

**SCHISM ON THE SUSQUEHANNA:
COMMUNITY AND CONGREGATIONAL
CONFLICT ON THE PENNSYLVANIA
FRONTIER DURING THE ERA OF THE
GREAT AWAKENING**

*Anthony L. Blair
Eastern University*

*R*eligious Conflict in a Frontier Community

In the early eighteenth century, on the banks of the Susquehanna River near the present-day city of Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, the community of Paxton (or Paxtang) grew up around the trading post and ferry service of John Harris (1673–1748).¹ In the late 1720s the first Scots-Irish settlers of the area organized the Paxton Presbyterian Church a few miles east of the river on the banks of the Paxton Creek.² Trained and credentialed ministers were scarce on the frontier in those days, and so the church was served only on an occasional basis until 1731 by James Anderson (1678–1740), pastor of the nearby congregation at Donegal. Afterward, it was assigned by the newly-formed Donegal Presbytery to William Bertram (1676?–1736), who also assumed duties at the Derry congregation a few miles further east in what later became the unincorporated factory town of Hershey, Pennsylvania. The community and the congregation grew rapidly enough that by 1738 Paxton was removed from Derry by the presbytery and was able to secure and provide compensation for

PENNSYLVANIA HISTORY: A JOURNAL OF MID-ATLANTIC STUDIES, VOL. 75, NO. 1, 2008.
Copyright © 2008 The Pennsylvania Historical Association

its own minister. John Elder (1706–1792), a recent immigrant raised and educated in the Scots community in Ulster, was to serve the Paxton congregation as its minister for the next 54 years, becoming in that half century a formidable presence both within and outside of the community.³

In the middle decades of the eighteenth century, both of these congregations (Paxton and Derry), the presbytery to which they belonged and, indeed, the entire fledging Presbyterian Church in the colonies found themselves torn apart by controversies related directly or indirectly to the revivals of what is now known as the “Great Awakening.” The question posed by this study is whether one can determine how the congregations divided—that is, whether the fault lines in each congregation were clearly delineated. In other words, on what basis would a layperson choose one minister or one church over another? It is assumed that part of the answer to this question is theological in nature, i.e. one would choose a church at least in part because its core doctrines aligned more closely with one’s own. However, while attempting to avoid simple reductionism, it is also obvious that theological leanings are often colored by other factors, particularly but not exclusively among laypersons who had not had benefit of theological training. Therefore, several additional answers are explored here, with a particular focus on social, economic, or cultural factors that may have influenced those choices. The essay concludes with some speculations as to how these conflicts may have contributed to the distinctive nature of American Christianity in the decades following the revivals.

The Great Awakening as Divisive Experience

“The Great Awakening” was coined as a term of nomenclature by Joseph Tracy in the early 1840s for a series of largely Calvinist religious revivals that occurred roughly between 1735 and 1760.⁴ Tracy was a participant in and advocate for the revivals of what is now known as the Second Great Awakening in the first half of the nineteenth century and with his labeling succeeded in connecting the events of his time with those of a century before, despite the very different character of those two movements.⁵ In recent decades both the event and the label given it by Tracy have been re-evaluated. Jon Butler famously referred to Tracy’s nomenclature as “interpretive fiction,” arguing that instead of a single, widespread continental experience with significant cultural implications, the “Awakening” was merely a series of

largely unrelated, sporadic, and relatively inconsequential entities. Frank Lambert, in *Inventing the 'Great Awakening'*, agreed that the Awakening was not nearly so “great” as it has sometimes been portrayed, but noted that it was the eighteenth-century protagonists themselves, not nineteenth-century pietists like Tracy, who “invented” the Awakening. They utilized the word “awakening,” among other descriptors, to signify what they deemed to be a significant transatlantic spiritual event taking place in their midst.⁶

Irrespective of the origins of the name and its long-term consequences for the American Revolution or other eighteenth-century cultural movements, the Presbyterians of the middle colonies who experienced the revivals interpreted them as a significant event, one with sufficient cause to argue and debate among themselves, and ultimately to divide. Those arguments, debates, and divisions touched less on the general topic of revivalism (which itself is a problematic word that is utilized to describe a variety of doctrines and practices) and more on specific issues of doctrine and practice, such as itinerancy (i.e. the question of whether a traveling minister could preach inside the parish boundaries of another without permission), soteriology (i.e. the question of whether one needed a conversion experience in order to be a genuine Christian), and ecclesiology (i.e. the question of whether a true church was defined by the geographical boundaries of a parish or by the voluntary association of believers), among other, lesser factors.⁷

Generally speaking, those who supported itinerancy did so because they believed in the necessity of conversion and in the voluntary model of the church. They called themselves “the New Side” and represented the revivalist party in the Church. Likewise, generally speaking, those who opposed itinerancy supported the parish model of the church and did not believe in the necessity of conversion for salvation. They were dubbed “the Old Side” and represented the anti-revivalist party. In New England, the Congregationalists who were engaged in parallel debates used the similar labels of “Old Lights” and “New Lights” for their nomenclature.⁸ As has been demonstrated elsewhere, the chronological labels of “new” and “old” were less-than-accurate descriptors of the relative origins of these competing ideas than were other factors, such as geographical origins or place of schooling.⁹ Nevertheless, they demonstrated that, beginning in the 1730s and continuing until the eve of the American Revolution, American Presbyterianism was largely divided into two camps with widely different foundational assumptions about their mission in the New World.

William Bertram at Derry and John Elder at Paxton, both trained in the Old World, were both Old Side partisans and bitterly opposed intrusions of itinerant ministers or strange doctrine into their parishes. Bertram died early in the controversies, but Elder was a signer of the Protest of 1741, a vituperative document signed by eight lay elders and twelve ministers that serves as an excellent exhibit of the perceptions of Old Side partisans. The Protest was a significant contributor to the Schism that year, in which the Synod of Philadelphia, which governed all Presbyterians in the North American colonies, divided into two competing entities. Thus, as a result of itinerancy and division, the Presbyterian attachment to the parish model of church governance gave way to a pluralism characterized by competition and shared boundaries, an intramural pluralism that was soon to be complicated by the presence of other and more widely varied religious options within these same communities. One finds here in the far corners of the Pennsylvania frontier the same pressures of religious diversity that were being encountered in the cities of the Eastern seaboard and, as a result, the first stirring of the multi-denominational, occasionally tolerant, even increasingly secular vision of the New World that was to eventually characterize the United States of America.

As evidence of this new vision, an energetic and controversial New Side minister was assigned by the New Castle (New Side) Presbytery to itinerate in the area. John Roan (born before 1724, died 1775) had already caused conflict in the Virginia colony with his itinerant preaching. Having been accused of blasphemy against the Anglican Church, he fled the colony and the Synod of Philadelphia found it necessary to address a letter of apology to Governor Gooch in an attempt to ensure a hospitable environment for other Presbyterian ministers working more quietly within the colony's boundaries.¹⁰ Having relocated to Pennsylvania and having been assigned by his new presbytery to serve as gadfly on the Susquehanna, Roan proved popular and successful in attracting individuals to his revivalist message.

In the end, both churches—Paxton and Derry—experienced schism largely as a result of Roan's presence. The New Side majority of the Derry congregation invited Roan to serve as their pastor; the Old Side minority there joined with Elder's congregation a few miles away in Paxton. The Old Side majority of the Paxton congregation retained Elder as their pastor; the New Side minority there formed their own congregation just two miles east of Paxton and invited Roan to be their pastor.¹¹ A similar division occurred in James Anderson's former congregation at Donegal. The New Side minority there formed their own congregation, known as Swatara, and also invited

Roan to serve.¹² Thus, all three original congregations divided, although only Roan had care of each of the three New Side churches. These congregations remained separate for thirty years, until Roan's death in 1775. Therefore, they provide not only a helpful glimpse of the fractures at a point in time, but also an opportunity to examine trends within their communities over the course of several decades.

The Influence of Origins

Why, then, did congregations like those at Paxton, Derry, and Donegal divide during the era of the Great Awakening? Why did they not simply absorb their differences within themselves, as they had done a decade earlier in a debate over subscription?¹³ Previous research on Scots-Irish Presbyterians and other ethno-religious groups in other communities have suggested several possible factors. One of these is that the origin of the minister determined his attitude toward the revivals and thus determined to a large degree the leaning of his congregation. Leonard Trinterud had made the argument in his classic 1949 work, *The Forming of an American Tradition*, that the Scots-Irish were typically opposed to the revival, while those born and educated in New England, old England, Wales, or in the colonies were more likely to support the revival. Indeed, Trinterud's basic argument appears valid in the context of these frontier churches at first glance. Elder was born in Ulster and educated there. Roan was originally from Virginia and was educated in the "Log College," a very humble and ultimately controversial institution in Neshaminy, Pennsylvania, founded and led by William Tennent (1673–1746), father of the New Side leader Gilbert Tennent (1703–1764).¹⁴

This pattern of correlation between origins and theology apparently had an even wider dispersal on the frontier than this contrast between Elder and Roan would reveal. One can find it in the other members of the Donegal Presbytery, which was the original frontier judicatory for the Presbyterians. Donegal was responsible for a very broad range of territory that east of the Susquehanna included much of Chester and all of Lancaster Counties, and west of the Susquehanna all of Pennsylvania, as far as those lands were settled. The presbytery's responsibilities even included the Shenandoah Valley of Virginia. It was founded in 1732 out of the New Castle (Delaware) Presbytery in order to serve the needs of the massive influx of Scots-Irish Presbyterians

who were flooding the Pennsylvania frontier. The earliest members of the presbytery were James Anderson (at Donegal), William Bertram (Derry), William Orr (Nottingham), John Boyd (Upper Octorara), and Thomas Craighead (Pequea).¹⁵

To measure this correlation between origins and theological leanings, an analysis of the background of each of the ministers of the Presbytery during this generation was performed and each was compared to what could be determined of the minister's attitude toward revivalism. Table 1, "Donegal Presbytery Ministers," below, consists of a list of the name of every member of the Donegal Presbytery between 1732–1758, along with as much as can be determined about his birth, education, licensing, ordination, service, and "party." The "party" designation refers to either "Old Side" or "New Side." It is obvious from the data that Donegal was overwhelmingly Old Side in its allegiances.

Table 1. Donegal Presbytery Ministers (1732–1758)¹⁶
Listed in the order by which they joined the presbytery.

NAME	BORN	EDUCATED	LICENSED	CHURCH(ES) SERVED	"PARTY"
James Anderson	Scotland	Scotland	Scotland	Donegal	Old Side
Adam Boyd	Ireland	Scotland?		Octorara and Pequea	Old Side
John Thomson		Ireland	Ireland	Chestnut Level and Virginia	Old Side
William Orr	Ireland?		New Castle	Nottingham	Old Side
William Bertram	Scotland	Scotland	Ireland	Paxton and Derry	Old Side
Samuel Black	Ireland?		New Castle	Forks of the Brandywine, Conewago, and Virginia	Old Side
Alexander Craighead	America?		Donegal	Middle Octorara	New Side
Thomas Craighead	Scotland	Scotland	Ireland	Pequea, Hopewell, And Pennsboro	New Side
Samuel Caven	Ireland?		Ireland	Falling Spring	Old Side
John Elder	Ireland	Ireland	Donegal	Paxton	Old Side
Richard Sankey	Ireland?		Donegal	Hanover	Old Side
John Craig	Ireland	America	Donegal	Virginia	Old Side
Samuel Thomson			New Castle	Upper and Lower Pennsboro	Old Side
David Alexander	Ireland	Log College?	New Castle	Pequea	New Side

SCHISM ON THE SUSQUEHANNA

Table 1. Donegal Presbytery Ministers (1732–1758)¹⁶
Listed in the order by which they joined the presbytery. (Continued)

NAME	BORN	EDUCATED	LICENSED	CHURCH(ES) SERVED	"PARTY"
John Paul			Ireland	Nottingham	?
Alexander McDowell	Ireland		Donegal	Virginia and Nottingham	Old Side
Hamilton Bell		Log College	Philadelphia	Donegal	New Side
John Hindman			Donegal	Virginia	Old Side
John Steel			Ireland	West Conococheague and Carlisle	Old Side
Joseph Tate			Donegal	Donegal and Chestnut Level	Old Side
Sampson Smith	Ireland?		Donegal	Chestnut Level	Old Side
Robert McMordie				Marsh Creek	?

Table 2, "New Castle (New Side) Presbytery Ministers," below, gives the same information for those New Castle (New Side) ministers who served in areas overlapping the Donegal Presbytery.¹⁷ The New Castle (New Side) Presbytery was a creation of the New Side Synod of New York, which itself was a creation of the revivalists after the schism. This presbytery, which covered an immense territory, overlapped the boundaries of the Donegal Presbytery. This unusual overlap of jurisdictions left revivalists and their opponents serving within the same area, or, as is indicated elsewhere in this essay, in the same communities.

Table 2. New Castle (New Side) Presbytery Ministers¹⁸
Restricted to those whose ministries overlapped boundaries of the Donegal Presbytery

NAME	BORN	EDUCATED	LICENSED	CHURCH(ES) SERVED	"PARTY"
Robert Smith	Ireland	America	New Castle	Pequea and Leacock	New Side
John Roan	Ireland	Log College	New Castle?	Virginia, Derry, Paxton, and Donegal	New Side
Andrew Sterling			New Castle	Upper Octorara	New Side
John Hoge				Virginia, Swatara	New Side
George Duffield	Pennsylvania	Princeton	New Castle	Carlisle, Monahan, and Philadelphia	New Side
John Blair	Ireland	Log College	New Castle	Big Springs, Rocky Springs, Middle Springs	New Side

These tables reveal some dramatic differences in the educational backgrounds of members of the two parties: most of the Donegal ministers

had been educated in Scotland or Ireland and a sizable minority was licensed there as well. On the other hand, a number of the New Castle ministers were educated at the Log College in Neshaminy and all were licensed in America. Trinterud had proposed that those who were born or educated in America were more likely to support the revivals than those born or educated in the British Isles and the evidence seems to support this conjecture for those who were serving in the frontier parishes.

Yet that distinction does not explain the differences between the *laity* in their churches, the overwhelming majority of whom were first-generation Scots-Irish immigrants. Would they have chosen one church or another because of pietistic practices brought from different homelands? In the case of Paxton and Derry, did they even represent different homelands? To help answer these questions, a surname analysis, utilizing existing land and tax records from the townships and membership records from the churches, was completed. It revealed no appreciable difference in the ethnic or geographical composition of the two communities. According to Trinterud's thesis, the members of both these churches should have been predominantly anti-revival. The majority at Paxton was, but the majority at Derry was not. Significant numbers of Scots-Irish Presbyterians in Derry had become revivalist in their doctrine and practice, to the point where they separated from their co-religionists in order to worship and practice in accordance with these beliefs, despite a common place of origin.

This observation reinforces the argument of Trinterud's critics in recent decades, who have noted significant evidence of revivalism and pietism among the Scots in both Scotland and Ireland, even prior to the waves of immigration to America. They were not devoid of this strain of Calvinism in their Old World experience.¹⁹ These observations throw doubt upon the "place of origin" argument. While it may have some limited explanatory power for at least one community (Paxton) and almost certainly for the ministers involved, by itself it is not sufficient for understanding the dynamics that led these congregations to divide. Another factor must be involved.

The Meaning of Mobility

Another line of inquiry is community mobility. Perhaps the population of one community was more transient than that of another. This question stems from a long line of historiographic inquiry originating with the late

nineteenth-century “frontier thesis” of Frederick Jackson Turner.²⁰ Historians of the New England revivals noted correlations between mobility in and out of specific communities (as opposed to social mobility of individuals within them) and socioeconomic status. Would, then, a well-settled and established community be more inclined to prefer a particular church, doctrine, or minister as opposed to a highly fluid community? Would those on the move have different perspectives on issues associated with the revivals than those who were settled for generations? One could imagine, for instance, that itinerancy as a concept would have presented few difficulties for those laity who were itinerants themselves, temporary homesteaders or recently-arrived settlers who had not yet been fully incorporated into a “community” of individuals who were still relatively isolated from each other.

In the context of the colonial Presbyterian frontier, it is noteworthy that the Paxton and Derry communities, defined by the Lancaster County townships that bore their names, were both very highly mobile. George Franz’s demographic study of the community of Paxton helped to arrive at this conclusion. Using a couple of two-year snapshots for which sufficient data was available, Franz determined that that Derry’s mobility rate in 1759–60 was an enormous 71%; Paxton’s was even higher at 83%. A decade later (1771–72), Derry’s rate had dropped to 55% and Paxton’s to 44%. The rates of neighboring townships were similar: Donegal, 33%; Londonderry, 53%; and Hanover, 43%.²¹ These patterns reflect at least two factors—the location of these communities along a primary migration route to the west and southwest, as noted earlier, and the continuing waves of Scots-Irish immigration to the colonies prior to and into the era of the Revolution. James Leyburn had distinguished between five distinct waves of Scots-Irish immigration to the colonies between 1717 and 1775, most of which entered through Philadelphia and passed through south-central Pennsylvania.²²

In terms of interpreting the community divisions that occurred in conjunction with the Presbyterian schism, however, the relatively insignificant difference in mobility rates between the two townships is not very helpful. Had one community been relatively stable and the other relatively fluid, it would have been easier to see any correlations between mobility and choice of congregation, minister, or theology. It would have been particularly interesting to determine if there were significant differences between settled and newly-arriving (or soon-departing) families. For instance, in his study of the congregation at Woodbury, Connecticut, during the New England revivals, James Walsh had noted that “new families were important in the Awakening

but not nearly so important as the older church families.”²³ The growth of the church in Woodbury, he found, was more attributable to the influx of the children of those who were already communicants when the revivals broke out. Unfortunately, such a pattern cannot be discerned for Paxton and Derry due to these high rates of mobility in and out of the communities.

Class Conflict on the Frontier

A third possible differential that would explain the decisions of individuals and families to align themselves with either side of the Presbyterian divide may be found in the socioeconomic status of the decision-makers. This argument has some considerable precedence, in that a generation ago historians of the New England revivals discovered that the New Lights tended to be younger, poorer, and more mobile than their Old Light counterparts. Such observations drew heavily upon the groundbreaking studies in social history based on Connecticut towns, such as those of James Walsh on Woodbury, Gerald Moran on Norwich, and Peter Onuf on New London, among others. These studies were particularly helpful in understanding social and economic transitions over generations and especially through periods of significant demographic or cultural pressures, such as the revivals.²⁴ Contrasting these dynamic portraits of these communities is the more static understanding of Michael Zuckerman, who argued that New England towns were largely unchanged and nearly uniform (within themselves) during the colonial period. Those who disagreed with the dominant paradigm were invited to separate but were not tolerated within the existing towns.²⁵ Which pattern, if either, applies more readily to the Pennsylvania frontier communities of this study?

Before engaging that question in terms of the revivals, it may be helpful to note that other studies of eighteenth-century Pennsylvania religious and ethnic communities have discovered that class differences, as defined by socioeconomic status, have correlated well to other broad social, cultural, or political trends, separate from the Awakening.²⁶ For instance, in their study of the American Revolution in Pennsylvania, John B. Frantz and William Pencak noted that there were in actuality “three revolutions” in Pennsylvania during the Revolutionary Era, each response indicative of a particular geographical and religious group. In that context, the more marginalized and less established settlers of the frontier communities engaged the conflict with the

British as just one more in a series of conflicts for basic survival rather than as the passionate rejection of imperial authority that characterized their fellow citizens in the more established communities outside of Philadelphia.²⁷

In a more recent work, Jack D. Marietta and G.S. Rowe explore the causes of colonial Pennsylvania's high crime rate, in comparison to the other colonies. In spite of its reputation for enlightened religious toleration and open immigration, eighteenth-century Pennsylvania was a violent and crime-ridden place. Marietta and Rowe identify its volatile mix of socioeconomic variables as one of the prevailing contributing factors.²⁸ Finally, Karen Guenther's study of Quakers in Berks County (instead of in or near the city of Philadelphia, where they are usually studied) portrays how the declining socioeconomic influence of the Quakers, particularly in a region in which they were a misunderstood minority, impacted their political standing in the colony they had founded.²⁹ In each of these cases, socioeconomic factors (which were often intertwined with religious or ethnic identity) were found to correlate with broad social or cultural trends in colonial Pennsylvania.

One would expect this pattern to be universal. Does the economic variable apply to the Scots-Irish religious conflicts in mid-eighteenth-century Pennsylvania? And if so, does it apply in the relatively isolated and comparatively flattened social hierarchies of these frontier communities?³⁰ Is there a class component to this division of congregations at Paxton and Derry? Helpfully, Franz's study of Paxton Township drew comparisons between Paxton and surrounding townships in terms of the socioeconomic status of their citizens. The available data was amassed in the latter years of the schism between these churches, but since the years of the Paxton/Derry schism transcended the relatively short era of the Awakening proper and since property was likely to remain in the hands of settled families, it is helpful for long-term analysis. Franz's work was published in 1989, but contains the most recent published data on these communities. This author's current research into these communities appears to consistently confirm Franz's earlier study.

Franz's research demonstrates that there was no appreciable difference in average wealth between the residents of mostly Old Side Paxton Township and the residents of Derry Township, a majority of whom were New Side. For example, in 1771, the average landholding in Paxton was 105 acres; in Derry it was 103. True, eleven years later (in 1782) the average Derry landholder had more than his Paxton counterpart: 154 acres compared to 131 acres.

Taken by itself, this ratio could indicate a reversal of usual patterns, which typically reflect greater wealth on the part of Old Side adherents, but the 1782 data reveals community data seven years after the death of John Roan, the chief divisive personality in these communities, and after the American Revolution had changed the community dynamics appreciably.³¹ The 1771 data are more reliable for the purpose of this study.

Thus, from Franz's data, there appears to have been no appreciable difference in landed wealth or mobility between the two townships in the decades of the church schism. However, if there were no discernable disparity between the general *populations* of the townships, perhaps there was yet a variation between *members* of the churches. The two groups are not coterminous. Old Side residents of Derry Township, for instance, would have had to travel to Paxton for church. Furthermore, by the time from which Franz's data is compiled, the Scots-Irish Presbyterians were still the dominant ethno-religious group in these communities but by no means the only one. For instance, the Harris family members were Anglicans who communed with the Presbyterians until such time that sufficient other Church of England men arrived to form their own congregations. The Germans, however, were the largest of the new immigrant groups, arriving in large numbers in mid-century and dominating the slightly older Scots-Irish communities east and south of Paxton and Derry and contributing quite a few Lutherans, Moravians, German Reformed, and Mennonites to the religious mix of south-central Pennsylvania.³² One cannot assume, therefore, that the residents of Paxton and Derry Townships were necessarily all Scots-Irish after the end of the Seven Years' War.³³

A comparison of the relative wealth of specific members of both the New Side and Old Side congregations would reveal any significant distinction between these churches in terms of socioeconomic status. This task proved difficult, for no original church membership records survive for any of the three congregations (Old Side Paxton, New Side Paxton, and New Side Derry). However, a limited list of Old Side members and even more limited list of New Side members has been reconstructed from several sources: cemetery records,³⁴ marriage records of the ministers,³⁵ and a 1754 call to John Elder from the joint Old Side congregation.³⁶ This call was apparently issued after enough years had passed for all to realize that the schisms were somewhat permanent. Although the Paxton congregation had originally called Elder sixteen years previously, the joint Old Side congregation, including the Old Side minority from Derry Township, issued another call in 1754, perhaps

at Elder's initiative, as it provided an opportunity to reaffirm his authority as well as perhaps to establish fresh compensation standards for his newly-expanded parish. It is the most definitive document for determining Old Side church membership. Primarily because of it, identifiable Old Side members are far more numerous (158 on the reconstructed list) than New Side members (54 on the reconstructed list). This should not be construed as an indication of the relative popularity of the two parties, which cannot be determined from this data.³⁷

The names on the reconstructed membership lists were then compared with tax rolls and land assessments to determine relative average wealth.³⁸ Here the results *do* indicate, at least tentatively, a discernible difference in economic status between the two parties, with the Old Side partisans possessing greater wealth than their New Side counterparts. For instance, the average tax assessment among identifiable New Side members in 1740 was three shillings, two pence. Among identifiable Old Side members it was eleven shillings, eleven pence. This data is hampered by the scarcity of data, however. There were very few identifiable individuals from either side in these tax rolls. The 1785 land assessment, while conducted late—a decade after the reunion of the churches—does reveal a similar pattern, however. Identifiable New Side members owed an average of one pound, one shilling, and six pence. Identifiable Old Side members, on the other hand, owed an average of two pounds, nine pence.

An analysis of land holdings provides greater statistical validity to this interpretation. A land assessment conducted in 1780 revealed that the average identifiable New Side member owned 132 acres, while the average identifiable Old Side member owned 247 acres. See Table 3, "Land Ownership of Identifiable New Side Members" and Table 4, "Land Ownership of Identifiable Old Side Members," below. These results are not definitive, for they do not take into account non-landholding members nor those had not bothered to take out warrants, nor do they include New Side members who were without property. Land warrants are more useful for they are not dependent on sources from only the end of the 30-year schism. Warrants granted to identifiable New Side members throughout the years of the division averaged 129 acres each. Old Side land warrants averaged 213 acres.

PENNSYLVANIA HISTORY

Table 3. Land Ownership of Identifiable New Side Members³⁹ (Paxton and Derry)
A total of 51 New Side members were identified. Only those with property are listed.

NAME	1780 LAND ASSESSMENT (ACRES)	LAND WARRANT (ACRES)
Carson, Richard	80	
Carson, William	355	
Cochran, James	125	
Deyarnund, Henry		50
Duncan, James		200
Hogin, Patrick	80	
Lusk, John	100	
McHargue, Alexander	100	127
Neely, Charles		30
Roan, John		100
Russell, James		80
Smith, Peter	150	
Steele, John		220
Whitley, Robert		250
Wiley, Thomas	100	
Wilkie, John	100	
AVERAGE	132	129

Table 4. Land Ownership of Identifiable Old Side Members⁴⁰ (Paxton and Derry)
A total of 156 Old Side members were identified. Only those with property are listed.

NAME	1780 LAND ASSESSMENT (ACRES)	LAND WARRANT (ACRES)
Armstrong, Robert		200
Armstrong, William		200
Awl, Jacob	217	
Bell, William	200	200
Black, Hugh		200
Brown, William	222	200
Carothers, James		100
Cavit, John	170	100
Chambers, Robert	600	150
Clarke, Charles		200
Collier, James	200	
Corbit, Peter		100
Cowden, Matthew		300
Crouch, James	300	
Dickey, Moses		100
Elder, John	397	264
Findlay, John		200

SCHISM ON THE SUSQUEHANNA

Table 4. Land Ownership of Identifiable Old Side Members⁴⁰ (Paxton and Derry)
A total of 156 Old Side members were identified. Only those with property are listed. (Continued)

NAME	1780 LAND ASSESSMENT (ACRES)	LAND WARRANT (ACRES)
Forster, John	700	200
Forster, Thomas (1)		200
Forster, Thomas (2)		200
Foster, David		100
Foster, James		200
Foster, John		200
Fulton, Joseph	170	
Galbraith, James		150
Galbraith, Samuel		200
Gilchrist, Robert	222	
Gillespy, Patrick		150
Gray, George	200	
Gray, John		550
Gray, Joseph	200	
Hannah, Andrew		150
Harris, John Jr.	650	
Harris, William		50
Hays, Hugh		250
Hilton, John	93	90
Houston, Andrew	100	
Hunter, Samuel		300
Kelso, William	200	
Kerr, William	221	258
King, Thomas	116	
Laird, Matthew		200
Laird, William	263	
Mays, Thomas		500
McArthur, Thomas	200	
McIlvain, Mary		100
Means, John	230	200
Montgomery, Robert	90	
Montgomery, William	150	
Moore, Andrew		200
Neal, John		200
Patton, David	280	300
Potts, James		200
Reney, William		500
Renick, Henry		50
Renick, Thomas		200

PENNSYLVANIA HISTORY

Table 4. Land Ownership of Identifiable Old Side Members⁴⁰ (Paxton and Derry)
A total of 156 Old Side members were identified. Only those with property are listed. (Continued)

NAME	1780 LAND ASSESSMENT (ACRES)	LAND WARRANT (ACRES)
Rutherford, Thomas		150
Simpson, Samuel	230	200
Simpson, Thomas		200
Stephen, Andrew	304	450
Stewart, Andrew	232	
Taylor, Mathias		250
Walker, David		50
Walker, Henry		600
Walker, John (1)		100
Walker, John (2)		50
Wallace, James	150	300
Wiggins, John Jr.		150
Wilson, Alexander	100	200
Wilson, Joseph		200
Wilson, Williams		400
AVERAGE	247	213

Despite obvious limitations, the data consistently reveal the same pattern: identifiable Old Side members were wealthier than identifiable New Side members in the Paxton and Derry communities. The difference may be greater still because a smaller percentage of New Side members have been identified. Due to the nature of the sources, it is likely that that unidentified New Side members had even less property.

Why were the New Side adherents poorer? It may be that they were younger and thus had not yet established themselves or inherited land from their fathers. Or they may have been newcomers to these communities. Unfortunately, there is insufficient information to identify those characteristics. Ages or dates of entry into the community for identifiable individuals are not obtainable, at least not on a scale large enough for statistically valid comparisons.

The Attraction of Revivalism

Why would those poorer (or younger, or less established) be more likely to support the revivals than those who were wealthier (or older, or more firmly established)?⁴¹ Perhaps here the answer revolves around the character of the

ministers. Old Side ministers like Elder and Bertram purposely identified with those members of their community who possessed economic and social status, as evidenced by the stature of the members of their congregations. Elder kept the allegiance of the wealthier or more reputable families in the Paxton community (the founding families of the soon-to-be state capital), not only because these wealthier members contributed most toward the minister's salary, but also because the church authorities and other community leaders cooperated closely with each other in matters that far exceeded the confines of the church's ministry. Elder captained the local militia, served as Indian negotiator, and corresponded with colonial authorities; it was only natural that he would be identified in the mind of his parishioners with individuals of status and authority.⁴²

John Roan, on the other hand, would have been attractive to those of lower status within the community. He was of humble origins, educated in a Log College, and sent to challenge the authority of Elder in his own community. In other words, it would have been easy for Roan to play the populist, or to be perceived as a populist hero. Nothing survives of his sermons, or of any diaries or journals he may have kept, so one cannot definitively ascertain the content of his ministry. Yet it is intriguing to imagine that the divisions in Paxton and Derry, may have been based, at least in part, on issues of class and that those issues may have been personally illustrated in the contrast of personalities exemplified by Roan and Elder.

Is it possible that the lower classes would also find something attractive in the message of the revivalists? The laity was capable of comprehending the fundamental disagreements between the Old and New Sides. They knew enough theology to charge some of their ministers with heresy. Marilyn Westerkamp maintains that the New Side attracted widespread support among the laity because the New Side ecclesiology encouraged—even required—the laity to assume greater prominence. Following Roan gave them power in the church for the first time. There was also the attraction of the revival message, which declared that the conversion experience was, in essence, the great equalizer: that poor and uneducated converts possessed greater spiritual authority and discernment than ministers trained in the greatest universities of the British Isles or than rich landowners to whom the lower classes paid rent as tenant farmers. This pattern should be familiar, as the “low-church” (i.e. democratic) and revivalistic forms of Christianity have been linked frequently with populist movements or marginalized peoples—from the explosive growth of the Baptist and Methodist movements in the

American West in the early nineteenth century, to the rise of Pentecostalism among African-American and poor white communities in the early decades of twentieth-century North America, and even to the spread of that same Pentecostalism in Latin America and elsewhere later in the century.

This link between social class and theological commitments has not been adequately explored by historians of colonial Pennsylvania. The apparent correlation between socioeconomic status and religious division in these communities offers provocation for further inquiry in other environments and among other ethno-religious groups. Verification of the conclusions indicated for these frontier churches by studies in other divided communities could result not only in significant re-interpretation of the Presbyterian revivals but also in a more nuanced understanding of frontier community dynamics.

“Irregular, Unaccountable, and Profane:” The Example of William Orr

Practically every Presbyterian minister on the colonial Pennsylvania frontier experienced difficulty maintaining harmonious relations with the leaders of his congregation. One by one, the clergymen were brought before the presbytery, usually by members of their own congregation but sometimes by their own colleagues, on charges ranging from drunkenness to inappropriate relations with the opposite sex, from doctrinal error to stubborn and unyielding temperaments. At this distance it is difficult to determine exactly the reasons for this high level of conflict—whether the frontier life attracted a certain rough-and-tumble kind of minister, whether these were patient, dutiful men who were unfairly treated by their congregations, or whether the roots of the conflict were not in either party, but in the system in which early American Presbyterianism was developed. The answer may lie in all three.

Nevertheless, there were one or two, like William Orr, who appeared particularly divisive. Orr was a young immigrant from Ireland, apparently a recent theology graduate, when he was received and licensed by the New Castle (Delaware) Presbytery in 1730. His *alma mater* is not known but, given his later inclinations, it may have been one that exposed him to Anglicanism, a relevant question given his behavior. In 1732, the Donegal Presbytery was formed and Orr was assigned to pastor one of its congregations—the church on the Lower Octarara, otherwise known as Nottingham, in what is now Chester County, Pennsylvania. He was there ordained.⁴³

The people of the Lower Octorara had been receiving supply ministers since 1725, but Orr was their first permanent, settled minister. Even before his call, however, there had been disputes at Nottingham. First, the congregation fought over where the meetinghouse would be established.⁴⁴ Then, they fought over whom they should call as their minister, the majority preferring Orr but a sizable minority desiring to have John Wilson serve them. Apparently, the primary argument against Wilson was that he was among the non-subscribers—those who were not willing to acknowledge the Westminster documents (the Confession of Faith, Catechisms, and Directory of Public Worship) as authoritative for all Presbyterians. Some were “shocked at the possibility of having a minister admitted into our connection who had a difficulty concerning an iota of it.”⁴⁵ Given this strong attachment to subscription—another divisive issue in American Presbyterianism—it seems likely that the congregation was composed primarily of Scots-Irish immigrants.⁴⁶

Orr received the call, but just months after his installation as minister, accusations of false doctrine were raised against him. First, John Kirkpatrick, an elder in the congregation, accused Orr of preaching Arminianism, a charge that was dismissed by the presbytery after hearing Orr’s explanation. Then, he was charged with performing a marriage for another minister, Alexander Campbell, with a license that seemed to recognize the authority of the Anglican Bishop of London.⁴⁷ He was further accused of other, non-doctrinal transgressions until the presbytery appointed a special commission to hear the objections of the lay complainants and reach a decision. Kirkpatrick, Orr’s leading lay critic, was not permitted to address the commission and was even suspended from church privileges for the “rashness and imprudence” of his accusations. Orr was subsequently acquitted of all the charges, but was also chastised by the commission for his “insulting, indolent, and reproachful” conduct.⁴⁸

His troubles were far from over, however. Several Nottingham elders filed an appeal to the Synod of Philadelphia. The synod responded with another commission, which ultimately reversed the presbytery’s decision. Kirkpatrick and his adherents were heard and believed; they received an apology and were restored to full privileges. Orr also confessed to inconsistently applying discipline in his dealings with his parishioners, and apologized. Even the apology was not enough to calm those troubled waters, however. Orr requested a demission from Nottingham, citing the controversies as cause. He also abruptly stopped preaching from his pulpit. Because of the

seriousness of the situation and the resulting schism in the congregation, the presbytery held a meeting at Nottingham in 1735. "After three days of contradictory testimony, the presbytery granted a demission on the grounds that neither Orr, the people, the session, nor the presbytery saw any hope of his further usefulness there."⁴⁹

Because the presbytery rebuked all the participants in this ugly drama, Kirkpatrick's party refused to let the matter die. He appealed once more. This time the presbytery cleared his reputation and, apparently having had their fill of Orr, declared that they could not give him a certificate of good standing. Orr responded by casting aspersions on the presbytery, and sued several leaders of the congregation regarding his salary. The presbytery, having had enough, both urged the congregation to pay the arrears in Orr's salary (there is no mention that they ever did) and officially censured Orr for his inappropriate behavior.

Orr left not only Nottingham, but also the Presbyterian Church. He found his way to London and to the Church of England. He was ordained by the Bishop of London as a deacon and then as a priest in 1736. He was assigned to the charges of St. Philip and St. Paul in South Carolina, where his greatest apparent achievement was increasing the number of communicants from eight to 34 by 1743. He later served two other Anglican parishes before his death in 1755.⁵⁰

Three things are apparent from Orr's story. First, it is obvious that William Orr was temperamentally prone to conflict. His epitaph in the Donegal Presbytery was that of an "irregular, unaccountable, profane, and disagreeable" man. Second, it is likewise obvious that the Nottingham congregation was also conflict-driven. Orr's successor, John Paul, also experienced difficulties at Nottingham. Apparently, calling someone with Orr's temperament simply made the possibility of disharmony at that congregation even more certain than it would have been otherwise. Third, the Nottingham incident also reveals the tremendous power that the laity possessed in their relations with the clergy. Not only did the Nottingham congregation force Orr out by not paying his salary, they also repeatedly induced the presbytery or synod to hear their complaints. And, in the end, to use Westerkamp's phrase, they "triumphed".

William Orr illustrates the challenges of tracing the roots of congregational conflict during the era of the colonial Presbyterian revivals. As this essay has demonstrated, some of it was the result of differences of opinion over deeply held theological beliefs (or the documentary authorities that articulated those beliefs) about church, salvation, and spiritual authority.

SCHISM ON THE SUSQUEHANNA

Some of it was doubtless the result of economic cleavages between settled landowners and newer, younger, or poorer immigrants. Some of it was due to the character and personalities of the ministers themselves, particularly in isolated communities in which the revivals introduced competition into the parish model of church governance. And some of it can be traced to the pressures of living in a frontier environment in which community structures were incomplete or fluid, the physical landscape was harsh or unfamiliar, and the opportunities for early death or other disaster were plentiful.

But the conflicts surrounding William Orr, as well as the means by which they were addressed or resolved, also illustrate that changes were afoot that, in the decades following, would deeply impact not only the Presbyterians in America, but also most other traditions imported from the Old World. The pluralistic, laity-driven, consumer-oriented religious environment that has characterized American Christianity over the past two centuries—and which has distinguished it from both its antecedents and its contemporaries in Europe—had its roots in the decisions faced and choices made by ministers like Orr, Elder, and Roan, along with thousands of now-anonymous laypersons, during this critical period of upheaval, renewal, and experimentation in the middle decades of the eighteenth century.

NOTES

1. Because of the width of the Susquehanna, there were only a few fordable places. Therefore Harris' Ferry became and remained one of the primary stops on the route westward across the mountains or southwestward into the Cumberland and Shenandoah Valleys. Many of the settlers of western Pennsylvania, western Maryland, and even western Virginia crossed at Harris' Ferry. In 1785 Harris's son, John Harris Jr., founded on the family property the city that bears his name. In 1812 it was named the state capital. Harris's original 800 acre grant is now occupied by the central commercial district of the city.
2. The date at which services were first offered at Paxton is a subject of dispute. The congregation claims an impossibly early date of 1719.
3. For additional information on Elder's career, see William H. Egle, *Parson Elder: A Biographical Sketch* (Harrisburg: Harrisburg Publishing Company, 1871); and Richard Webster, *A History of the Presbyterian Church in America* (Philadelphia: J.M. Wilson, 1857), 454–56. Some of Elder's correspondence and letters are still preserved at the Dauphin County (Pennsylvania) Historical Society, Harrisburg. Because of his leadership of the Paxton Rangers and despite his refusal to participate in the raid, he has been historically linked with the "Paxton Boys Rebellion" of 1763.
4. Joseph Tracy, *The Great Awakening: A History of the Revival of Religion in the Time Of Edwards and Whitefield*, reprint. (New York: Arno Press, 1969).

PENNSYLVANIA HISTORY

5. Among other differences, the First Awakening was largely Calvinist, while the Second was Arminian in theology; the First occurred primarily on the Eastern seaboard, while the Second was largely a Western movement; the First was rooted in the established churches transported from the Old World, such as the Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Lutherans, and even Anglicans; the Second was rooted in newer movements, such as the Baptists, Methodists, and Disciples of Christ.
6. Jon Butler, "Enthusiasm Described and Decried: The Great Awakening as Interpretative Fiction," *Journal of American History*, 69 (September 1982): 305–25; and Frank Lambert, *Inventing the "Great Awakening"* (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1999). One of the earliest propagandists for the Awakening was Thomas Prince of Boston, who published a periodical entitled *Christian History* between 1741 and 1743. And Jonathan Edwards, probably the best known American revivalist leader, was careful to collect and circulate reports of the revivals in an early public relations campaign.
7. There is a need for a comprehensive history of revivalism across historical and cultural contexts. For the American context, the best introductory text remains William G. McLoughlin, *Revivals, Awakenings, and Reform* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980).
8. Classic histories of the Great Awakening in New England include Edwin Gausted, *The Great Awakening in New England* (Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, 1965) and Alan Heimert, *Religion and the American Mind* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966).
9. This is the argument of Leonard Trinterud, *The Forming of an American Tradition: A Re-Examination of Colonial Presbyterianism* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1949). See also Anthony L. Blair, "Shattered and Divided: Itinerancy, Ecclesiology, and Revivalism in the Great Awakening," *Journal of Presbyterian History* (Spring, 2003): 18–34. For the New England context, see Cedric B. Cowing, *The Saving Remnant: Religion and the Settling of New England* (Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 1995).
10. For more information on Roan, see Richard Webster, *A History of the Presbyterian Church in America* (Philadelphia: J.M. Wilson, 1857), 498–500; Rhys Isaac, *The Transformation of Virginia, 1740–1790* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982), 149; and *Records of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, 1706–1788*, reprint. (Philadelphia: Arno Press, 1969), 182–83.
11. This meetinghouse for the "New Side" Paxton congregation no longer exists, but a small cemetery at the site, on New Side Road, is maintained by the Daughters of the American Revolution.
12. All three congregations (Paxton, Derry, and Swatara) took their names from the creeks by which the original church buildings were erected. The creek names were usually derivative of a Native American appellation. This was consistent with the pattern of Presbyterian church planting on the frontier; most such churches were built near water and, because they typically pre-dated the market towns that arose in the coming decades, many of the extant colonial churches are still located in very rural areas.
13. "Subscription" refers to a mandatory agreement (often accompanied by a signature) with certain doctrinal statements. In the late 1720s, the Presbyterians in North America debated over whether subscription to the Westminster Confession of Faith and related documents was necessary for ordination. While the conversation was certainly emotional, they managed to resolve this issue (in favor of subscription) without resorting to schism.
14. The Log College and other, less-well-known boarding schools filled temporarily the need for American-based institutions of training for the Presbyterian ministry. The College of New Jersey

SCHISM ON THE SUSQUEHANNA

(eventually Princeton College) was founded by mid-century as the long-term solution to this problem. For an introduction to Gilbert Tennent, his father and brothers, and other members of the "Log College" group from contemporary accounts, see Archibald Alexander, *The Log College: Biographical Sketches of William Tennent and his students, together with an account of the revivals under their ministries*. Reprint edition. (London: Banner of Truth Trust, 1968) and Milton J. Coalter, *Gilbert Tennent, Son of Thunder: A Case Study of Continental Pietism's Impact on the First Great Awakening in the Middle Colonies* (Westport, Ct: Greenwood Press, 1986).

15. These churches are all still open and active. They are scattered through what are now Chester, Lancaster, and Dauphin Counties in Pennsylvania.
16. That is, every member who is known. There are gaps in the Minutes of the Donegal Presbytery, from whence much of this information is obtained. Webster supplied some supplementary details.
17. This list does not include those New Side Donegal Presbytery ministers (noted in Table 1) who joined the New Castle Presbytery after the schism.
18. This information is derived from Minutes of the New Castle Presbytery and from Webster's biographical sketches.
19. One of the primary critics of this thesis is Marilyn Westerkamp, whose research explored a legacy of latent and occasionally active revivalism and emotive pietism among Presbyterians in both Scotland and Ireland. Marilyn J. Westerkamp, *Triumph of the Laity: Scots-Irish Piety and the Great Awakening, 1625-1760* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989).
20. See John Mack Faragher, ed., *Re-reading Frederick Jackson Turner: 'The Significance of the Frontier in American History' and Other Essays*, reprint. (New Haven: Yale, 1999).
21. George Franz, *Paxton: A Study of Community Structure and Mobility in the Colonial Pennsylvania Backcountry* (New York: Garland Publishers, 1989), 205, 236.
22. James G. Leyburn, *The Scotch Irish: A Social History*, reprint ed. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1989). For a similar but more recent study of the Scots-Irish emigration to North America, see Patrick Griffin, *The People with No Name: Ireland's Ulster Scots, America's Scots Irish, and the Creation of a British Atlantic World, 1689-1764* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001).
23. James Walsh, "The Great Awakening in the First Congregational Church of Woodbury, Connecticut," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 28 (October 1971): 550.
24. Ibid.; Gerald F. Moran, "Conditions of Religious Conversion in the First Society of Norwich, Connecticut, 1718-1744," *Journal of Social History*, 5 (Spring 1972): 338ff; and Peter S. Onuf, "New Lights in New London: A Group Portrait of the Separatists," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 37 (October 1980): 627-43. These early studies in social history were inspired by the groundbreaking work of Philip Greven in *Four Generations: Population, Land, and Family in Colonial Andover, Massachusetts* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1970).
25. Michael Zuckerman, *Peaceable Kingdoms: New England Towns in the Eighteenth Century* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1970).
26. Interestingly, however, in his study of the ratification of the U.S. Constitution in Pennsylvania, Owen Ireland concluded that class differences were less important than denominational or ethnic allegiances. Thus, the Scots-Irish as a group tended to opposed ratification, reflecting their long-held antipathy toward centralized authority. See Owen S. Ireland, *Religion, Ethnicity, and Politics: Ratifying the Constitution in Pennsylvania* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995). By

PENNSYLVANIA HISTORY

1788, of course, the intramural Presbyterian conflicts of the late 1730s were a half century old and largely forgotten.

27. John B. Frantz and William Pencak, eds., *Beyond Philadelphia: The American Revolution in the Pennsylvania Hinterland* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1998).
28. Jack D. Marietta and G.S. Lowe, *Troubled Experiment: Crime and Justice in Pennsylvania, 1682–1800* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006).
29. Karen Guenther, *“Rememb’ring our Time and Work is the Lord’s”: The Experiences of Quakers on the Eighteenth Century Frontier* (Selinsgrove, PA: Susquehanna University Press, 2005).
30. The role of immigrant communities and class in the southeastern (i.e. Philadelphia and surrounding counties) Pennsylvania economy had already been explored in the early 1970s by James T. Lemon in his influential work *The Best Poor Man’s Country*, revised edition. (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2002).
31. Franz, Paxton, 294.
32. Aaron Spencer Fogleman, *Hopeful Journeys: German Immigration, Settlement, and Political Culture in Colonial America, 1717–1775* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1996).
33. For a fuller discussion of the role of Pennsylvania townships, see Lucy Simler, “The Township: The Community of the Rural Pennsylvanian,” *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 106 (January 1982): 41–68. Simler’s essay, however, is primarily concerned with the townships of the southeastern counties rather than with the Western townships that are the topic of this study.
34. There are three cemeteries. The Paxton Church cemetery is still maintained by the church and a list of its inhabitants is available there. The same is true of the Derry Church cemetery. The New Side Paxton church did not survive John Roan but, as noted earlier, did last long enough to establish its own cemetery. Only a fraction of the graves are still visible or accessible. A list of its known inhabitants is available at the Dauphin County Historical Society, Harrisburg. Reconstructed membership records are based on the assumption that one would choose to be buried in the cemetery of the church of which one was a member or to which one was aligned.
35. Fairly comprehensive marriage records for both Elder and Roan are available in Luther Reily Kelker, *History of Dauphin County* (New York: Lewis Publishing Company, 1907), Vol. II: 668–79. Reconstructed membership records are based on the assumption that one would choose to be married by the minister of the church of which one was a member or to which one was aligned.
36. The document with which the call was issued is housed in the archives of the Dauphin County Historical Society, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.
37. The accuracy of these lists is limited somewhat by the usual difficulties of distinguishing between fathers and sons with the same name, and occasionally even non-relatives with identical names.
38. The tables indicate only the land warrants, which were accessed from Kelker, Dauphin County, 653–59, and returns from the 1780 land assessment, also found in Kelker, 399–400, 411. The 1785 tax assessment is found on 727–30. Tax and land records for Lancaster County at the Pennsylvania State Archives were also reviewed to verify these figures.
39. Kelker, Dauphin County, 399–400, 411, 653–59.
40. *Ibid.*
41. Historians of the other American revival movements have noted that those revivals, too, appealed primarily to marginalized groups and individuals. For the Second Great Awakening in the nineteenth

SCHISM ON THE SUSQUEHANNA

- century, see Nathan Hatch, *The Democratization of American Christianity* (New Haven: Yale, 1989). For an ethnographic and theological exploration of the Pentecostal revival of 1906, see Grant Wacker, *Heaven Below: Early Pentecostals and American Culture* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001).
42. Elder's extra-ecclesial authority is nowhere more evident than in his captaincy of the Paxton Rangers and his refusal to join with a violent fringe of them in what is now known as the "Paxton Boys' Rebellion." The "rebellion" was primarily a Scots-Irish Presbyterian reaction against the Quaker-dominated Pennsylvania government (with an unfortunate group of Conestoga Indians serving as the proverbial scapegoat). Its causes and consequences fall outside the scope of this study, as it was not primarily an intramural conflict within Presbyterian churches or communities, but a political dispute between groups identified by both region and religion over the colony's policy toward Native Americans on the frontier. For information on this Pennsylvania version of the better-known Bacon's Rebellion, see Brooke Hindle, "The March of the Paxton Boys," *William and Mary Quarterly* 3 (October 1946): 461–86; Peter A. Butzin, "Politics, Presbyterians, and the Paxton Riots, 1763–1764," *Journal of Presbyterian History* 51 (Spring 1973): 70–84; and James E. Crowley, "The Paxton Disturbances and Ideas of Order in Pennsylvania Politics," *Pennsylvania History* 37 (October 1970): 317–39. The various pamphlets, letters, and official correspondence relating to the Paxton Boys incident are collected in John R. Dunbar (ed.), *The Paxton Papers* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1957).
 43. George Whitefield preached at Nottingham during his first tour of the colonies in 1740.
 44. For a description of the founding of Nottingham Lotts, including a map and a photograph of the meeting house, see Wilmer W. MacElree, *Around the Boundaries of Chester County* (West Chester, 1934), 174–77.
 45. Richard Webster, *A History of the Presbyterian Church in America* (Philadelphia: J.M. Wilson, 1857), 410.
 46. Those with a Scots or Scots-Irish heritage were, according to Trinterud, more likely to support subscription.
 47. Orr's action here is quite odd, given that his Presbyterian ordination already granted him the credentials to perform marriages. The only sensible explanation is that Campbell, the groom, wanted Anglican rites and Orr was willing to make this concession.
 48. Webster, *Presbyterian Church*, 405.
 49. Marilyn Westerkamp, *Triumph of the Laity*, 157.
 50. Webster, *Presbyterian Church*, 411.