial. The revival of the college by Duffield and his colleagues was short-lived. While they had experienced much initial success in reorganizing Dickinson College and attracting students, by 1830 the entire faculty had quit. The college had run out of money and the state aid which had once helped it reopened its doors was no longer forthcoming. The collection practices of the college's agents also contributed to the fiscal crisis, as they took far more pledges than they ever collected. The college had also suffered from a declining reputation, because of the frequent changes in its leadership and the growth of other colleges.[65] Dispute between faculty and trustees had grown so acrimonious that trustees published a pamphlet blaming the old faculty.[66] Among the trustees, several, including Lyon, blamed Duffield for the college's downfall.

Duffield had definitely been very involved with Dickinson. He certainly had an influence on the student body, particularly on those students who converted in 1823. Duffield encouraged later students to pursue the ministry frequently and probably to excess. He reportedly said to a student considering medicine as a career, "Do not allow your mind to be polluted and your heart to be debauched by the investigations of science."[67] Duffield's life and work was almost entirely devoted to the spreading of God's word, even if it was at the expense of the school as a secular institution of higher learning. The more intellectual Lyon, along with fellow community leader James Hamilton, who helped found Carlisle's public school system, valued education as an end itself, while Duffield saw it as a means merely to train ministers.

---

[65] Sellers, "The Duffield Years."
[66] Dickinson College Board of Trustees, *A Narrative of the Proceedings of the Board of Trustees of Dickinson College*, (George Fleming: Carlisle, 1830), 3.
[67] Sellers "The Duffield Years"

Also contributing to Duffield's mounting unpopularity were the causes he advocated. The most notable failure of Duffield's revivalism was his effort to promote temperance. The cause never commanded much popular support in the community, and efforts to reduce drinking had minimal effect on the number of taverns and inns in Carlisle, not to mention distilleries and breweries. Only one tavern definitely closed because of temperance pressure. A more significant change lay in distillery closings. Where there were eight distilleries recorded in the 1820 Tax List, the 1840 census indicated only three.[68] This decline was probably caused by the new railroad, which made it less expensive to transport unrefined grains, but this reduction in production might have come from temperance efforts. Andrew Blair, who had owned a still in 1820, no longer had any indication of owning one by 1847, so among Carlisle's Presbyterians, the call to temperance was not wholly ignored. There were other closings, but a history of Carlisle's taverns blames the railroad for most of them.[69] Nationally, however, temperance met with real success in reducing the consumption of hard liquor, and per capita consumption dropped dramatically.[70] Yet the extent of that success in Carlisle is unclear. While inns declined in numbers, groceries—which also often sold alcohol—expanded, so it is difficult to evaluate specific local trends in production, distribution or consumption.[71]

This temperance effort was but one of many that Duffield initiated. Following his successful revival in 1823, Carlisle's religious reformers began to publish *The Religious Miscellany*, which sought to provide the same depth of religious news that political papers

[68] Israel Daniel Rupp, *The History and Topography of Dauphin, Cumberland, Franklin, Bedford, Adams, and Perry Counties*, (G. Hills: Lancaster, Pa, 1846), 372. *Google Book Search*.
[69] Merri Lou Scribner Schaumann, *Taverns of Cumberland County, Pennsylvania*, 1750-1840, 23.
[70] Howe, 168.
[71] Cumberland County Tax List, 1820, Cumberland County Historical Society; Cumberland County Tax List, 1847, Cumberland County Historical Society. Distilling was largely for export, so local production reduction does not necessarily indicate collapsing local demand.

provided.[72] The paper frequently published fantastic accounts of missionary efforts in the far flung reaches of the world, and served as a kind of missionary propaganda. Despite the many tales of exotic peoples and the unstoppable power of Christ, *The Miscellany* ceased publication after just three volumes. There are no farewells in the optimistic last issue. An indication that religious enthusiasm was already collapsing appears in a notice to the Young Men's Missionary Society: "The Board of Managers…passed a Resolution for to [sic] have the funds of Society, transmitted to the parent Society."[73] The first of several over-extensions of religious enthusiasm had failed. It was clear in 1824 that there were real limits on what religious enthusiasm could accomplish. Several of the societies well documented by the *Miscellany* leave little evidence elsewhere, and the failure of the *Miscellany* itself indicated the limitations of revival-fueled religious enthusiasm.

Whatever mixed success his reform attempts had, the shepherd had expanded his flock immensely. Duffield had found the church with fewer than two hundred members, and expanded its membership to over seven hundred by the early 1830s. The church had been composed of elites of which these new members were not part. While still mostly landowners, they were minor ones, some with just small houses on quarter lots to their names.[74] Additionally, the once Scotch-Irish church expanded ethnically. Many converts came from Carlisle's German Reformed church, and even more with German surnames joined the Presbyterian Church. There were even a few members added who had 'colored'

---

[72]K, "Address to The Religious Miscellany," *The Religious Miscellany, Containing Information Relative to the Church of Christ; Together with Interesting Literary, Scientific and Political Intelligence*, January 17, 1823, 16. http://www.proquest.com/ (accessed April 19, 2009).
[73] "Advertisement 1 -- No Title." *The Religious Miscellany, Containing Information Relative to the Church of Christ; Together with Interesting Literary, Scientific and Political Intelligence* July 2, 1824, 384. http://www.proquest.com/ (accessed April 19, 2009).
[74] See previous chapter. Home appraisals of less than $100 indicated diminutive homes.

next to their names. [75] This new membership came to the church because of Duffield's emotional preaching and prayer meetings. The prayer meeting gave would-be converts the opportunity to pray before the whole congregation and invest themselves in the religious experience. Old church members, such as Lyon, disliked the change in Sunday evening services, and the emotional nature of the new services. When Duffield began these meetings, Lyon began to take notes on his preaching, as well as corresponding with prominent Old Light Presbyterian Ashbel Green on what to do about the New Light problems in their church.[76] Lyon, Andrew Blair and James Hamilton (a lawyer and son of a noted Carlisle jurist of the same name) began to take steps to oppose Duffield, beginning with a petition opposing Duffield's selection of a new Hymnal without their consent. This open opposition also included anonymous letters published in the *American Volunteer*, probably by an associate of Lyon, complaining of Duffield's preaching. These complaints led to a barrage of letters from the prickly Duffield asking Lyon if he was the author, to which Lyon replied that he was not, but that he agreed with the man. Lyon, Blair, and Hamilton were not the only leaders of the Presbyterian Church.[77] This network of leaders was itself divided on Duffield, but even a unified front could not have ousted Duffield without the consent of the congregation, which was composed mostly of Duffield's own converts.

Duffield provided his opponents with a far more expedient means of removal in his writings. He had been working on a book concerning exactly what it meant to be baptized, and the reasons for its necessity. The book, entitled *Spiritual Life, or, Regeneration,* was full of controversial statements on the subjects of man, God, and salvation, and provided ample

[75] First Presbyterian Register, 1756-1920, 5.2.2-3, First Presbyterian Collection, DCA.
[76] George Armstrong Lyon to Ashbel Green, "re: Presbyterian Church and doctrine," August 31 1831, Box 1, Folder 1, George Armstrong Lyon Collection.
[77] George Armstrong Lyon to George Duffield, "re: Pained people believe Lyon wrote piece by "H"," August 24 1831, Box 1, Folder 1, George Armstrong Lyon Collection.

opportunity for his more intellectual parishioners to attack him. Early in 1832, the book was published, but the Presbytery did not take action against Duffield until the fall of that year.[78] A review commenced of Duffield's book in 1832, but Duffield appealed to the Synod of Philadelphia against the proceedings. The Synod upheld the right of the Presbytery to place Duffield on trial, and later Duffield himself was put on trial for errors in April 1833.

Duffield had been absent from the church for much of the 1831 revival, because of his wife's illness.[79] When he returned, and began to publish his book, he met with great opposition. Following the lead of Ashbel Green, who had put another New Light preacher, Albert Barnes, on trial in Philadelphia for theological irregularities, local Presbyterians took steps to condemn Duffield's work. Local Presbyterian leaders organized a committee to review his work, and requested Duffield's presence at the hearing.[80] After twice summoning Duffield, they finally convinced him to attend the hearing. Once there, the pastor immediately appealed the proceedings and lodged a complaint with the synod. Duffield himself deigned to attend only to clear his good name, at least as relayed in the account by his supporters. The hearing lasted only a few days, during which Duffield complained extensively about the proceedings. Ten objections were made to the book, but Duffield's popularity made the hearing a spectacle, and Duffield's constant objections made

---

[78] *Remarks Upon The Report of the Committee Appointed by the Carlisle Presbytery to Review the Work Entitled Duffield on Regeneration Together with Some Additional Extracts from The Minutes*, (William F. Geddes: Philadelphia, 1832), Google Book Search (within result for *History of the Proceedings…Duffield on Regeneration)*, 5. George A. Lyon considered publishing his own account of the events, and encouraged the printing of the minutes of the hearing, in large part to oppose this account and another which took the form of letters. Lyon's account of events keeps the same chronology, but downplays the significance of the dispute, making it seem as though the two churches split over personality clash. His account was prepared to make the formation of 2nd Presbyterian appear less schismatic, as the church was formed a month after the trial, and was schismatic. Duffield's defenders certainly have their own bias, and while the documents they produce are suspect, they will be held as roughly reliable for lack of any alternative (Lyon produces minimal evidence in his account, aside from of his own organizing against the minister).

[79] George Duffield, untitled Diaries, 31 October 1828-15 February 1836, Dickinson College Library.

[80] *Remarks…* 7-8. The first committee's meeting will be called "the hearing," as no judgment was passed by it, the second, which convened after the formation of Second Presbyterian and which did condemn Duffield, will be termed "the trial."

proceedings halt. The first hearing concluded with Duffield's appeal to the Synod to stop the proceedings.[81] This hearing, more than the trial for heresy several months later, would divide local Presbyterians and signal the decline of revivalism in Carlisle.

What is termed the hearing convened ostensibly to correct the errors of Duffield's book, but the minister realized its intention, as demonstrated by his reticence to attend and frequent complaints. *Regeneration* was an understandably controversial work and Duffield was well aware of this. In the book he decried many of the old Calvinists who helped found the Presbyterian Church. Duffield defended himself by claiming that he never knowingly violated the catechism of the Presbyterian Church. This was perhaps fair, since in his references to the *Shorter Catechism* and *Larger Catechism*, he offered nothing but deference. However, the manner in which he addressed the catechism's ambiguities certainly undermined a Calvinist interpretation of the document. *Regeneration* constantly questioned the adequacy of Calvinist clarifications for the catechism, and older, more Calvinistic, confessions of faith. In one note, he remarked, "The reader will notice the sentiments of Calvin and others, quoted on this subject; nor can he failed to perceive how very vaguely, and confusedly, and contradictorily Calvinistic confessions of faith, and Calvinistic writers spoke, on the subject of original sin, when they incidentally undertook to define or to describe it."[82] While this was not a direct attack on the contemporary confession of faith it certainly was a criticism of the Presbyterian Church's origins, which had been Calvinistic. Old Light Presbyterians in particular were sympathetic to Calvinism and saw an attack on Calvin, and Scotch Calvinists, as an attack on Presbyterianism. The New Light viewed Presbyterianism as having moved beyond Calvinism and the vestiges of predestination that

[81] *Remarks…*37-38.
[82] George Duffield, *Spiritual Life, Or, Regeneration*, (George Fleming: Carlisle, 1832), Google Book Search, 276.

Old Light teaching on fallen man implied.[83] This was made especially clear by the committee's attitude towards George Duffield's teaching on physical depravity. The committee interpreted Duffield's assertion that man was not inherently sinful as a rejection of original sin, though inherent sinfulness in man was in direct opposition to the confession of faith according to one writer on the trial.[84] Central beliefs about the nature of man were called into question by the trial and hearings, and the limitations of a very general Confession were made clear.

Perhaps even more than for its theological deviance, *Regeneration* was controversial for its encouragement of emotional revivalism. While most of the work was devoted to the exploration of theological and philosophical issues, the last two chapters argued that the best preaching did not seek to instill theological correctness so much as to inspire conversion. Duffield asserted that the bare truth of scripture was necessary for salvation, but suggested that emotional excitement was also essential to conversion. On the other hand, Duffield stated that religion should not be too emotional, or the conversion would be temporary.[85] However, the middle path between reason and emotion given by Duffield erred on the side of emotion. He argued, "The man who tells a sinner of his guilt and danger, and evinces no concern…who extols His grace and glory, and does not burn with holy zeal, may indeed be accounted a learned divine, and a profound scholar, and a great preacher, but will never sway

[83] *History of the Proceedings of the Carlisle Presbytery in Relation to a Work Entitled Duffield on Regeneration: In a Series of Letters from a Person Present to His Friend*. (William F. Geddes: Philadelphia, 1832), Google Book Search, 23. A New Lighter refers to the Old Light here as "out Calvining Calvin."
[84] *History of the Proceedings of the Carlisle Presbytery in Relation to a Work Entitled Duffield on Regeneration: In a Series of Letters from a Person Present to His Friend*. (William F. Geddes: Philadelphia, 1832), Google Book Search, 17. This, *Remarks...*, and *Principles of Presbyterian Discipline* are all apparently collected in a bound volume at the University of Michigan, and lumped together by Google Book Search.
[85] Duffield, 571.

the hearts of his hearers."[86] This was exactly the sort of emotionalism that brought so many into his church.

Those who rejected this kind of emotional piety formed the Second Presbyterian. Following the unsuccessful initial hearing in September of 1832, Blair and Lyon, along with other prominent members of First Presbyterian, organized a new church by November of that year.[87] They did so with some irregularity and without the consent of their pastor as Duffield asserted was a requirement, though given that he was what drove them to form the new church this is unsurprising.[88] This action led to a reaction by Duffield, who contested the departure from his church, their funding, and any other objections he could raise. Each side publically and privately engaged in a war of words, both in the public eye and within church government. That this dispute was resolved with so much debate, with such a large audience, demonstrates some of the impact of the communications revolution. It was more than just a talking point as Blair and Lyon did rob First Presbyterian in a sense, because they and the families that left with them to form Second Presbyterian had given around half of the donations to the church by Lyon's accounting.[89] Those who formed Second Presbyterian were not only more generous but in fact wealthier than the members of First Presbyterian after the split.

Second Presbyterian, while substantially wealthier than First Presbyterian, was also much smaller. The membership consisted of seventy men and women, and witnesses against Duffield led the list. This new church temporarily worshipped in the German Reformed

[86] Duffield, 572.
[87] *Remarks*… 34.
[88] Members of Mr. Duffield's Congregation, *The Principles of Presbyterian Discipline*, (George Fleming: Carlisle, 1835), Google Book Search, 20.
[89] Swaim, 83.

Church, which provided them with a space for their services.[90] Within a few years, the new church had raised enough funds for its own building, and the trustees built a new church in 1835. The average member of the new church was 50 percent wealthier than the average member of First Presbyterian, who was roughly in line with the average taxed valuation of the town as a whole. In their selection of minister, the church indicated its preference for the Old Light: John Williamson. Williamson perhaps still held a grudge against Duffield for his selection. Williamson betrayed his strong Old Light affiliation in the accusations he raised against Duffield, which were very Calvinistic themselves.

Table 3.1: Composition of the First and Second Presbyterian churches by wealth, 1833

Church	***Median Valuation***	***N***
First Presbyterian	$1001	55
Second Presbyterian	$1504	25
Town	$1,030	458

Source: Cumberland County Tax List, 1820, Cumberland County Historical Society; Second Presbyterian Membership Rolls, 1833-1848, 5.1.1, Second Presbyterian Collection, DCA; First Presbyterian Register, 1756-1920, 5.2.2-3, First Presbyterian Collection, DCA.
Notes: Using the 1847 tax lists shows an even more dramatic divide between the two congregations economically, but the sample is smaller, so it is omitted.

There are limitations to an entirely economic explanation of this dispute, however. Although all of Duffield's notable opponents were wealthy, it seems simplistic to reduce their break with him to economic variables. The wealthy self-made man Andrew Blair and the heir George Armstrong Lyon both found something fundamentally objectionable about George Duffield's religious leadership and theological principles. From the objections these men made to his theology, it is clear that his opponents favored a stricter Calvinism than

[90] George Armstrong Lyon, "Origin of the Second Church," undated, Box 2, Folder 2, George Armstrong Lyon Collection.

Duffield. They sincerely differed with him in a contest of ideas and beliefs. What is significant about this religious difference of opinion is that Calvin's followers emphasized the frailty of man, while New Lighters believed strongly in man's ability to choose salvation. This distinction meant that for New Light Presbyterians the only necessary religious action was constant exertion to persuade people to abstain from sin and to choose God. The Old Light did not see persuasion as so essential to the religious experience. Removing poorly disciplined members of the church was acceptable with this group, as was equipping people to read and interpret the Bible for themselves. The popularity of Duffield's strict discipline and Lyon's conversion under that disciplinary regime evidence this. When Duffield arrived, he enforced the expulsion of members from the church for missing services on Sundays, drunkenness, and other poor behavior. These rules attracted men like Lyon and Blair, who joined after Duffield put these rules into force.[91] In a more Calvinistic view, these measures expelled those not predestined for salvation from the church. Duffield, perhaps, thought of these as a means to encourage good behavior persuasively, rather than as a way to create an elite church only composed of the saved. Actions like this appealed to a wide religious base, and account for much of his initial popularity.

Following the formation of Second Presbyterian, the Presbytery formally put Duffield on trial for heresy in April 1833. Even this proceeding was mostly unsuccessful. The first few days of Duffield's final trial were spent arguing over whether or not the Presbytery could try him, given biases against him, whether or not there existed "common fame" sufficient to accuse him, and attempts to make Duffield plead guilty. The peculiar issue of common fame illustrates much about the nature of the trial. Despite the fact that several within the Presbytery were very clearly accusing Duffield, no identifiable person accused him, because

[91] First Presbyterian Register, 1756-1920, 5.2.2-3, First Presbyterian Collection, DCA.

he "common fame" of his heresy accused him. Such a claim would not have been admissible in the Common law trials the Presbytery's preceding imitated. This strange circumlocution avoided the appearance of anyone actually accusing Duffield of anything, and prevented the religious views and ideas of his accuser from being called into question. This made the trial into a fundamentally unbalanced affair before which Duffield could never receive a fair understanding. One contemporary account of over a hundred pages of the trial gave almost four-fifths of its space to Duffield's many appeals, complaints, and demands, interrupted occasionally by the Moderator of the committee asking Duffield to simply plead guilty.[92]

The many pamphlets were a sign of the new communicative and increasingly disputatious times. A public clearly existed that was educated enough to follow complex theological arguments, and numerous enough to pack into the audience for his trial. When Duffield eventually stopped fighting the committee, it found him guilty, with minimal presentation of evidence. Much of this evidence Duffield ably refuted. Duffield's chief accuser, John Williamson, had been his rival for selection as Carlisle's new pastor, and he had clear Old Light sympathies. Williamson's claim that *Regeneration* rejected the fall of man does not tolerate scrutiny. The specific quotations attributed to his work do not correspond with the extant printing of *Regeneration*.[93] Admittedly, they correctly ascribed deviance from old school Calvinism in the text, but this was not exactly heretical. The Confession of Faith and Catechisms used by the Presbyterian Church at the time were flexible enough in their wording to accommodate the slightly varying interpretations of

[92] Members of Mr. Duffield's Congregation, 14-73.
[93] The phrase attributed to Duffield is absent from the text and the section on the fall of man makes clear that there was a fall, as are all other heretical statements cited in the trial. His accusers were probably basing their claims on advance excerpts from his manuscript that he had been passing around, though it is possible the earliest printing of *Regeneration* contained these controversial statements and they were edited out in a reprinting. This seems unlikely, though, since the copy of *Regeneration* in question is dated 1832, which would have meant multiple printings within a year.

Duffield and his accusers, but the churches they shared were not. Those who went on to form Second Presbyterian were attempting to purge Duffield and other revivalists from their church, and to make the church more exclusively denominational than the cooperative revivalists could allow.

This disruption in church and college affected the wider community as well. The 1833 trial was a public spectacle, and received a great deal of attention, but more significantly, it disrupted local organizational efforts. The Sunday schools which had worked so well declined, leaving minimal lasting documentation.[94] The many societies Duffield and the revivalists helped form did not last long after the division. With the Presbyterians split, the prime organizers of many local efforts found themselves at odds and embittered. Yet this frustrating development also encouraged some, such as Andrew Blair, to pursue new social efforts outside the scope of religion for the betterment of the community. These efforts, such as the drive to establish public schools, expanded on the earliest successes of Carlisle's reform movements, but turned the reform energy toward more secular goals.

This collapse of religious initiatives was rooted in Duffield's departure. The trial and the division in the church compelled Duffield to leave Carlisle. After the prolonged trial following which much of his church deserted him, Duffield had had enough. Duffield spent months visiting friends and ideological allies elsewhere before relocating to Philadelphia. Exhausted by the local trials, Duffield continued to dispute them in meetings of the Synod in Philadelphia. In 1837, Duffield and other New Light Presbyterians proposed alterations to the catechism. The reaction to these proposals was overwhelmingly negative, and the reaction

[94] Which is to say, no meeting minutes or board listings.

divided the national Presbyterian Church.[95] Churches, Synods, and Presbyteries had withdrawn from the national organization before, but this division was extensive, and led to rival Presbyterian establishments in many communities. One such community was Carlisle. The two churches which had split over revivalism divided again, with each joining a different national Presbyterian order. First Presbyterian joined the New Lights, and Second Presbyterian joined the Olds. What had started as a local dispute had become national, and this national division divided the town further.

Unlike what historian Paul Johnson has observed in Rochester, the Old Light was wealthy in Carlisle, and the New was more working class in its origin. In Carlisle, this had much to do with the methods of Duffield's revivals and religious efforts. For much of the time he preached in Carlisle, Duffield did not lead separate prayer meetings, or conduct any particularly extraordinary measures. He was a popular preacher, who appealed to the emotions of his audience, and a minister who brought immense energy and effort to improving his church and community. The *American Volunteer* even criticized him as such, deriding the lack of intellectual depth in his sermons.[96] While he was a friend of noted New Light theologian Nathaniel Taylor, and identified strongly with much Congregationalist theology, Duffield was no Charles Finney.[97] Though he served as a minister in the New York church Finney helped establish, he was so incensed at Finney's perfectionism that he later successfully prevented Finney from conducting a revival in Detroit, where Duffield held his longest ministerial position after Carlisle. Duffield did lead his church members in revival-style prayer meetings, but other preachers initiated both of the largest revivals in his

[95] Zebulon Crocker, *The Catastrophe of the Presbyterian Church*, (B & W Noy: New Haven, 1838), Google Book Search, 85.
[96] "The Popular Preacher," *American Volunteer*, (Carlisle, Pa: March 4, 1818), 2.
[97] George Duffield, untitled diary. George Duffield visited Nathaniel Taylor following his trials and before he officially gained a new ministerial position in Philadelphia.

congregation, those occurring in 1823 and 1831. Unlike Finney in Rochester, Duffield was a lasting presence who slowly organized and influenced others over the decade and a half he lived in Carlisle. Duffield's slow and persistent influence attracted many of no religious background into his church, and his Sunday schools prepared a generation to be active church members. Carlisle, while a dynamic place, had not undergone the same kind of radical shifts observable in places such as Rochester.

Yet the trial and other divisions demonstrate a major insight that can be derived from a study of Carlisle's revivals. A force of personality was essential in keeping the many religious societies and organizations running and striving, and without that personality, George Duffield, the revivals soon faded, and reform efforts faltered. His emotional revivalism was successful at bringing new bodies into his church; however, this also came at a cost. Prayer meetings, unpopular reforms, and the personality that facilitated his revivals also divided his church and community. This division limited the successes of his reforms, and ultimately brought an end to Carlisle's high period of Presbyterian revivalism. But it is impossible to study Carlisle, Duffield and the Awakening without acknowledging the significant role that individual choice and leadership decision-making still played in these moments of sweeping social and economic change.

Chapter 4: Revival in Retreat

The 1830s and 1840s marked a period of dramatic change both in the nation and Carlisle. The town was the site of a major revival and then a dramatic showdown that led to the expulsion of its chief revivalist. What followed was a quieter retreat toward a less disruptive religious climate. The church membership rolls of First Presbyterian slowly returned to a pre-revival state, and interdenominational reform efforts began to falter.[98] However, this decline in Presbyterian religious efforts was but one of many shifts taking place in Carlisle. In 1835, following state laws requiring it, Carlisle introduced a public school system.[99] This provided all of Carlisle's children with the opportunity to be formally educated for the first time. It was a logical extension of the Sunday schooling program, providing a fuller education for even more of the town's youth. Leaders in the Second Presbyterian Church organized schooling. A common or public school system did much for the community, but in most local histories, it was overshadowed by the railroad that opened in 1837.[100] The railroad strengthened the market, and had an impact on the economic structure of the town. As religious energies dissipated, these new efforts transformed the community.

The most notable transformative effort was the railroad, which brought Carlisle's transportation into the nineteenth century. The town had been a major marketplace for years, but the railroad contributed to the growth of the town and the reshaping of its market. Agricultural processing declined as a key industry in Carlisle. The tanners and butchers who once made up so much of Carlisle's workforce and wealth had a relative decline in

---

[98] First Presbyterian Register, 1756-1920, 5.2.2-3, First Presbyterian Collection, DCA. Since departures are not named no table can be presented of what kind of people left the church. All that is reported is a loss of N members at different dates.
[99] Edward W. Biddle, "Carlisle," *History of Cumberland County*, ed. Conway P. Wing, 1879, 233, DCA.
[100] Flower 39-40.

prominence, but each profession made small real increases in number. Other important shifts occurred as well because of the new mode of transportation. The number of innkeepers declined, as did the number of inns. The borough was a midpoint between Chambersburg and Harrisburg, and the rapid transportation afforded by rail reduced the need for stays in Carlisle itself.[101] The merchants who were once the most numerous of any occupation also appear reduced in situation. This is mostly due to more men self-identifying as gentleman, as well as increasing distinction between the many kinds of merchants.[102] Outside of these subtle shifts, however, Carlisle's economy was largely unchanged since 1820 (see Table 2.1). Construction jobs were still the most common by the end of the 1840s, with custom manufacturing (blacksmiths, tailors, shoemakers, etc.) remaining well-represented. The borough's population nearly doubled with a more diverse number of trades and occupations than before (120 in 1847, versus 80 in 1820), but this did not appear to represent dramatic changes in industrial structure. Only one occupation experienced real decline because of the railroad, innkeeping. Innkeepers saw substantially reduced demand because travelers did not need to stop to rest every twenty miles. A job that provided a similar income (based on the rate at which it was taxed) was work as a railroad conductor, and for every innkeeping job lost, there were new conductors. One low skill service job replaced another.

Table 4.1: Carlisle's Top 12 Occupations, 1847

Occupation	Mean Valuation	% of Heads of Household with Listed Occupation, 1847[103]	% of Heads of Household with Listed Occupation, 1820

[101] Merri Lou Scribner Schaumann, *Taverns of Cumberland County, Pennsylvania*, 1750-1840, 17.
[102] The 1847 Tax list describes four different kinds of merchants and two kinds of dealers, while the 1820 tax list only lists 'merchant.'
[103] 22% of those listed in the 1847 tax list had no listed occupation. Many of these people were women, several were black. Even a woman with a known occupation, Sarah Bell—who taught at Carlisle's public school for

Laborer	$179.03	12.7%	--
Carpenter	$366.35	5.4%	6.9%
Gentleman	$3373.05	4.8%	--
Shoemaker	$276.34	4.6%	5.3%
Merchant	$1303.48	2.8%	7.3%
Tailor	$343.64	2.5%	3.4%
Farmer	$4666.73	2.5%	0%
Attorney	$3272.30	2.3%	6.5%
Mason	$296.39	2.0%	3.1%
Blacksmith	$623.33	2.0%	3.4%
Preacher[104]	$1565.44	1.8%	0.7%
Plasterer	$413.77	1.5%	0%

Source: Cumberland County Tax List, 1847, Cumberland County Historical Society.
Notes: Laborers and gentlemen did not report their occupation in the 1820 tax list, leading to the massive apparent shift in occupation-free Carlisle residents. This also led all reported occupations to appear to represent a smaller share of the population. Additionally, employed women were not taxed, and did not have occupations listed.

The railroad did not introduce Carlisle to a new national market, but it did have a real effect on the community. In 1841, the borough officers repealed all old laws and wrote new ordinances. While none[105] of these ordinances specifically addressed the railroad itself, the vast majority dealt with market regulation. While in 1820 the borough boasted over a hundred head of cattle, under nuisance ordinances the borough reserved the right to seize

blacks—had none listed. Given her meager salary ($12.50 per month, lower than any other teacher, and this also paid the rent on the school room and for firewood), that is perhaps fair.
[104] Called "Reverend" in 1820. The change probably reflects a change in status of ministers following the revivals or the expansion of Methodism.
[105] The word railroad is not even in the book.

loose chickens and pigs.[106] Transportation improvements would naturally lead to new regulation when interpreted as part of a communications revolution. A faster paced and busier market would need reorganization to accommodate the change, and that is what the community did.

There was, however, a dramatic change in employment that still needs reckoning. One occupation that was truly new to Carlisle's top twelve did mark a significant change in the community. "Preacher," a new occupation since 1820, now accounted for almost two percent of Carlisle's heads of household. This title, less honorific than minister, marked the expansion of a new sort of Christianity in the community, Methodism. Long a part of Carlisle's denominational diversity, the Methodist movement was the fastest growing in the nation. These Methodists, though they led revivals and contributed to a religious spirit in many ways, did not seek to create a national network for social reform. Methodists sought to expand their national church, and the rise of Methodism in Carlisle brought an end to interdenominational (though Presbyterian dominated) social reform. The Methodists did not try to create a better Carlisle so much as a more Methodist one. As Presbyterians divided and their evangelical efforts diffused, the Methodists grew, but without the same kind of community impact.

While Carlisle's Presbyterians had divided and declined, the Methodist Episcopal Church had risen to prominence. The Baltimore and Philadelphia conferences of the Methodist Church had collaborated to reopen Dickinson College, in addition to opening other colleges throughout the nation. This reopening did not significantly change the character of the school. The course of study, despite the lack of continuity with faculty and trustees, followed the model the Presbyterians had used. The Methodists did not attempt to transform

[106] 1820 Cumberland County Tax List; *Charter*, 40.

the school or the town in the same way Duffield had. The denomination had developed from Methodism, an English religious movement that began in the eighteenth century which had spread rapidly across the English-speaking world. Methodism emphasized personal religious discipline, and the movement utilized emotional preaching and a large network of travelling preachers to spread its word. American religious historian Mark Noll observes that when mass conversion occurred during the Second Great Awakening, it was predominantly a Methodist phenomenon.[107] While Presbyterians may have played a key role in organized reform efforts during the Awakening, it was Methodists who were the most successful at converting. In Carlisle, this model holds true. The Presbyterians were essential to the evangelical-backed reforms within the borough, but their revivalism was ultimately divisive. Methodists gained a large number of converts in their church, and took over management and funding for a previously Presbyterian institution, but were less active in promoting a social agenda. In 1840, the Methodists gained over a hundred converts in a revival.[108] Even after the division in their church, Presbyterians were still an influential force in the town, and they promoted and organized the most lasting institutional change in the borough of Carlisle the era presented.

Public schooling was a major realignment of the state's role in community life. Education in Pennsylvania had been the sole financial responsibility of parents, and the introduction of public schools marked a new community responsibility. Andrew Blair—an elder in Second Presbyterian—directed a new effort that would have real impact on the community, the formation of public schooling. This system was not established to provide a novel service to the community. Several teachers had worked in Carlisle before there were

[107] Mark Noll, *America's God*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2002, 200-01.
[108] "An extensive revival of religion," *Norwich Aurora* (Norwich, CT: May 6, 1840), Nineteenth Century Newspaper Collection, online.

public schools, as well as a growing number of private schools.[109] What was innovative about public schooling was that, for the first time, the community took responsibility for the children of others. Each landholder in the borough now subsidized the education of the entire town's youth. State law provided for the building of public schools, but they local politicians did not establish them. Andrew Blair, a successful tanner and owner of a distillery, and fellow Old School Presbyterian James Hamilton, have been credited as initiators of the schools in every local history on the subject.[110] Yet ironically, public schooling was in some ways an Old Light extension of the New Light agenda. If the black or colored school followed the same model as the others, public schooling was highly evangelical in its efforts to spread literacy. According to an observer of the black school in 1838, "The Bible is itself a textbook here, and the knowledge which the children have of the Scripture is surprising… After her pupils had sung a hymn, she requested everyone to repeat a text of scripture; they all obeyed from the greatest to the least. Their examination on the subjects of grammar, geography, etc., evinced their own diligent application, as well as their teacher's ability and faithfulness."[111] This schooling system brought religious education to an even larger portion of Carlisle's population. Instilling an intellectual commitment to God from an early age was an effective way to preserve religious values while avoiding the complications of religious organization.

This planned school system only included Carlisle's blacks because of the action of a few women, whose black school was integrated into the school system as a separate and unequal institution. Eight ladies of Carlisle, mostly unmarried women of leading families,

---

[109] Sellers, "The Duffield Years." One of these schools was established by Henry Duffield, one of George Duffield's sons, who remained in Carlisle after the elder Duffield left.
[110] Biddle, 232.
[111] Origen, "For the Colored American To the Church and Congregation at T.," *The Colored American*, (October 20, 1838), *African American Newspapers Collection*, Accessible Archives.

met and decided to provide a school for Carlisle's black population. This school was independent until 1835 when it became a segregated school in the public school system. At the other schools, the lowest paid teacher received a $12 monthly salary, the $12.50 paid for the colored school provided for fuel, rent, and the teacher's salary.[112] Sarah Bell, a single white woman, would remain teacher at that school for decades. An account of this school illustrates how this school was both an extension of the Sunday schooling program and something else entirely. A correspondent to *The Colored American* wrote in October, 1838, "There is a Juvenile Anti-Slavery Society in the school which subscribes for the Colored American. The teacher informed us that when the Colored American arrives, every child that can read is anxious to know what news the Colored American has brought. This is truly a happy case..."[113] Carlisle's colored school helped organize the black community, but also instilled evangelical values.

The men preached in the churches and divided the Presbyterians, but women worked together from the split congregations in this extension of the evangelical front.[114] The women who formed these schools were of varied church membership, but there was a strong indication that the reform enthusiasm of the New Light persisted in Carlisle's women. Almost half of the recorded members of the informal committee were members of First Presbyterian, one woman from Second and four who were not affiliated with either met.[115] This unity suggests that the divide between men over churches did not extend to women in

---

[112] Miriam Woods Blair, *Andrew Blair, a Progressive Thinker, 1789-1861,* (Hamilton Library Association: Carlisle, 1951), 6.
[113] Origen, ibid.
[114] Even borough government became Second Presbyterian dominated by 1840, while it had before included men who would join both churches. Blair and Hamilton, and not one member of First Presbyterian, are credited with public schools, etc.
[115] Edward W. Biddle, "Carlisle," *History of Cumberland County*, ed. Conway P. Wing, 1879, 233, DCA; Second Presbyterian Membership Rolls, 1833-1848, 5.1.1, Second Presbyterian Collection, DCA; First Presbyterian Register, 1756-1920, 5.2.2-3, First Presbyterian Collection, DCA.

the same way. Men and women also organized their efforts very differently. Women's societies met in parlors, took few official minutes, and elected no leadership. Men's organizations met in public houses, had highly ordered meetings, and often published reports and minutes. Women's social efforts were entirely concerned with the less fortunate: from the first Bible Society to the school to a ladies' aid society, Carlisle's women strove to help their poorer neighbors.[116] Men's societies often had grander ambitions, and met with far more mixed results. An Anti-Slavery Society did not last a year in Carlisle, while male-led temperance efforts met with limited success.[117] Women were empowered to reshape their communities, and while they were limited in the scope of their activities by gender roles of the time, the communications revolution extended to even this non-voting group.

The years after Duffield's departure were marked by several other major changes. Presbyterian religious societies and efforts declined into obscurity. Local Presbyterians, who had once dominated all aspects of Carlisle's life, held only a handful of seats on the 1840 Borough Officers list.[118] This decline was part of a larger decrease in religious enthusiasm. Even the Methodist revival in 1840 did not reverse this trend. The college they had recently reopened grew more secular rapidly.[119] Presbyterians who wished to further their agenda did so through the public schools, which combined with female benevolence to provide a tax funded public education to over eight hundred students, of all colors, by 1840.[120] The railroad had encouraged the town even more in its market development, but also stunted the town's growth. Between 1840 and 1850, the population of Carlisle increased at one-quarter of its

[116] Biddle, 233.
[117] Martha C. Slotten, "The McClintock Slave Riot of 1847," *Cumberland County History*, Vol 17, Number 1, 28.
[118] *Charter and Ordinances of the Borough of Carlisle*, (Carlisle: The Herald Office, 1841), 24.
[119] Sellers, "The Methodist Dawn."
[120] *Charter and Ordinances of the Borough of Carlisle*, 17.

prior rate. The railroad decreased the need for local production, and the rise of Harrisburg, which had become the state capital years earlier, provided an alternative regional hub with access to water power and even more diversified industry. New technology and organization decreased Carlisle's prominence, but improved many aspects of life. Religiously, the town reverted in many ways to a pre-revival state, but public schools teaching from the Bible kept the evangelical spirit alive in the community's youth. Revivalism and communicative changes were disruptive and transformative, and moved town and nation in new directions.

Chapter 5: Conclusion

In 1848, one of Carlisle's oldest faith communities stood as a house divided. The Lutherans of Carlisle had split in 1833 due to a growing gulf in its membership: language. The historically German church grew increasingly integrated in the English speaking town. The Lutherans split into two churches: one which had services in English, and the other in the traditional German. [121] Many of the ethnic Germans in Carlisle were no longer German speakers, or at least preferred their religious services in English. The rise of English as a dominant and necessary language was a major communicative change in the borough. [122] The linguistic division had been a long time coming. Duffield's preaching had drawn many from outside Presbyterianism's usual strength among the Scots-Irish, and many Germans had joined his church from the Reformed and Lutheran churches.[123] Unlike what occurred with the Presbyterian Church, the division over language was not part of a wider, schism, though; the Lutheran Church was a flexible enough organization to accommodate services in multiple languages. Presbyterian division had been more acrimonious, and with that split came the end of much evangelical benevolence and the decline of efforts to transform the community.

There were clearly many changes in Carlisle during the early nineteenth century, but Duffield's heresy trial best demonstrates the varied consequences of the communications revolution that Howe describes in his study. A focus on Carlisle, however, provides an even greater emphasis on the divisive results of the struggle for personal empowerment than *What Hath God Wrought* so powerfully describes. After failing to remove Duffield from the

[121] Edward W. Biddle, "Carlisle," *History of* Cumberland County, *Pennsylvania*, ed. Conway P. Wing, Philadelphia: J.D. Scott, 1879: 233.
[122] The history of Germans in Carlisle and similar places deserves more study, but German publications are not as well preserved (Carlisle's printers printed at least one, *The Magazine of the German Reformed Church*), not to mention this student can't read German.
[123] First Presbyterian Register, 1756-1920, 5.2.2-3, First Presbyterian Collection, DCA. Many of those who joined Duffield's church came from other local churches, but almost exclusively from nearby Silver Spring Presbyterian Church and Carlisle's German Reformed Church.

Presbyterian Church, the minister's accusers founded a second Presbyterian church in Carlisle. This division would later become national, but this national rupture within the Presbyterian Church receives minimal attention in the grand narratives of the period. The Presbyterian Church split into two groups during the 1830s: the Old School, which was less amenable to emotional revivalism and which favored an emphasis on the role of God in salvation, and the New School, which favored revivals and continued joint action with the Congregational Church. The Old School/New School split in the Presbyterian Church, barely receives a mention in Howe's text. He writes, "The Presbyterians, who had split along Old School/New School theological lines in 1837, split again on sectional lines before the Civil War."[124] The Methodist split is better documented, probably because it involved views on slavery, and contemporaries considered it as a sign of the union's imminent collapse. Yet given the great attention devoted by most authors to explaining the rise of American churches, and the Presbyterian/Congregational leadership in this rise, it is striking that there is so little attention to the Presbyterian split. The Presbyterians had several high profile heresy trials following Finney's great revival in Rochester, including not only the one involving Duffield in Carlisle, but also one concerning noted New England minister Lyman Beecher, which probably encouraged Finney's own move to Congregationalism.[125] This division contributed to the collapse of the united evangelical efforts, and the slow decline of the Awakening. However, though the division ended interdenominational coordination, there was extensive participation in certain societies by members of either faction. This is but one of the complexities to the story that Carlisle illustrates.

[124] Howe, 479.
[125] Howe, 458.

Another deviation from the national narrative lies in the composition of the Awakening. George Duffield's prayer meetings appealed to different people than those of Charles Finney in Rochester. When Carlisle's Presbyterians divided over emotional revivalism, the split was not along the same lines as has been observed elsewhere. Those attracted to revivalist piety were not as wealthy as those who objected to it, with a taxable valuation that was two-thirds that of the typical member of the second church.[126] Other studies, such as Johnson's well known examination of Rochester, posit that emotional revivalism appealed largely to the rising middle class, but in Carlisle the opposite appears to have occurred.[127] Why did Carlisle's revivalists infuriate the established wealthy of the town? Carlisle was unlike Rochester. It was an older town, established in 1751, while Rochester was established in 1812.[128] The town was of particular import in the Revolutionary era, when a local minister, the first George Duffield, served as the first chaplain of the Continental Congress, and Benjamin Rush helped establish a new college there. Located twenty miles from the nearest navigable body of water, Carlisle was as far inland as a viable settlement could be. Rochester was a sparsely populated village until the Erie Canal brought an immense amount of trade. The governance of Rochester was barely put in order by the time the canal dramatically disrupted the local dynamic. By contrast, Carlisle was a comparatively stable place, when the revival began. Both towns were swept by revival, though with varying effects.

Carlisle's history underscores how one critical consequence of revivalism was division. The denominational split which came out of intra-Presbyterian feuding illuminates the limits, shortcomings, and failings of the Awakening, something that appears, in Carlisle

[126] See Table 3.1 in Chapter 3 for more on this.
[127] Johnson, 138.
[128] Johnson, 17.

at least, to have nothing to do with the marketplace. Howe notes that revivalism was both divisive and unifying, which only furthers his point about the empowering effect of communication: it led to much debate. What he does not emphasize, however, is that this debate undermined much of the "transformation" that took places such as Carlisle. One small example for this phenomenon comes from the story of a local debating society which formed in 1828 but closed after a few years because of the intensity of the debating itself.[129] In the case of Duffield and the Presbyterians, communicative improvement had more mixed consequences. Duffield's revivals brought many into churches and the Sunday schooling he started brought Christianizing literacy to the town's children. Yet, after fifteen years of preaching and organizing in Carlisle, members of Duffield's church resorted to desperate measures to stop his increasingly controversial efforts. The hearing and trial that followed were a referendum on this communicative revolution. Duffield's supporters flooded the community with pamphlets, while the trial organizers declined to print even their accusations.[130] Divided after the trial, local reformers faced a growing lack of enthusiasm and saw their efforts decline.

These divisions in Carlisle were not simply a product of a communications revolution, however. Individual actions directed local events, not an impersonal force. The division stemming from Duffield's trial did not affect women as it did men. The women who funded the colored school overlooked the division in the Presbyterian Church, unlike their husbands. These women's efforts addressed human needs they perceived in their community, and they were far from radical. In this fashion, Carlisle's women were also distinct. In 1848, they were not gathering as some of their sisters in Seneca Falls, to prepare a list of demands.

[129] Milton Embick Flower and Lenore Embick Flower, *This is Carlisle*, (Harrisburg, Pa: J. Horace McFarland Company, 1944), 39-40.
[130] *Remarks*, 9.

They were reformers, not revolutionaries. In larger syntheses as well as local studies, it is easy to overlook the role of these busy, reforming women, since they did not leave the kind of evidence that male reformers and female radicals did, but for these particular women, as well as other minority groups, the consequences of the communications revolution were clearly important. Howe highlights this development in his conclusion, and Carlisle's women surely illustrate his point.[131]

John LeFevre presents a different challenge. LeFevre, a Newville area farmer who frequently came to Carlisle to sell firewood or attend court, was born again in the 1840s; his conversion stands apart from the town's story, however. He had worked as a farmer, teacher, and justice of the peace before one day stating in his diary that he baptized three people. Soon after, he became a bishop in a minor denomination. LeFevre made his sudden change apart from both local and national trends. A willing market participant but devoid of anxiety on the subject, and a literate man who owned a Bible only relatively late in life, LeFevre is a difficult individual to comprehend within the framework of any broad interpretation.[132] Individuals like LeFevre were affected by the communications revolution, but in idiosyncratic ways.

If there was one event which signals the effects of the communications revolution in Carlisle between 1815 and 1848 and yet which also marks a turning point toward Civil War, it might well be the McClintock Riot of 1847. In June 1847, slave catchers brought a couple of slaves they had abducted in Cumberland County to Carlisle's jail. The local black population immediately took actions to free them, and with each attempt, more and more of Carlisle's black populace angrily crowded around the courthouse. A judge ordered the slaves

[131] Howe, 838.
[132] Lefevre, *Lefevre Diary Transcription*, CCHS: 1-113. Lefevre's diary is decidedly minimalist, and is mostly consumed with weather reports and short trips until his conversion.

remanded to their owner in Maryland. A professor at the college and leading Methodist intellectual, John McClintock, heard about the judge's action and returned home to obtain his copy of the state's new personal liberty law, which he had read in his newspaper. Such laws were intended to prevent enforcement of the federal Fugitive Slave Act—which compelled all able-bodied people to assist in recovering slaves, even in states where slave ownership was unlawful—by making it illegal to abduct anyone in Pennsylvania, regardless of whether or not said person was elsewhere enslaved. McClintock's intervention heightened white anxieties, and inspired the black crowd to action.[133] When the prisoners were moved, Carlisle's free blacks struck out at the slave catchers and law enforcement, and succeeded in freeing the slaves. One slave catcher later died of wounds he received in the melee. The riot shocked the nation and McClintock's involvement was blamed for the well planned liberation, though he deserves credit only for being better informed than the legal professionals.[134] Twenty men were put on trial, including McClintock, and while he escaped imprisonment, the black rioters were imprisoned for almost a year until their sentence was overturned.[135]

The riot showed both the extent and some of the limitations of the communications revolution that had transpired. A local judge knew less of the new law than a professor, yet the dissemination of information through newspapers was still impressive. Also the network of black citizens mobilized with remarkable speed. Yet the riot was part of a rising tide of violence that would eventually flood the nation in blood. While the anti-slavery movement owed much to improvements in communication and organization, these improvements also heightened controversies. McClintock, by being well informed, and the rioters, by being well

[133] Slotten, 14-18.
[134] Slotten, 28.
[135] "Alarming Riot," Carlisle (PA) *American Volunteer*, June 10, 1847, p. 2: 1.

organized, heightened division in the community. Improved communications did not lessen controversy in the borough, or the nation at large. New, religiously inspired ideas about race and slavery made McClintock come to the aid of black Americans without pause. These new ideas about equality and individual autonomy were the communication revolution's most controversial and divisive effects, but also its most significant in the future of the country.

Although the story of Carlisle from 1815 to 1848 deviates often from large national models, without such models a meaningful study of Carlisle would be impossible. These studies provide essential information for understanding events in Carlisle. Without Howe's effort to unify the understanding of diverse elements like Sunday schooling, Bible distribution, the railroad, and the telegraph in national or even continental terms, it would be difficult to understand them locally. Howe's synthesis makes mention of the wide variety of religious arrangements the Awakening unleashed, and Carlisle demonstrates that variety: New and Old Light were atypically composed and particularly acrimonious in their division.[136] Devoid of a framework or interpretation for any of these trends individually, a local historian would have to reconstruct the meaning of each in his community. Significant syntheses, such as *What Hath God Wrought* or *The Market Revolution,* provide interpretations of these major events essential to writing history. However, it is equally true that studying local communities allows scholars to reinterpret and rethink their efforts at broader synthesis. The story of Carlisle's revivals and retreats offers one such useful opportunity for reinterpretation.

[136] Howe, 201.

Appendix A: Methods

The tables used throughout this paper were constructed by joining records by name. The tax lists, church membership lists, and miscellaneous club and civic leadership lists were all matched by first and last name in Microsoft Access, a powerful database program. The linked records were entered into the database in the following order:[137]

1. First Presbyterian Membership List (999 entries)
2. Second Presbyterian Membership List (125 entries)
3. Bible Societies (65 entries from 2 years)
4. 1820 Tax List (459 entries)
5. 1818 Burgess List (12 entries)
6. 1840 Veterans List (3 entries) [unutilized]
7. 1847 Tax List (888 entries)
8. 1840 Burgess List (20 entries)
9. Female Colored school founders list (8 entries)[138]

Since many of the records were transcribed, and there existed substantial variety in name spelling and error, all lists were compared to check for similar name spellings. The process was as follows:

[137] Record order is recorded to show what record all were standardized against: First Presbyterian. First Presbyterian has almost 1000 members, who come and go, between 1815 and 1835. The next largest record is the 1847 Tax List, with 888 names. There is also a collection of article .pdfs and text from various newspaper databases in the database, along with totals from the national censuses. These records were not joined to the others.

[138] 2,579 entries make up the database, which is composed of around 50 queries and tables. The first few tables took a long time to enter, as I transcribed much more information than I needed (# of homes and heads of cattle on the tax lists, among many other superfluous details), and it took a while to figure out how to effectively use queries to make work simple.

1. Before finalizing these matches, names were compared by using the Soundex algorithm[139] to provide rough possible matches. A combined table was shown showing similar spellings from each table to check spelling.

Sample Tables A.1, A.2, & A.3

1776 Burghers			
First Name	**Surname**	**SoundFir**	**SoundSur**
John	Boden	J500	B350
Thomas	Carothers	T520	C636
Plunkett	Hackett	P452	H230

3rd Presby Soundex			
First Name	**Surname**	**SoundFir**	**SoundSur**
Jane	Boden	J500	B350
Thomas	Caroders	A500	C636
Plunket	Hacket	P452	H230

Combined Comparison			
First Name Burghers	**First Name 3rd**	**Surname Burghers**	**Surname 3rd**
John	Jane	Boden	Boden
Thomas	Thomas	Carothers	Caroders
Plunkett	Plunket	Hackett	Hacket

2. Obvious identical names, like Hacket and Hackett, were altered to reflect the most complex spelling (arbitrarily, but least complex spellings pose a risk of adding artificial matches). E.g. Plunket Hacket in the "3rd Presbyterian" was changed to Plunkett Hackett, to reflect the spelling found in the "1776 Burghers" list.
3. Not all Soundex suggestions were followed. For example, Jane Boden was not corrected to John Boden. If there was a significant date gap between conversion and

[139] Implemented along the lines of the Wikipedia reference description: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Soundex, using code from http://allenbrowne.com/vba-Soundex.html. Soundex is not the best fuzzy matcher, but was the easiest to implement and check the database with. Metaphone would give fewer false positives, but Soundex's false positives are usually so glaring that it didn't matter (plus writing a metaphone matcher would be a waste of time for such relatively small samples). The sample set was also small enough to make re-checking easy.

the tax list, an obvious gender difference, or a substantive spelling difference, no change was made to the records.

4. When possible, all references to a name were corrected to correspond with printed spellings. For example, if the 1776 Burgers list gave Thomas Carothers, Thomas Caroders in the 3rd Presbyterian list was corrected to Carothers.
5. Obvious last name and first name spelling or transcription errors were then corrected in the records at large.
6. Lists were then compared side by side to catch glaring errors.
7. Soundexes were rechecked.
8. A join was created between the two tables. Every time a table has been joined to another, confidence is increased in its reliability. When in doubt, the most joined records were favored for subsequent comparisons.

The now joined records were used to make composite tables comparing interactions between two or more tables. These tables were truncated (records were selected for use) and/or averaged (reduced to aggregates and averages) for presentation in the paper.

Links between records were typically a small percentage of either record. It is unsurprising that many in the town were not church members, but a surprising number of church members were not heads of household or Carlisle residents. Only 55 of the 999 members of 1st Presbyterian could be tied to tax lists, which is approximately 5% of the church membership. This is including some correction for non-heads of household, who were joined by known head of household name (such as when a woman has her name, followed by "wife of John Doe," in a church record, or a Mrs. follows a man with the same surname);

however, most non heads of household cannot be conclusively tied to a taxable resident. Another factor is the relative size of the records. The Tax Lists vary in length from 459 to 888, but there were nearly 1000 members of 1st Presbyterian, so complete linking would be impossible, especially with frequent moves and deaths occurring. Using more tax list years would not really solve the problem, as taxable valuations are not comparable between years as there is no reasonable method to adjust for inflation. Expanding each survey to include all tax lists in Cumberland County would also have given a better understanding of non-Carlisle resident members, but this would have expanded the study substantially beyond its intentionally limited scope. Consequently, comparisons could only be made in arbitrary years that would always show an unusually small portion of the church population. This is also because all members of 2nd Presbyterian were once members of 1st Presbyterian, and they are excluded from the 1st Presbyterian membership columns when comparisons are made between the two churches (otherwise, there would be 80 reported members in 1st Presbyterian, giving 8% linking between the Tax Lists and the church membership). 2nd Presbyterian yielded better representation, with 25 of 125 members, or a 20% representation in records. The 1847 Tax Lists show an even more dramatic valuation gap between the two churches, but due to the slightly poorer 1st Presbyterian representation in that record, it was excluded.

Appendix B: Timeline

1814: Local women form Carlisle's first grassroots religious organization, the Carlisle Bible Society.

1815: Duffield visits Carlisle on business, shortly after the War of 1812 ended.

1816: The local women's society is supplanted by a male Bible society, and Duffield takes charge of First Presbyterian. The behavioral standard of the membership is increased.

1820: Duffield and others, mostly Presbyterians, reorganize and reopen Dickinson College.

1821: Florida is officially annexed. First Presbyterian's rapid growth begins to slow for the first time since Duffield became pastor.

1823: Carlisle's first major revival occurs in the wake of two student deaths at Dickinson College. The revival leads to heightened religious activities, such as the launch of *The Religious Miscellany*, new temperance efforts, and a young men's missionary organization that brought many Dickinson students to the ministry.

1828: George A. Lyon begins to take notes on Duffield's sermons, while organizations from the first revival falter. Duffield experiences his first major public conflict after calling Methodists undemocratic in a sermon.

1830: Dickinson College shuts down for a second time after years of decline. Faculty and trustees blame each other, though many focus their blame on Duffield, who was too controlling of the faculty. The trustees publish an account of the decline that absolves them from blame.

1831: Finney's Rochester Revival spreads revivals throughout the nation, including to Carlisle, where First Presbyterian grew as never before. *Regeneration* and the growing revival divide Carlisle's Presbyterians, and Duffield begins to notice the limits of reform spirit. The Liberator begins circulation this year.

1832: Duffield's book is put under review in a series of hearings, which he protests, but he is never personally censured. The Presbyterians who had put Duffield on trial form Second Presbyterian after the trials fail to remove Duffield from the Presbyterian Church. South Carolina instigates the Nullification Crisis.

1833: Duffield undergoes his final trial, which accuses him of heresy on all but one of the counts brought against him, relying mostly on intentional misreading and misquoting of his book. Duffield looks to move elsewhere. The Baltimore and Philadelphia Conferences of the Methodist Church reopen Dickinson College under new management.

1834: Wealthy local women organize a free school for Carlisle's growing black population.

1835: Carlisle establishes public schooling under the leadership of Second Presbyterians Andrew Blair and James Hamilton. The school system takes charge of the black school, keeping it separate and unequal from the extensive white system. Duffield moves to Philadelphia.

1837: The Presbyterian Church divides nationally, in part due to the opinions of Duffield. The Panic of 1837 destabilizes the economy, and Pennsylvania's black population is disenfranchised. The Cumberland Valley Railroad brings Carlisle and the Cumberland Valley into the new era of transportation and communication.

1840: The growth of the market due to the railroad causes the borough council to completely redesign Carlisle's laws. The Methodist Church in Carlisle leads a large revival, adding a hundred members to their growing church.

1844: Samuel Morse's telegraph asks "What Hath God Wrought?" as Dickinson College students do battle with soldiers from the Carlisle Barracks.

1845: A fire wreaks havoc on Carlisle's downtown, started by an arsonist in the town hall. Texas is annexed, beginning the Mexican-American War. First Presbyterian has declined to the same number of parishioners as before Duffield.

1847: Carlisle's free blacks after some confusion over the status of personal liberty laws in Pennsylvania, erupt in violence in front of the court house, killing a slave owner who had caught a runaway slave in what is known as the McClintock Riot. Mexico City falls to American forces.

1848: All who were arrested following the McClintock riot are released, and Carlisle remains a divided, chaotic place.

Selected Bibliography

Primary Sources

U.S. Bureau of the Census, "Table 6. Population of the 90 Urban Places: 1830," U.S. Bureau of the Census, http://www.census.gov/population/www/documentation/twps0027/tab06.txt, accessed on 29 January 2009.

U.S. Bureau of the Census, "Table 5. Population of the 61 Urban Places: 1820," U.S. Bureau of the Census, http://www.census.gov/population/www/documentation/twps0027/tab05.txt, accessed on 29 January 2009.

"Carlisle Fire," *Providence Patriot, Columbian Sun,* (Providence, RI: February 28, 1821), 19th Century Newspapers.

John B Romeyn, "From The Christian Herald," *The Christian's Weekly Monitor; or, Sabbath Morning Repast,* (January 1817), 3-7, American Periodicals Series Online.

"Bible Societies," *American Volunteer,* (Carlisle, Pa: January 18, 1816), 4.

"Auxiliary Bible Societies," *American Volunteer,* (Carlisle, Pa: April 17, 1817), 4.

"Extract of a Report from Carlisle, Pennsylvania, April 1818," *The Religious Intelligencer,* (Oct 17, 1818) 3, 20, American Periodicals Series.

First Presbyterian Register, 1756-1920, 5.2.2-3, First Presbyterian Collection, DCA.

George Armstrong Lyon to Ashbel Green, "re: Presbyterian Church and doctrine," August 31 1831, Box 1, Folder 1, George Armstrong Lyon Collection.

George Armstrong Lyon to George Duffield, "re: Pained people believe Lyon wrote piece by "H"," August 24 1831, Box 1, Folder 1, George Armstrong Lyon Collection.

Remarks Upon The Report of the Committee Appointed by the Carlisle Presbytery to Review the Work Entitled Duffield on Regeneration Together with Some Additional Extracts from The Minutes, (William F. Geddes: Philadelphia, 1832), Google Book Search (within result for *History of the Proceedings…Duffield on Regeneration)*.

George Duffield, untitled Diaries, 31 October 1828-15 February 1836, Dickinson College Library.

George Duffield, *Spiritual Life, Or, Regeneration*, (George Fleming: Carlisle, 1832), Google Book Search.

History of the Proceedings of the Carlisle Presbytery in Relation to a Work Entitled Duffield on Regeneration: In a Series of Letters from a Person Present to His Friend. (William F. Geddes: Philadelphia, 1832), Google Book Search.

Members of Mr. Duffield's Congregation, *The Principles of Presbyterian Discipline*, (George Fleming: Carlisle, 1835), Google Book Search.

Dickinson College Board of Trustees, *A Narrative of the Proceedings of the Board of Trustees of Dickinson College*, (George Fleming: Carlisle, 1830), 3.

Zebulon Crocker, *The Catastrophe of the Presbyterian Church*, (B & W Noy: New Haven, 1838), Google Book Search, 85.

George Armstrong Lyon, "Origin of the Second Church," undated, Box 2, Folder 2, George Armstrong Lyon Collection.

"An extensive revival of religion," *Norwich Aurora* (Norwich, CT: May 6, 1840), Nineteenth Century Newspaper Collection, online.

Origen, “For the Colored American.To the Church and Congregation at T.,” *The Colored American*, (October 20, 1838), *African American Newspapers Collection*, Accessible Archives.

John Lefevre, *Lefevre Diary Transcription*, CCHS: 1-113.

Charter and Ordinances of the Borough of Carlisle, (Carlisle: The Herald Office, 1841), 24.

Secondary Sources

Biddle, Edward W. “Carlisle,” *History of Cumberland County, Pennsylvania*. ed. Conway P. Wing, Philadelphia: J.D. Scott, 1879.

Cornell, Saul. "Aristocracy Assailed: The Ideology of Backcountry Anti-Federalism," *The Journal of American History*. 76, no. 4, March, 1990: 1148-1172.

Feller, Daniel. “Review: The Market Revolution Ate My Homework,” *Reviews in American History*. September, 1997, 410.

Flower, Milton Embick and Lenore Embick Flower. *This is Carlisle*. Harrisburg, Pa: J. Horace McFarland Company, 1944.

Ford, Lacy K. "Democracy and Its Consequences in Antebellum America: A Review Essay," *Journal of Southern History* 74, no. 1 (2008): 125-138. *America: History & Life*, EBSCO*host* (accessed February 16, 2009).

James Grant, “Vibrant, Turbulent Young America,” *The Wall Street Journal*. 27 September, 2008.

Johnson, Paul E. *A Shopkeeper’s Millennium*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1978.

Howe, Daniel Walker. *What Hath God Wrought: The Transformation of America, 1815-1848*. The Oxford History of the United States. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Lepore, Jill."Vast Designs," *The New Yorker.* 29 October, 2007.

Noll, Mark. *America's God.* New York : Oxford University Press, 2002.

Robins, Glenn. *The Bishop of the Old South: The Ministry and Civil War Legacy of Leonidas Polk.* Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 2006.

Ridner, Judith Anne. *"A handsomely improved place": Economic, social, and gender-role development in a backcountry town, Carlisle, Pennsylvania, 1750-1810,* (Ann Arbor: UMI, 1995).

Schaumann, Merri Lou Scribner. *A History & Genealogy of Carlisle Cumberland County, Pennsylvania, 1751-1835*. Dover, Pa: 1987.

Schaumann, Merri Lou Scribner. *Taverns of Cumberland County, Pennsylvania, 1750-1840*.

Schlesinger, Arthur M. *The Age of Jackson*. Boston: Little, Brown and company, 1945.

Sellers, Charles Coleman. "The Duffield Years," *A History of Dickinson College*.

Sellers, Charles Grier. *The Market Revolution: Jacksonian America, 1815-1846.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Swaim, William T. *Disruptions of the Presbyterian Church and Dickinson College by George Duffield III, 1816-1833.* unpublished manuscript, 1983 CCHS.