THE Great Awakening began as an interdenominational revival of religion and ended in an invigorated denominational consciousness. The different denominations entered this spiritual whirlpool with enthusiasm or skepticism, and left it elated or alarmed; passing through it they changed their relationship to each other. Indifference became partisanship and affinities grew into alliances. Moreover, this event was important not only for denominational organizations but also for colonial politics. Pennsylvania at that time had institutions of representative government, but no real party structure. Many recent immigrants of British and German origin were new to this country and had no other form of organization among themselves except their ecclesiastical polities, no leaders but their clergymen, religious teachers, vestrymen, or elders. In consequence these denominations served the purpose of pressure groups and parties, and many a clergyman or elder assumed the role of political boss. Whatever affected religious commitments was bound to affect political alignments in this state of affairs.

The Great Awakening was started by these religious leaders but it ended in making the layman the supreme judge in ecclesiastical matters. It was the layman who threw the "unconverted" or the "unorthodox" minister out of the church, according to his own judgment as to his conversion or orthodoxy. In this situation the minister could no longer command or order; he had to manipulate and agitate. If he was imperious or uninspiring, he soon found himself without support.

Out of these developments grew a specifically American ex-
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1 During the Great Awakening rival factions used to lock each other out of church.
perience. The encounter of denominations, the relationship between denominational organizations and politics, and the awakening of the layman produced a new climate which affected the European heritage of all denominations. Parts of this European heritage entered into the new experience, but it was the interaction of these elements in the Great Awakening which became for all denominations the foundation for their common American heritage. This interaction forced the denominations to look at each other—be it in admiration or disgust—rather than back at the fathers in Europe. In this way a curious combination of old and new feuds, old and new allegiances emerged, and the sum of this new experience was very different from its original parts.

In Pennsylvania this development was especially interesting because not only the English groups but also many German groups participated in the process of Americanization. In order to understand what happened to these groups in the Great Awakening, we have to examine their background and their relationships to each other in Europe and later in America.

There is a basic conflict in Christianity between religious experience and religious organization. Religious experience at its best penetrates the individual soul and connects it with eternity. Religious organization is a temporal union of believers for matters of worship, common dogma, and the teaching of the Gospel to coming generations. Ideally experience and organization supplement each other, because even the soul experiencing eternity has to live in a temporal world. However, in numerous cases religious experience has threatened to dissolve religious organization, and as frequently religious organization has tended to stifle religious experience. In most of these situations, movements have been started which broke away from their contemporary religious organizations. A movement derives its energy from a sense of urgency, and it is difficult to keep up this feeling for more than one generation. Consequently such a movement either vanishes, or perpetuates itself in the form of a sect.

Up to the time of the Reformation the Catholic Church avoided this conflict by allowing individual mystics, and numerous religious orders a degree of freedom within its own ranks. The Protestant

2 See the author's article, “Kirche und Geschichte” in Ansaetze, Stuttgart Evangelische Studentengemeinde Deutschlands, 6, 1956.
churches, however, themselves born of a religious movement, permitted no such freedom and left only the possibilities of dissent and secession. Consequently the period of the Reformation saw the rise of a number of movements which became sects or, in a few cases, new churches—and every generation since the Reformation has added to the number.

The authority on which dissent and secession were founded has always claimed direct access to revelation, either from within through an "inner light," or from without through reliance on the Bible pure and simple. Thus, a great number of Inspirationist or Biblicist sects sprang up all over Europe. This scattering of believers led necessarily to some serious thinking, and a consensus that if revelation is meaningful it has to be one, and obviously many particular claims to revelation must be spurious. From this insight arose the idea of "the community of God in the Spirit."

During the 17th century two plans for such a community became prominent: the idea called "Philadelphia,"
and the idea of the "ecclesiola in ecclesia." "Philadelphia"—literally, fraternal love—meant a spiritual union of true believers, whatever their outward rank or denomination might be. At first "Philadelphia" was nothing but a program. With persecution and distress, however, a new solidarity grew up, and "Philadelphia" was thought of more and more as a place of refuge. On the continent tolerant princes could offer their own estates as a "Philadelphia" for religious seekers of all kinds. In England the new colonial expansion offered a way out, and it was in keeping with the spirit of the time that the new proprietor of Pennsylvania, William Penn, named his colonial capital Philadelphia. However, Philadelphia depended on the inspiration and experience of its founders and defied institutional organization. Therefore the movement could not survive once the experience was lost, and the founders were dead. The community remained but the spirit changed. The "ecclesiola" had a similar fate. It started as a kind of Protestant alternative to the Catholic orders, as movements within the church. Church and

3 The idea of Philadelphia was propagated in England by Jane Leade and the Philadelphians, in Germany by J. W. Petersen and by numerous separatists. See Albrecht Ritschl, Geschichte des Pietismus, Bonn, Marcus 1880, I, 98, 395.
4 Ecclesiola in ecclesia, little church in the church, was the ideal of pietists like J. P. Spener in Frankfurt-Main and later A. H. Francke at Halle. This movement encouraged prayer meetings and evangelism, and also social work.
movement, experience and organization should remain together, the movement should be the leaven of the church, the ecclesiola should be the motor of the ecclesia; these were the ideals of the pietists who met in conventicles all over the continent. The vigor of this movement waned after a few decades, but the foment had indeed leavened the church.\(^8\)

A unique attempt to combine all the ideals of pietism was made by Count Zinzendorf. He had been a pietist at one time, and a Philadelphian at another; he tried to form an ecclesiola with his Order of the Mustard Seed.\(^6\) Unlike many other advocates of religious experience he had a deep interest in the church as a community, and as a preserver of the means of grace. Therefore he tried to establish a movement-church, which combined the vigor of the movement with the stability of the church.

The need to keep church and movement together was urgently and universally felt in the period from 1730 to 1740. The English Methodism of John Wesley\(^7\) was a response to the same needs which Zinzendorf had seen in his own country. However, while Wesley considered himself a member of the Anglican church throughout his life, Zinzendorf had to face a more difficult problem. The Lutheran Church of which Zinzendorf considered himself a member was only one of the churches and sects which he wanted to reach with his message of the “community of God in the Spirit.” Therefore he devised a complicated scheme of ecumenical organization. He molded the ancient Moravian Church,\(^8\) to some of whose refugees he had granted asylum on his estates, into a “community of God in the Spirit.” Then he joined to this church, in the form of autonomous departments, groups of believers of the Lutheran and Reformed Churches who wanted to cooperate with him.\(^9\) He supplied this unique organization with a theology based on the atonement or, as it was termed by him, “the blood of the Lamb.”

\(^8\) For the rise and fall of this movement during three generations see Ritschl, op. cit., II, 584.
\(^8\) The Moravian Church had been founded in Kunwald, Moravia, in 1457, by some followers of John Huss.
\(^9\) These forms were called “Tropi Paedias.” See J. M. Levering, A History of Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, Bethlehem, 1903, 23.
The ecumenical intentions of Zinzendorf's program were not universally appreciated, and his enemies accused him of deliberate ambiguities. Yet as a missionary organization his "community of God in the Spirit" became an immediate success. Within his lifetime the dynamic Count controlled a world-wide network of missions and sent scores of dedicated revivalists to many parts of the globe. Although Zinzendorf wanted to remain a member of the Lutheran Church, the very momentum of his organization separated him from this church. In this respect his movement had a different history from that of Methodism, which needed a second generation to develop into a distinct organization.

The English parallel to Zinzendorf was George Whitefield. This great revivalist had many of the same characteristics: an occasional rashness of judgment, tireless energy, impatience, an ecumenical spirit, and oratorical gifts, but he did not share Zinzendorf's concern about a theology of atonement, nor his preoccupation with church organization. His revivalist appeal and his indifference to doctrinal subtleties made Whitefield as popular with the dissenters as with the Anglican masses.10 Most dissenters, Presbyterians and others, actually needed him as much as the Anglicans did, because dissent had become nearly as stiff an establishment as the Established Church itself.

In America the spiritual situation in the eighteenth century was in many respects similar to the one in Europe, but the problem was aggravated by a tendency to meet the challenges of a new environment by clinging obstinately to standards that were valid "at home."11 This tendency was most apparent in the attitude toward the ordination of ministers in America. Ordination is a central feature of a church, and a constant source of suspicion and scorn to a movement. No church can exist without a standard pattern of recruiting and installing ministers, and no movement will accept the fact that a minister merely by virtue of ordination becomes an authentic messenger of God.

The education and ordination of an indigenous American clergy was one of the major steps toward the emancipation of America from European tutelage. But in America itself sectarian

---

11 The persistent American use of "at home" as referring to England stands in contrast to the German use of "draussen" (outside) in reference to Europe. See Christopher Sauer's use of "draussen" in *Pennsylvanische Berichte*. 
apprehensions and the conservatism of many older ministers stood against this development.

The Biblicist and Inspirationist sects of Pennsylvania had no formal problems with regard to the recruiting of religious leadership within their own ranks. They viewed the churches' recruitment with suspicion because an increase of ordained ministers meant to them the danger of a new establishment, and with it the possibility of renewed persecution. Church members in Pennsylvania, however, had to depend on the churches in their home countries for a supply of new ministers. But no minister who was not either an ardent idealist or a man with a dubious record at home could be persuaded to come to Pennsylvania, unless a fixed salary and traveling expenses were guaranteed. Local education and ordination of an American clergy might have solved this problem, but there were numerous obstacles. Educational opportunities in America were limited and the right to ordain ministers was vested in higher church authorities, who for the most part resided on the other side of the ocean, and had little knowledge of American affairs. If there were to be higher church authorities in America, more ministers were needed—and that completed the vicious circle. Thus, increasingly the Anglicans looked to the Bishop of London, the Presbyterians to the Church of Scotland, the Reformed Church to the Classis of Amsterdam, and the Lutherans to the University of Halle and the Lutheran Court Preacher of King George for their supply of ministers.

The constitution of the Presbyterian Church was perhaps the best for handling this situation and for breaking through this dependence on Europe. Any properly organized presbytery could ordain ministers. There were several presbyteries in America by 1740, and there was even a well-organized synod of these presbyteries, but the ministers belonging to the presbyteries were con-

12 The Anglican Church in America was directly under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of London.
13 See Records of the Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, 1904, 119.
14 The Classis of Amsterdam was a local "presbytery" of the Dutch Reformed Church. See Minutes and Letters of the Coëns of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, 1903.
15 The University of Halle had become a missionary center under the influence of the pietist, A. H. Francke. The Court Preachers in London under George I and George II were alumni of Halle.
servative and hesitated to ordain anyone who did not have a European education. Because of the scarcity of such an education among possible candidates in America the presbyteries guarded their standards the more jealously. In spite of the advantages of their constitution, the Presbyterians too looked to Europe.

A small group in the Presbyterian Church, mainly consisting of the Tennent family, had tried to break the deadlock by establishing a "Log College" for the local education of ministers. William Tennent, the founder of the college, was a convert to Presbyterianism, who had left the Established Church of Ireland because he disliked "the usurped power of bishops" and the "connivance of the church at the practice of Arminian doctrines." His colleagues in the Presbyterian synod, however, were mostly conservatives who did not trust the "Log College" men.

This was the situation when George Whitefield, and Zinzendorf's Moravians, came to Pennsylvania. Whitefield started a revival of religion in Philadelphia which marked the high point of the Great Awakening in Pennsylvania. His own Anglican Church noted the revival with embarrassment. Commissioner Cummings, the representative of the Bishop of London, preached against Whitefield. But it was not the Anglican Church which felt the greatest impact of the Great Awakening—it was the Presbyterian Church. Gilbert Tennent joined the revival and preached a vigorous sermon on the dangers of an unconverted ministry. This was no longer a revival, but a revolt. The Log College men turned the tables on the representatives of the Presbyterian organization and pitted the converted heart against European education as the hallmark of ministry. When this revolutionary doctrine invaded the church, a split was inevitable. From Tennent's sermon both ministers and laymen had to assume that an awakened soul could pass judgment on the state of conversion.

---

17 See Presbyterian Records, 141.
18 Ibid., 51.
19 In this article the word revival is used for the Whitefield revival of 1740, as contrasted with the Great Awakening which lasted for several years (1740-48 in Pennsylvania). The Great Awakening is a historical period, the revival merely an event. A good description of the Presbyterian part of the revival can be found in Cartwright Austin, "The Great Awakening in Philadelphia," B.A. thesis, Swarthmore College, 1953.
20 Gilbert Tennent preached his sermon on "The Dangers of an Unconverted Ministry" at Nottingham, Pa., March 8, 1740. See Trinterud, op. cit., 89 ff.
of ministers, and that while a minister was bound to his people, the people were as free from their minister after an official call as before.\textsuperscript{21} The Presbyterian conservatives were appalled by this subversive idea, and in 1741 the Synod of Philadelphia excluded the Log College men. The latter immediately formed a presbytery of their own, and took it upon themselves to ordain ministers who conformed to their standards.\textsuperscript{22} Thus, the deadlock was broken, and converts of the Whitefield revival were gathered into the fold of New Light Presbyterianism.\textsuperscript{23}

The next revolution in the ordination of ministers came with the arrival of Moravian bishops in Pennsylvania.\textsuperscript{24} Under Zinzendorf's plan these bishops could ordain not only Moravian ministers but also Lutheran and Reformed ministers. As a movement-church the Moravian Church of Zinzendorf did not insist on education for the ministry but would ordain any awakened soul.\textsuperscript{25} The revival of religion which Zinzendorf and his Moravians brought about among the Germans in Pennsylvania was in many respects more successful than the revival which Whitefield and the New Light Presbyterians had brought about among the English. Missionaries came in great numbers in a ship owned by the Moravian Church, and within a few months there was hardly a German community in Pennsylvania which had not been visited by a preacher of Zinzendorf's following.\textsuperscript{26}

In the beginning the two movements worked together. Whitefield had been deeply influenced by the Moravians. The year 1740,

\textsuperscript{21} Quoted from \textit{The Querist, Part III}, printed by B. Franklin, Philadelphia, 1740, 101.

\textsuperscript{22} See "Records of the New Brunswick Presbytery," Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia.

\textsuperscript{23} Gilbert Tennent preached to the converts of the Whitefield revival in Whitefield's New Building. In 1744 Tennent was officially installed as minister of the Second Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia by the Presbytery of New Brunswick. See "Records of the New Brunswick Presbytery." This church remained in the New Building until 1748.

\textsuperscript{24} Bishop Nitschmann arrived in Pennsylvania on Dec. 18, 1740, as the first Moravian bishop to come to America.

\textsuperscript{25} The Moravians ordained numerous lay-preachers of both English and German origin. Under Zinzendorf's plan the Moravian bishops also ordained members of the Lutheran and Reformed Churches as ministers of these churches.

\textsuperscript{26} With the arrival of the first "Sea Congregation" in 1742, approximately 35 married and single missionaries were available for work among the German settlers and the Indians. Many of these missionaries preached almost every day of the week at different places for the next five years (1742-47). See numerous "Diaries" in the Moravian Archives, Bethlehem, Pa.
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however, saw a multiple split in what had been a more or less united front. In July, 1740, Wesley parted company with the Moravians in London, because of their excessive religious enthusiasm. Moreover, at about the same time the Calvinist Methodists developed into a separate group and Whitefield, who had become under the tutelage of Gilbert Tennent considerably more Calvinist in his ministry, joined with the Calvinist Methodists and severed his connections with Wesley’s group. In November, 1740, when Whitefield came back to Pennsylvania, he precipitated a heated doctrinal debate with the Moravian theologian, Peter Boehler, who had had a strong influence on Wesley. Whitefield insisted on predestination; Boehler emphasized salvation by the Blood of the Lamb, that is, the redeeming power of the atonement. After this clash the united front was dissolved in America, too.

The Presbyterians knew little about the Moravians in the early days of the revival, though they tried to find out about them. During the years 1742-43 the New Light Presbyterian ministers Samuel Finley and Samuel Blair made several attempts to engage the Moravians in debates on their doctrines. The Moravians tried to avoid doctrinal debates because they were convinced that discussions of that kind would only make divisions among believers and not contribute to religious experience. However, as time went by, numerous encounters took place and soon the Presbyterians were convinced that the Moravians were a most dangerous group. Gilbert Tennent vented his grievances against them even in distant Boston. Like his father, William Tennent, Gilbert hated Arminianism and insisted on predestination. His early sermons seemed to indicate a great reliance on Luther and a stress on justification by faith alone. In later doctrinal controversies with the Moravians he felt compelled to stress more explicitly that “assurance is a fruit of faith,” and not vice versa. Whitefield, who depended heavily on Tennent in matters of theology, sided

32 See Levering, op. cit., 51-52. As a consequence of this clash the Moravians had to leave the Nazareth Tract in the Forks of the Delaware which belonged to Whitefield at that time.
32 See letters of S. Blair and S. Finley in Hazard Family Papers, Historical Society of Pennsylvania; also G. Tennent, The Necessity of Holding Fast to the Truth, Boston, 1743, Appendix, 77.
32 See G. Tennent, The Necessity...
32 See G. Tennent, A Sermon upon Justification, Philadelphia, 1741.
32 See G. Tennent, The Necessity...
completely with the Presbyterians. The conflict which thus arose was the beginning of a heightened denominational consciousness in Pennsylvania. The rejection of revivalism by the Old Side Presbyterians and the Anglicans, and by the quietist sects, contributed even more to this increase in denominational self-awareness. The days of interdenominational enthusiasms had been only a brief interlude.

The New Light Presbyterians quickly consolidated their church organization. In 1745 the Synod of New York was formed by the Presbyteries of New Brunswick and New York; in 1749 the first overtures toward a reunion with the Old Side Synod of Philadelphia were made. The Moravian Church, however, spread itself too thin. In the interest of the Awakening an interdenominational activity was kept up on a grand scale. A vast area was supplied with ministers, and yet no congregation thus served was asked to assume the status of a Moravian congregation. The Moravians went out of their way to avoid the charge of being proselytizers. From 1741 to 1748 they tried to maintain the spirit of the Seven Pennsylvania Synods, and it was not until 1748 that the first general synod of the Moravian Church was held.

At that conference the Moravians decided on a new system of ordination and made it known to all who wanted to be served by Moravian missionaries that they would have to move to places where a regular Moravian community could be established. This meant the abandonment of an interdenominational service, and a disciplined consolidation of the Moravian Church as one denomination among others. The consolidation of the Moravian Church in America was thus a rather late event. A few years earlier, at the height of Moravian revivalist work (1742-45), a great many converts might have joined the Moravian Church. By the time of the consolidation, however, vigorous competition, as well as Moravian reluctance to appear as proselytizers, had lessened the ranks of prospective converts.

One of the most decisive elements in the situation was the persistence of Zinzendorf's old adversaries at Halle University.

---

33 See the Tennent-Whitefield Correspondence in Moravian Archives, Bethlehem, Pa. (esp. letters not mentioned by Tyerman).
34 See Presbyterian Records, 239.
35 These interdenominational synods were held 1741-42. See Relation von den Sieben Pennsylvanischen Synoden, Philadelphia, 1742.
36 See Minutes of the Synod of 1748 in Moravian Archives, Bethlehem, Pa.
and in London, who saw to it that an energetic Lutheran minister was sent to America to challenge the Moravian missions to the Lutherans. Henry Melchior Muhlenberg, the Lutheran minister who was sent to Pennsylvania by Dr. G. A. Francke of Halle with recommendations by the Lutheran Court Preacher in London, arrived in Philadelphia in 1742, two years after Whitefield’s revival, and one year after the arrival of Count Zinzendorf in Philadelphia. The short period of time between Zinzendorf’s arrival and Muhlenberg’s had been enough for the Moravians to penetrate most Lutheran congregations. Zinzendorf himself served as a Lutheran minister in Philadelphia. Naturally Muhlenberg faced an uphill task. He had to reclaim the Lutheran congregations from the Moravians, and he had to take over from Zinzendorf in Philadelphia. Moreover, he had to guard himself against the attacks of German sectarians who had an aversion against any churchman, be he Zinzendorf or Muhlenberg.

Undoubtedly a staid minister of an established church would have hesitated to take up such a work. But Muhlenberg was a Halle Pietist, a missionary who had been preparing to go to India when his instructions were changed and he was sent to Pennsylvania. In his diaries he refers to his church in America as an “ecclesia plantanda” and spurns those ministers who can live only in an “ecclesia plantata.” Muhlenberg’s missionary zeal curbed the influence of the Moravian Church. However, he had to spend years in America, before his influence outweighed that of the Moravians. His attempts to organize a Lutheran synod, thereby establishing a Lutheran Church authority in America, were frustrated for some years by Moravian resistance.

The first overtures toward Lutheran Church unity and organization had been made by laymen. The Swedish merchant Peter Kock had been eager to bring about a union of all Lutheran ministers and congregations, Swedish as well as German. He invited all ministers to a synodal meeting in 1745. There seems to have been

---


Muhlenberg’s emphasis on the “church which has to be planted,” as against the “planted” or established church, occurs several times in his diaries."
a plan to elect Muhlenberg as president of the synod at that time. However, the Swedish Lutheran minister, Laurentius Nyberg, who adhered to the Moravian leadership and who also attended this meeting obstructed this plan. Among other things he insisted Peter Kock had no right to call ministers to a synod, since Kock was a layman. In the months after this abortive synod, Laurentius Nyberg made an attempt to attach the Swedish to the Moravian interest—an attempt which caused much alarm and misunderstanding among the German Lutherans. Finally, the Archbishop of Upsala sent a testimony against Nyberg to Pennsylvania, in 1747, and deprived him of his credentials as a Lutheran minister. Nyberg then joined the Moravian church. Only after these obstacles had been overcome, could Muhlenberg found a German Lutheran synod. At this synod—in August, 1748—Muhlenberg and his colleagues for the first time ordained a Lutheran minister in America.

The period from 1740 to 1748 thus witnessed a rather complicated alignment of religious groups. The conflict of New Lights and Old continued among the English settlers while the German immigrants were divided over Moravian revivalist techniques. Yet the New Lights and the Moravian revivalists were opposed to each other, and English and German sectarianists were apprehensive of both revivalist and conservative ministers.

From a long-term point of view the Great Awakening strengthened the American churches by bringing the layman into his own in church affairs and by fostering a locally educated clergy inspired by missionary zeal. In the years between 1740 and 1748, however, the many divisions and splits among the church people greatly handicapped their church organizations. Therefore these organizations were not able to challenge as effectively as they might have the dominant position of the sects.

The pacifism of the sects was twice put to a test during this period by a threat of war. Surprisingly enough, instead of jeopardizing the political position of the sects, this threat consolidated their stand in a period of rapid transition. The first threat forced

---

44 See copy of a letter written by Nyberg to his colleague Bryzelius, containing the description of an intended Lutheran consistorium, 1745, Moravian Archives, Bethlehem, Pa.
45 Nyberg left his congregation in Lancaster and moved to Bethlehem, Pa., in 1747.
46 See Mann, op. cit., I, 150.
the Quakers to campaign among the German sectarians for political support, since the Quaker oligarchy could no longer be based on Quaker votes alone. The second threat, in 1747-48, demonstrated the tenacity of this coalition. In both instances political forces among the church people tried their utmost to defeat the Quaker party at the polls.

The crucial point was that while the German sectarians did not hesitate to throw in their lot with the Quakers, the German church organizations did not yet throw in theirs with the English churches. Having just gained certain advantages over the Moravians, the German churches did not want to jeopardize their position by political commitments. Muhlenberg characterizes this situation in the following way:

During this year a great deal has been conjectured and said about a hostile attack by the Spanish and French. Consequently there are two chief parties here among the English and they have entered into a violent newspaper war before the Spaniards and the French have come. The Quakers, who are the foremost party in this province have on their side the German book publisher Sauer, who controls the Mennonites, Separatists, Anabaptists, and the like with his printed works and lines them up with the Quakers. All of these speak and write against the war and reject even the slightest defense as ungodly and contrary to the command of Jesus Christ. The church party has the English book publishers on its side, and they maintain in speech and printed word that defense is not contrary to God's command, but right and necessary in accord with the laws of nature. This party makes use of the preachers of the Episcopal and Presbyterian churches on its side. The latter party held several lotteries and used the proceeds to build a fortification on the coast; they have organized for defense, dividing up into companies and regiments which drill at regular times. Our pastors' collegium has been sharply watched to see which side we would turn to. We said, however, that we had been sent to preach to our people repentance to God and faith in the Lord Jesus, and hence we could not mix in political affairs unless we had express orders from our highest or provincial government; accordingly we remained silent. Graciously give us peace, Lord God, in our time. Amen.  

"Muhlenberg, op. cit., I, 212."
It took several years more before the Lutherans engaged actively in politics, and it took more than a decade before they became an organized force at the polls. In the meantime the opponents of the Quaker party, in search of German partners who could help to break the Quaker monopoly of the German vote, became frustrated and angry. Unaware of the inner structure of the German groups, they concluded that the Germans were misled by the Quakers, because of their gross ignorance.

By 1748 the Great Awakening had reached its final stage; the first period of revivalism had given way to a period of realignment of denominations, and this period had been followed by a third period, the period of consolidation and organization along American lines. New denominational synods had been created, new plans for education were under way. A new period in politics began. The church organizations gained more power, while the leadership of the Quaker party shifted from sectarian to non-sectarian hands. One of the offsprings of the realignment brought about by the Great Awakening was a secular liberalism. This liberalism was espoused by those laymen who, like Franklin, had been initially interested in the Awakening, but were not interested in the ensuing denominational controversies. Disaffected by the partisanship of religious factions, these liberals were looking forward to a new "community of God in the Spirit," but this time it was based on philosophy, not on theology.

Through partisanship and controversy the American churches had finally come into their own. Indigenous church authorities now ordained locally educated ministers, and American religious organizations were beginning to stand as equals to their European counterparts. A state of dependence was changing to a relationship of mutual consultation. At the same time the intensive participation of the layman in church affairs, which became one of the most

45 The first time the Lutherans became of great political importance was in the elections of 1765, when the Lutheran vestryman, Heinrich Kepple, was elected assemblyman against a candidate of the Anti-Proprietary Party. See Muhlenberg, op. cit., II, 273.

46 The Charity School movement of the next period (1748-60) was essentially a political movement, conceived in the hope of breaking the hold of the Quakers on the supposedly illiterate and ignorant Germans. See Samuel E. Weber, The Charity School Movement in Colonial Pennsylvania, 1754-1763, Philadelphia, 1905.

47 See Sweet, op. cit., 334 ff., on the "unchurched liberals."
outstanding features of American religious life, was initiated in these years, when laymen seconded their ministers, founded synods, and listened to numerous speakers who tried to win their souls for one cause or another. The existence of the various denominations, aligned in numerous ways, made it necessary for each of them to tolerate the others and to live together with religious and political opponents. Religious experience supplemented political experience, and religious organization reinforced political organization.