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ABSTRACT

The Enlightenment Atlantic was awash in deep feelings. People expressed the ardour of patriots, the homesickness of migrants, the fear of slave revolts, the ecstasy of revivals, the anger of mobs, the grief of wartime, the disorientation of refugees, the joys of victory. Not only did the events of the period evoke a variety of powerful emotions, but women and men also regarded the cultivation of appropriate feelings as a marker of morality, taste, and sociability.

This study examines how people in one community participated in the transatlantic swirl of debates over emotions, and how they adapted emotional practices and discourses to their own communities. The focus is on the emotional communities that overlapped in Cornwallis Township, Nova Scotia, from about 1770 to 1850. At its heart are four case studies of individuals whose lives intersected in the township—Handley Chipman, Jacob Bailey, Henry Alline, and Edward Manning. The contention of this study is that ordinary people and their middling leaders drew upon several kinds of resources to help them make meaning of their emotions, and to navigate revolutionary changes in political and religious communities. In addition to their own sense and experience, they also appropriated the discourses about affections and sentiments that were debated throughout the Atlantic world.

“Enthusiasm and Loyalty” aims to recover the wide range of political and religious emotions that were possible—feelable—in the Enlightenment Atlantic. While the burgeoning historiography of emotions has tended to focus on the passions of American Patriots, this study considers the affective dimension of
loyalism before, during, and after the American Revolution. Doing so makes it possible to understand loyalism as a coherent set of feelings and convictions with a long history, rather than simply reactionary conservatism. Paying attention to religious affections also adds nuance to the perception of the “emotionalism” of evangelical Protestantism. Even so-called enthusiasts worried about unfeeling hearts, attempted to cultivate an array of affections and sympathies, and reflected on the meaning of their emotions. Ordinary British North Americans were adroit participants in transatlantic debates about emotions, if not always the masters of their own feelings.
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INTRODUCTION

Social Affections

When Charles Inglis preached his sermon recommending “Steadfastness in Religion and Loyalty,” he feared that both would be overturned once again by the unbridled passions of revolution.¹

Not for the first time was he facing such a ferment of feelings. Years earlier, on the eve of the American War of Independence, when he was then an Anglican rector in New York, Inglis took up his pen to criticize Thomas Paine’s *Common Sense* — a pamphlet that he said was “addressed to the passions of the population, at a time when their passions are much inflamed.” Inglis claimed that despite its title, the work did not promote reasoned sense, but “uncommon phrenzy.” He claimed that Paine’s appeal to the passions of the colonists was nothing less than an “insidious attempt to ... seduce them from their loyalty and truest interest.” When the passions of Americans subsided, Inglis was sure, then their former affections for the King and constitution would return.² Yet as a Loyalist refugee, Inglis had become keenly aware that those passions did not always subside.

---

² Charles Inglis, *The True Interest of America Impartially Stated, in Certain Strictures on a Pamphlet Intitled Common Sense, 2nd ed.* (Philadelphia: James Humphreys, 1777), quotations
The year was now 1793, and France was in revolution, its King executed only weeks earlier. Inglis, now the Anglican Bishop of Nova Scotia, stood with a sense of \textit{déjà vu} to address the province’s legislature. Inflamed passions were once again at the root of revolution. He charged that a “spirit of enthusiasm” led the French revolutionaries to “overturn the Religion and Civil Constitution of their country ... subverting all order and government,” to the horrifying extreme that they “embrued their hands in the blood of their lawful Sovereign.” Unrestrained emotion destroyed any trace of civil society or social conscience: “They are unchaining the unruly appetites and affections of men to prey upon one another.” Like other commentators in the Revolutionary Atlantic, Inglis employed the term “enthusiasm” as a smear word to describe the spectre of unrestrained feelings and radical individualism—tendencies he said that were “malignant to government, and subversive of the peace and welfare of society.” Sharing the fears of many observers, he asked his Halifax listeners, “Can a more frightful picture of human depravity, let loose by infidel principles, be imagined, than is at this day exhibited by France?”

\footnote{at v and vi. Thomas Paine, \textit{Common Sense}, ed. Isaac Kramnick (New York: Penguin, 1976). On Inglis’s response to \textit{Common Sense}, see James B. Bell, \textit{A War of Religion: Dissenters, Anglicans, and the American Revolution} (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), 149-55. To retain the sense of eighteenth-century language, primary sources will be quoted here without correcting spelling or grammar, and without using [sic]. Necessary clarifications will be included in brackets, and, in rare cases, will be silently corrected.}

So it was unthinkable to Inglis that the French Revolution had its British North American sympathizers, those who reveled in its passions and echoed its sentiments in their criticism of Britain’s constitutional monarchy. Are there not, he asked, those who “wish the same scenes may be acted on the theatre of the British empire? Can we therefore be too much on our guard?” That fear of spreading revolutionary enthusiasm would have had even more resonance to those who read Inglis’s sermon in print. Remarkably, it was printed in the same week that news reached Halifax that Britain and France were again at war. Having lived through the turmoil of the American Revolution, would Loyalists like Inglis—would British North Americans—be engulfed again in revolutionary commotion?4

Somewhat surprisingly, Inglis linked the unrestrained passions of the French Revolution with religious “fanaticism” and populism closer to home. Inglis was alarmed by the apparent spread of enthusiasm in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick by New Lights and Methodists. Having sketched the effects of enthusiasm in French society, he explained its consequences in the religious sphere:

A mighty zeal for truth, for great purity, and other good purposes, is displayed; and it is observable, that this zeal generally rises in proportion as the peculiar tenets of the innovators, deviate from scripture and common sense; zeal being the substitute to make up the deficiency. Claims are often made to extraordinary revelations, to higher degrees of grace, and divine illumination; and at the very time that the regular institutions of Christianity, are disregarded—perhaps

---

trampled on. Bitter invectives are thrown out against others—against their persons, their principles, and mode of worship; as if all who did not think with the innovating leaders, were in the direct way to perdition. A rigid, external sanctity is assumed, and a glowing ardour to make proselytes is exerted; so that sea and land will be compassed for the purpose.⁵

The emotional fervor and antiauthoritarianism that characterized such religious movements had their effects on individuals. Inglis reported that in recent meetings in Halifax, “three persons have been driven to actual madness, to the most deplorable state of insanity, and become maniac,” and he hinted at even more shocking transactions in New Brunswick. But it was the social consequences that most concerned Inglis, consequences that tied religious populists to revolutionary atheists: their common “turbulence” produced the same disorder in society.⁶

Rather than jettisoning the language of feeling altogether, however, Inglis sought to draw upon a different—more sociable—discourse about emotions. He wrote, “Whoever reflects on the social affections and instincts that are implanted in our nature will be inclined to think that man was designed by his Creator for a state of society.” Look to fellow feeling and the universal need for belonging, said Inglis, and it is evident that “happiness ... can only be attained in a state of society.” Inglis rejected the philosophical idea of a “state of nature,” in which humanity was theorized to have lived “separate, independent, and without any social connection between individuals.” “Such a state,” he asserted, “is wholly fabulous; it never had an

---
⁵ Inglis, Steadfastness in Religion and Loyalty, 20.  
⁶ Inglis, Steadfastness in Religion and Loyalty, 24 (note), 16.
existence.” He rejected the idea that individuals can willy-nilly enter or leave society—humanity is necessarily social.7

Inglis sought to cultivate those “social affections” that held people together, rather than the unrestrained passions and unruly appetites that atomized society. Religion and loyalty together provided the antidote for revolutionary disorder and unsocial passions. They are, he argued, “the pillars, as it were, on which society rests, and by which it is upheld.”8 The kind of religion that supported society, instead of undermining it, was “the pure, peaceable and rational Religion of Jesus Christ, which requires holiness and benevolence in its professors, and strongly inculcates order and subordination.” Christianity, he said, had eternal and interior purposes apart from this public influence, but it also cultivated social virtues so necessary for civic life.9 Inglis also suggested that loyalty to the British King and constitution was grounded in affections, as well as reason. He wrote about George III’s desire to “promote the happiness and prosperity of his subjects” and “the eminent virtues that adorn him.” He asserted that the British constitution “is the best calculated to procure political happiness, of any that was ever framed by human wisdom.” In other words, he made a particularly affectionate case for British loyalism, and not simply for social peace in general.10

Social affections competed with more turbulent passions, even within an individual heart. While he contended that happiness is to be found in the “social state,” Inglis admitted that “some persons are naturally of a more restless and

---

7 Inglis, Steadfastness in Religion and Loyalty, 5; emphasis added.
8 Inglis, Steadfastness in Religion and Loyalty, 6.
9 Inglis, Steadfastness in Religion and Loyalty, 8-10, 25-6, quotation at 16.
10 Inglis, Steadfastness in Religion and Loyalty, 29.
turbulent cast than others. They are fond of innovation and change, for the sake of innovation. The calm shade of peace and quiet pleases them not; their delight is in a storm.” The destructive turmoil of revolution originated in a “turbulent temper,” and had emotional rather than political origins: “For if any are discontented under [the British Constitution], if they are restless and given to change, the cause must be sought in their own bosom, and not in the Constitution.” Reasoned loyalty and religion, then, provided a check on such turbulent, enthusiastic passions and fostered more social affections.11

The way that Inglis linked the most consequential public events of the eighteenth century—the American and French Revolutions—with the interior movements of the heart raises a number of intriguing questions. Why did people in the Enlightenment Atlantic ascribe such power to emotions? How did they think feelings were related to other kinds of causation, such as diplomacy, ideas, economics, or polities? What could passions do? If feelings were potentially so disruptive to social order, why did people appeal to emotions when attempting to construct coherent communities? How did religious and political emotions converge or conflict? The ways that Inglis used “passions,” “affections,” and “enthusiasm” suggests that these were not synonyms, and begs the question of how their meanings at that time differed from their current connotations. And Inglis’s own experience as a Loyalist refugee invites exploration of how his feelings contrasted with the political affections of Americans who supported the revolution, or Britons

11 Inglis, Steadfastness in Religion and Loyalty, 19-20, 24, 30.
across the Atlantic, or loyal Nova Scotians who settled in the province prior to the imperial crisis.

The chapters that follow take up some of these questions, examining political and religious emotions in the Enlightenment Atlantic world from a vantage point in British North America. They attend to the ferment of feeling in the community of Cornwallis Township, Nova Scotia, from about 1770 to 1850. This study argues that ordinary British North Americans—and not only prominent authors elsewhere—participated in transatlantic debates about emotions and sentiments, and that they used those emotional discourses and the fashioning of their own feelings to navigate changing political and religious communities.

The Revolutionary Atlantic was awash in deep feelings. People expressed the ardour of patriots, the homesickness of migrants, the fear of slave revolts, the ecstasy of revivals, the anger of mobs, the grief of wartime, the disorientation of refugees, the joys of victory. Not only did the events of the period evoke a variety of powerful emotions, but also, both women and men regarded the cultivation of appropriate feelings as a marker of morality, taste, and sociability. The importance of feelings was clearly expressed in the titles of some of the era’s popular novels: A Sentimental Journey (1768), The Man of Feeling (1771), The Power of Sympathy (1789), and, of course, Sense and Sensibility (1811).12

---

Emotions were also a special preoccupation in the culture of the Enlightenment, belying its characterization as primarily an “age of reason.” An emphasis on sense perceptions encouraged people to examine their feelings as tangible evidence, rather than impulsive distractions. Philosophers such as Francis Hutcheson (1694-1746) went further, arguing that affections could offer reliable moral guidance.\(^{13}\) David Hume (1711-1776) suggested that emotion, rather than reason, motivated human action, asserting that, “Reason is, and ought only to be, the slave of the passions.”\(^{14}\) Adam Smith (1723-1790), perhaps more famous for advocating economic self-interest, also wrote *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, the century’s most influential articulation of how sympathy could be the basis of sociability in an increasingly commercialized society.\(^{15}\) Jonathan Edwards (1703-1758), the theologian of the Great Awakening, engaged with many of these themes,
declaring, "True religion, in great part, consists in holy affections." The eighteenth-century was not so dispassionate or disenchanted after all.

As these brief glimpses suggest, several terms were prominent in the emotional lexicon of the Anglo-Atlantic world. Until the end of the eighteenth century, it was less common to use “emotion” than one of the other words which had distinct, if often overlapping, connotations. Since debate about the meaning of these terms (and experiences) features prominently in this study, a brief working definition of some of them may be helpful. Passions were strong feelings that, if left unchecked, threatened to overwhelm the will. Affections were the habituated inclinations or dispositions of the heart toward another person or an idea. Feelings were the sensory experience of particular emotions. Sensibility was the capacity to perceive another’s feelings, or to respond morally and feelingly to a situation. Sentiments were reasoned feelings or deeply felt opinions. Sympathy was the imaginative identification with the feelings, ideas, or circumstances of another person. Then as now, such terms were often used interchangeably or with less precision; this study will identify those moments when a particular meaning was intended or being debated.

---

18 There is an ongoing debate about whether “emotion” can be usefully distinguished from “affect,” the former designating intentional, culturally conditioned responses, and the latter
Feelings were not only central to history; feelings themselves have a history. The expression and meaning of particular emotions has changed in different times and places. Historical context is what made tears, for example, sometimes essential to masculinity, and at other times its antithesis. While some historical emotional expressions may seem recognizable to moderns, there are also jarring differences. The meaning of anger, boredom, or happiness has varied widely by culture or century. Tracing the continuities and changes of feelings has made the history of emotions a burgeoning field of inquiry.19

Scholarship on emotions in the Age of Revolutions has helped to uncover the role of feelings in public and political realms, and not only in interior or domestic spaces. Sympathetic bonds helped citizens create coherent national communities, just as tumultuous passions were channeled into revolutionary disruptions.


Affections now find a place—alongside ideology, polity, economics, and print—in discussions of historical causation, as well as the examinations of the “lived experience” of revolutions. This study attends to the way that individuals in British North America debated the role of emotions in the great changes of their lifetimes, and how they understood their emotional experience of those events. A particular focus of this study is how political and religious passions were intertwined.

Historians now see affect as an important element in the construction of early modern national identities and in the fashioning of individual political identities. Benedict Anderson influentially includes this emotional aspect of nationalism in his account of nations as “imagined communities.” He asserts that political ideologies or bureaucratic structures do not, in themselves, make nations “emotionally plausible.” Historians must also consider the “attachment that peoples feel for the inventions of their imaginations” to better explain why citizens will make sacrifices, or even die, for their nation. “Political love,” Anderson says, is an important dimension of national belonging. Historians of Britain and America have developed these themes, describing how national or imperial officials

---

22 Anderson, Imagined Communities, 51.
23 Anderson, Imagined Communities, 141, 52-3; emphasis in original.
intentionally cultivated this affective facet of political identity through public ceremonies and holidays, the language of petitions and bureaucracy, and the cultivation of historical culture. From the perspective of the individual, there is a rich literature on how individuals appropriated these elements, alongside burgeoning print culture, in the self-fashioning of their political identity.


Recent studies have proposed both the centrality of passion in the American Revolution, and conversely, suggest that the Revolution marked a juncture in the transatlantic history of emotions. John Adams famously wrote that, “The Revolution was in the minds and hearts of the people ... this radical change in the principles, opinions, sentiments, and affections of the people, was the real American Revolution.” Nicole Eustace, for one, argues for the development of an “American emotional vernacular in the decade before the Declaration of Independence.” She argues that even though British North Americans participated in a transatlantic culture of sensibility, the unique conditions of the colonial setting—particularly encounters with Indigenous and African peoples—undermined the distinction between elite sentiments and popular passions. When the simmering tensions between Britain and the colonies further weakened the affectionate bonds of empire, American Patriots came to embrace more vehement emotions to fuel their resistance. Eustace describes the American spirit as a unique amalgam of patriotic passion and social feeling—a combination that she acknowledges was potentially political and legal philosophy, see James E. Fleming, ed., Passions and Emotions, NOMOS 53 (New York: New York University Press, 2013).

27 R. R. Palmer’s now-classic account frames the era in terms of revolution. Though not a central theme of the book, Palmer does portray the “depth of feeling” displayed by European observers of the American Revolution, from ambivalence to frustration to hope. Loyalists sit uneasily in the study, as conservatives whose main role in the drama is leaving the scene. Religion, likewise, though not absent from consideration, is not a primary concern: “The truth is that the age was not notably religious.” R. R. Palmer, The Age of the Democratic Revolution: A Political History of Europe and America, 1760-1800 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014), 190-198, 176, 148.


unstable. Scholarship focused on American literary history has tended to emphasize the instrumentality of emotions in the creation of an “imagined” American national identity. The leaders of the early republic attempted to strengthen ties of affection and sensibility to give the new nation the emotional cohesiveness it lacked, even as they attempted to mitigate more divisive passions and interests.

Yet it would be a mistake to assume that emotions only served national interests. The history of sentiment is a transatlantic story. In the colonial period, sensibility contributed to a common, cosmopolitan, polite culture. Alongside her assertion that, “The history of the American Revolution is in part a history of

---

30 Eustace, Passion is the Gale, 387-88, 479.

sensibility,” Sarah Knott can also observe, “The transatlantic circulation of sensibility allowed colonists to see themselves as part of British culture.” Americans and Britons alike learned to be “spectators” to their feelings, wept over the same novels, and sought to cultivate social affections. Letters and texts also helped individuals imagine their places in transatlantic “webs of affection,” communities shaped by familial, religious, or political identities. Across the Atlantic world, a range of actors “harnessed popular languages of feeling—whether passions or sensibility—to serve their own political ends.”

One way to recover a broader range of political feelings in North America would be to put Loyalists back into the story, as Sarah Pearsall has argued in an incisive review. Historians of loyalty, at least, have not entirely neglected emotions in ideology or experience. Robert M. Calhoon’s series of case studies remains the most sophisticated depiction to date of how Loyalists attempted to “explain and organize their experiences and sensations” as they reflected on their

33 Sarah Knott, Sensibility and the American Revolution (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2009), 4, 16; see 17.
disaffection from the Revolution. Janice Potter has offered a persuasive account of Loyalist ideas about reason and passion, emphasizing their views that passion was “aesthetically abhorrent” and “undermined both freedom and morality.” She also suggests that Loyalists and Patriots exhibited very different emotional styles: “Whereas Patriots tended to admire zeal, audacity, and commitment, Loyalists preferred moderation, propriety, and prudent detachment.” And yet, it was not that Patriots did and Loyalists did not employ political emotions, but rather that they attempted to mark out different kinds of emotional communities. Many Loyalists argued that participating in the transatlantic, cosmopolitan culture of sensibility was not irreconcilable with their American identity. They worried that the violent passions that their Patriot neighbours had embraced would only serve to desensitize them to those sympathies that knit diverse people together. This study’s focus on the emotions of loyal British North Americans also positions it in scholarly conversations about the definition of loyalty, as distinct from Loyalists. The conflict over American independence did not create loyalty—reaching back, as it did, at least to the seventeenth century—nor were the American refugees the first to

---

39 Potter, Liberty We Seek, 42. Potter cites a study that attempted to determine whether loyalists and patriots displayed consistent personality differences. Based on the analysis of eighty individuals (for whom sufficient biographical information was available) using standard personality instruments, the authors concluded personality did indeed affect political choice. N. E. H. Hull, Peter C. Hoffer, and Steven L. Allen, "Choosing Sides: A Quantitative Study of the Personality Determinants of Loyalist and Revolutionary Political Affiliation in New York," Journal of American History 65, no. 2 (1978): 344-66.
fashion or dispute their loyalty. Attending to the political emotions expressed by the Nova Scotians here in view contributes to the effort, urged by Jerry Bannister and Liam Riordan in their important essay on reframing the long history of loyalism, “to conceptualize loyalism as an affective sensibility as well as a specific program.”

Mapping the complex emotional terrain of loyalism before, during, and after the American Revolution makes it possible to reconceptualize the period; this study argues for the decentering (though certainly not the erasure) of the Revolution in the histories of emotion and loyalism. Focusing on individuals in British North America recovers some sense of the broad spectrum of political affections and overlapping loyalties that were available—*feel-able*—in the Enlightenment Atlantic.

---


As Charles Inglis’s invocation of “enthusiasm” suggests, religious feelings were a special preoccupation in the “long” eighteenth century: from the transatlantic awakenings of evangelical Protestantism to the stoking of anti-Catholic fears, from the sensational claims of the “French Prophets” to the exuberance of revivals among enslaved Africans, from the ecstasies of Methodist camp meetings to the sympathies that motivated the abolitionist movement. “Heart religion” flourished in the Age of Enlightenment. Yet until recently, religious emotions have fit uncomfortably in the histories of the Enlightenment and the culture of sensibility.42 Seen as a reactionary response to Enlightenment rationality, evangelical piety has largely been absent from the story of the more refined culture of sensibility. As historians of religion have engaged with the history of emotions, new scholarship has gone some distance to reintegrate evangelical feelings into those histories.43

---

42 A notable exception is David Hempton, who asserts, in an incisive synthesis of research on religion in the era of the Enlightenment, “It is erroneous to view these more emotionally satisfying forms of religiosity as expressly counter-Enlightenment. ... Another way of looking at these more emotionally resonant forms of religion is to view them as a religious version of the greater emphasis on sentiment and sensibility within Enlightenment thought that characterized the second half of the eighteenth century.” David Hempton, The Church in the Long Eighteenth Century (London: I. B. Tauris, 2011), 114.

There is now a growing literature about the prominence and diversity of emotions in Puritan life and thought, making it difficult to sustain the stereotype of them as dour killjoys or despairing predestinarians. There are studies of Puritan happiness, affection, friendship, and delight, alongside the more familiar themes of assurance and anxiety.\(^4^4\) And while the history of sentimentalism has often been framed as a secular development, Abram Van Engen has recently demonstrated the importance of sympathetic fellow-feeling in key Puritan texts, arguing that religious impulses dovetailed with other sources in the emergence of eighteenth-century sentimental culture.\(^4^5\) The resulting picture is that Protestantism did not inure early modern people from participating in wider debates about emotions or the literary culture of sentiment.


It is perhaps no surprise that historians have given considerable attention to the intense emotionalism of the evangelical Protestantism emerging from the Great Awakening of the 1740s. In *Fits, Trances, and Visions*, Ann Taves explored the range of spiritual and natural explanations offered by intellectuals as they debated the meaning of heart-warming conversions, bodily ecstasies, and raucous camp meetings. Sarah Rivett traced the entwining of scientific empiricism and religious “experience” in Puritan and evangelical thought. Like important earlier studies by Isabel Rivers, Norman Fiering, and Michael Crawford on dissenting and evangelical engagement with British sentimentalist philosophy, Taves and Rivett portray religious emotions at the heart of a complex relationship between evangelicalism and Enlightenment, rather than a simple opposition.

46 In a classic study of the Great Awakening as it related to the American Revolution, Alan Heimert noted the importance of the emotions as a defining feature of the debates about the revivals: “The criticisms of the revival rested at bottom on an objection to the evangelical evaluation of the place of the emotions in man’s psychology.” Alan Heimert, *Religion and the American Mind: From the Great Awakening to the Revolution* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966), 44. In the present study, the term “evangelical” is typically used to describe the Protestant style emerging from the Protestant Awakenings of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. David Bebbington’s influential description of the movement identifies four main cultural and theological characteristics: a particular emphasis on the cross of Jesus Christ, personal conversion, the authority of the Bible, and an activist or missionary impulse; David W. Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain: A History from the 1730s to the 1980s* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1989). For narrative and intellectual histories of early evangelicalism, see, respectively, Mark A. Noll, *The Rise of Evangelicalism: The Age of Edwards, Whitefield and the Wesleys* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2003); and W. R. Ward, *Early Evangelicalism: A Global Intellectual History, 1670-1789* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006). Curtis Johnson has distinguished between “formalist” and “anti-formalist” evangelicals in the antebellum period. While the former “became embarrassed by open displays of raw religious passion, preferring domesticated emotions instead,” the latter “sought an emotional faith that could not be controlled or manipulated by their well-educated “social betters.”” Curtis D. Johnson, *Redeeming America: Evangelicals and the Road to the Civil War* (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 1993), 8-9. The present study insists that both kinds of evangelicals were concerned with emotions, though in different ways.

But ordinary evangelicals, and not only the movement’s leading thinkers, also reflected deeply upon their emotional experiences and aspirations. This is one of the signal contributions of Phyllis Mack’s *Heart Religion in the British Enlightenment*. She counters previous characterizations of evangelicals as irrationally “emotional,” and argues that in their life-writing, British Methodists were attempting to understand, discipline, and cultivate their emotions, engaged in that quintessentially Enlightenment endeavour of self-fashioning. Mack helps to uncover the emotional experience of Methodists in their daily lives, and not only the heights of revival meetings. In another study on emotions and the agency of ordinary evangelicals, Calvin Hollett has argued that lay people in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Newfoundland embraced individual and communal religious rapture to shape their own religious culture, rather than relying on clerical leadership.

---

48 Phyllis Mack, *Heart Religion in the British Enlightenment: Gender and Emotion in Early Methodism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008). See also Taves, *Fits, Trances, and Visions*, 4, who observes that in the historiography, “educated elites are typically depicted as explaining (away) religious experience in abstract terms, while ordinary people, embedded in traditions of faith and practice, are depicted as having them”—a set of assumptions she attempts to avoid by incorporating elites and ordinary people in the same narrative, an approach this study adopts. See Eustace, *Passion is the Gale*, 6-7.

Just as emotions helped early modern people “imagine” their participation in emerging national communities, so too did feelings structure the experience of far-flung religious communities. With a burgeoning evangelical print culture, readers formed emotional attachments beyond their own locales, and used newly abundant texts to help fashion their religious affections.50 Emotions were also central in the experience of missionary expansion, as, on the one hand, missionaries attempted to shape the emotional lives of indigenous converts, and at the same time, sympathy helped Anglo-American evangelicals identify with both missionaries and the inhabitants of imperial spaces.51

Worries about “enthusiasm” linked the religious and political histories of emotion in the late Enlightenment Atlantic, where private religious emotions and experiences could dangerously reverberate through society. As the title of this study suggests, the pages that follow will explore the relationship between varieties of

“enthusiastic” religion and a spectrum of political loyalties. Lingering over the powerful resonances of “enthusiasm” in the early modern period clarifies what British North Americans thought was at stake. Enthusiasm was a term that no group adopted as its own, but was a smear word used to cordon off any number of religious practices from polite Enlightenment culture. Though the word has the basic sense of either inspiration (god in the person) or ecstasy (the person in god), in the early modern period it acquired the negative connotation of a false revelation.\textsuperscript{52} Samuel Johnson's 1755 dictionary defined enthusiasm as, “a vain belief of private revelation; a vain confidence of divine favour or communication.”\textsuperscript{53} William Hogarth vividly portrayed this usage in a satirical print published in March 1762, contemporary with most of the figures in this study [Figure 1]. Labeled


\textsuperscript{53} Johnson, as quoted in Tucker, \textit{Enthusiasm}, 17.
"Credulity, Superstition, and Fanaticism: A Medley," it was based on Hogarth’s unpublished drawing called "Enthusiasm Delineated."\(^5^4\)

---

The complex image depicts an animated evangelical preacher (probably George Whitefield) addressing an overwrought and unruly congregation from a high pulpit. The emotional depths and heights to which the preacher provokes the hearers is measured, in the print, by a heart-shaped thermometer, ranging from “settled grief,” “despair,” or “madness,” to “love heat,” “extacy,” “convulsion fits,” and “raving.” The many kinds of fanaticism and the overall disorder of the scene powerfully conveys what one historian calls the “anarchy of religious individualism” implied in the charge of enthusiasm. These religious passions were not, however, seen as merely private—they invoked the spectre of the seventeenth-century wars of religion and the English Civil War. Britons remembered all too well the horrors of leveling sects, the death of the King, and the “world upside down.” Enthusiastic emotions, it was worried, could corrode social and religious order. Over against the culture of politeness, so-called enthusiasts insisted on thrusting religious zeal, candour, and controversy back into the public sphere, causing one historian to describe enthusiasm as “the monstrous alter ego of eighteenth-century civility.”

This is a story about how people in one community participated in the transatlantic swirl of debates over emotions, and how they adapted emotional practices and discourses to their own communities. The focus is on the emotional communities that overlapped in Cornwallis Township, Nova Scotia, from about 1770

57 Heyd, Be Sober and Reasonable, ch. 6.
58 Mee, Romanticism, Enthusiasm, and Regulation, 24.
to 1850. At its heart are four case studies of individuals whose lives intersected in the township: Handley Chipman, Jacob Bailey, Henry Alline, and Edward Manning. They have been chosen because of the richness of their personal writings that are available, and because each illuminates the emotional, religious, and political communities in which they participated. Cornwallis Township provides a unique vantage point for engaging with the period's long-running debates about the meaning and social consequences of emotions. For good reasons historians often turn to the likes of Adam Smith or Jonathan Edwards to frame the terms of that conversation. Yet, this study assumes that the circle of conversation and debate included many other, less recognizable voices. To borrow the words of historian Emma Rothschild, this study, too, “is about large and abstract ideas in the lives of individuals who were not themselves philosophers or theorists of enlightenment [or theologians of religious experience].”

Through a pastiche of commonplace selections, a volley of regional polemics, an exchange of letters, the circulation of manuscript essays, or the singing of locally composed hymns, ordinary people and their local religious leaders participated in that transatlantic conversation. It is not the claim of this study that Chipman, Bailey, Alline, or Manning deserve wider recognition as major thinkers; rather, it is an argument that ordinary people, middling writers, and local leaders also engaged in the conversation about the

---

meaning and consequences of religious and political emotions. As Ann Taves demonstrates, “claims about religious [and emotional] experience were consistently contested at a grassroots level and significant theoretical explanations of experience were generated by the self-educated as well as by intellectual elites.” In addition to their individual and distinctive ways of making sense of emotional experience, ordinary Nova Scotians also drew on discourses available throughout the Atlantic world, such as passion, affection, and sentiment.

Some background may give some sense of the history that shaped the emotional discourses of Cornwallis Township. Cornwallis was reconstituted as a British and Protestant settlement in the 1760s, following the grand derangement of l’Acadie in 1755-56 and the ongoing displacement of the region’s Mi’kmaq. In proclamations of October 1758 and January 1759, Governor Charles Lawrence offered generous grants of that fertile land to New England settlers ("Planters"), along with free passage and promises of religious liberty (for Protestants) and a representative assembly. Cornwallis Township was thirty miles long, stretching from the Minas Basin in the east to Berwick in the west, and twelve miles from the Bay of Fundy in the north to the Cornwallis River. In the words of Jacob Bailey, it was “the most fertile and delightful apartment of Nova Scotia, an extensive plain

---

60 On the interaction between elite and popular culture, see Peter Burke, *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe*, 3rd ed. (Farnham, Surrey, UK: Ashgate, 2009), especially 95-101. “The minds of ordinary people,” Burke argues, “are not like blank paper, but stocked with ideas and images” (96-7). The subjects of this study also played the role of mediators that Burke describes as facilitating the movement of themes between elite and popular cultures, and between local and transatlantic communities, traffic that moves in both directions (99-130).

bounded by Mountains.” The population of the township in 1763 was 656, and by 1827 had grown to 4,400. Like the rest of Nova Scotia, Cornwallis Township was shaped by successive waves of immigration and Revolutionary-era mobility. Resettled first by New Englanders from Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts, it was part of the larger story of northeastern expansion into territories that became Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont. Just as importantly, Nova Scotia was a site of expanding British Imperial power from as early as 1749 and the reconstitution of the Empire after 1783. After the American War of Independence, free and enslaved Loyalist refugees swelled the population of the province. And although Cornwallis Township was more homogeneous than other regions of the province, immigration into Nova Scotia during the late eighteenth-century mirrored the cultural diversity of the British Empire, as Jamaican Maroon,

62 Bailey to Mrs. Domet, May 2, 1781 [Letterbook copy], Bailey Papers, 94-10.
English, Scottish, Irish, and Welsh settlers joined the region’s New England settlers. Bailey, once again, memorably described the Annapolis Valley’s population as “a collection of all nations, kindreds, complexions and tongues assembled from every quarter of the Globe, and till lately strangers to me and each other.”64 It is just this diversity and mobility that makes Cornwallis Township an ideal place to stand, looking outward, to the debates and emotional experiences of the Revolutionary Atlantic world.65 At the seaboard intersection of two political entities under transformation—the United States and the British Empire—and recent migrants themselves, Nova Scotians in the Revolutionary era self-consciously wrestled with feelings of identity and belonging.66

Just as religion and loyalty were twinned commitments for Charles Inglis, so were political and religious emotions intimately linked in the experience of his Cornwallis Township contemporaries. They do not tell a unitary story, however. Bailey, Alline, Chipman, and Manning—and the emotional communities in which they participated—exhibited a spectrum of feelings and they employed multiple discourses about emotions. While Inglis (and Bailey) found enthusiasm and loyalty

64 Jacob Bailey to Samuel Peters, Oct. 31, 1784, as quoted in MacKinnon, This Unfriendly Soil, 53.
irreconcilable, Alline, Chipman, and Manning were each committed to some version of evangelical Protestantism, and attempted to square their religious convictions with varied conceptions of British loyalty and social order.

Handley Chipman (1717-1799) migrated from New England to Nova Scotia in 1761, but his writings attest to how he remained emotionally connected to a wider Anglo-American world. On the eve of the American Revolution, Chipman compiled a commonplace book—a digest of his reading in British and American publications. The document reveals that although Chipman sympathized with the complaints of his former New England neighbours, he continued to express surprisingly strong British affections. His writings recover an emotional experience of British American loyalism that was obscured elsewhere by the polarization of war. In still other manuscripts, Chipman writes at length about the role of emotions in religious life, attempting to balance the experiential piety of evangelicalism with a concern for social order. In New England, Chipman knew evangelical leaders George Whitefield and Sarah Osborn, and in Nova Scotia, he was a warm supporter of itinerant preacher Henry Alline, even transcribing and circulating the latter’s diary. Yet Chipman also wrote with concern about what he perceived as emotional excesses in the New Light community. He demonstrates that ordinary British North Americans, along with philosophers and theologians, grappled with the cultivation of affections and the meaning of feelings.

Jacob Bailey (1731–1808) arrived in Cornwallis Township as a Loyalist refugee from the American Revolution. Born in Massachusetts, educated at Harvard College, and a convert to the Church of England, Bailey had been an Anglican
missionary for the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel (SPG) in eastern Maine (then Massachusetts). Bailey's experience of the Revolution was emotionally fraught. His letters and diaries express the fear and anger of his Loyalist ordeal with the Pownalborough Committee of Safety that accused him of being “disaffected” with the cause of liberty. Bailey did not see this ordeal as an isolated event, however. In a manuscript prepared for the press (though never published), Bailey traced the themes of enthusiasm and disloyalty through the history of New England. Despite these bitter reflections, he cultivated a deep affection for his American birthplace within a cosmopolitan and imperial framework. Forced to seek refuge in Nova Scotia in 1779, Bailey documented the complex feelings of dislocated British American Loyalists. Disillusioned by British overtures of peace, angered by what he perceived as neglect of Loyalist refugees, and living among former New Englanders with republican sympathies, Bailey became profoundly disaffected with Britain. Yet he did not abandon his loyalty; rather, he had to find a way to be loyal without affection. He lost confidence that a culture of sentiment could overcome differences in the Anglo-American public, and in his writing turned to acerbic satirical poetry to express his sense of a world overturned. His is an account of the passions and disaffections that shaped the revolutionary Atlantic.

New Light itinerant preacher Henry Alline (1748-1784) was instrumental in a period of religious revival in the British Maritime provinces that coincided with the American War of Independence. Opponents considered him a quintessential “enthusiast.” His message emphasized personal conversion, emotional experiences of religious ecstasy, and the right of lay people to criticize traditional clerical
authority. Yet there was more to the emotional experience of Alline’s New Light community than rapture. The letters and hymns of ordinary Nova Scotian New Lights demonstrate that while they did indeed aspire to moments of selfless ecstasy, they also cultivated a wide range of religious affections over the course of their lives. The debates between Alline and his critics reveal a tension between individualistic and communitarian impulses within the evangelical tradition, a tension that was sometimes mediated by attention to emotional self-fashioning.

Edward Manning’s (1766-1851) story is a dramatic emotional transformation. Born to Irish Catholic immigrants to Nova Scotia’s Planter community, Manning was converted to Alline’s New Light faith. As a young man, he became an itinerant preacher with a network extending throughout the Maritime Provinces and Maine. Along with a cadre of other preachers, Manning embraced radical evangelical beliefs, spurned the necessity of education, and adopted an emotive style of preaching. Yet over the following decade, Manning rejected his own “enthusiasm," and became the leading advocate for a more moderate evangelicalism. He became a Calvinist, a Baptist, a supporter of theological education, and an extensive reader. Emotions remained crucial to Manning’s faith, but in a different way. He continued to forge affectionate ties throughout the region and across the border, even during the heightened nationalism of the War of 1812. His daily diary reveals an intensely emotional reader—using newly abundant religious print to help shape his religious affections. And during crucial years of imperial and
missionary expansion, Manning used sympathy to identify with missionaries and Indigenous inhabitants in locales far removed from his Cornwallis home.67

The kind of history of emotions ventured here is not enabled by unusually revealing historical documentation of the psychological states of the residents of Cornwallis Township; nor is it a variation on psychohistory. Rather, this microhistory of emotions is possible because British North Americans, like other early modern people, wrote reflectively about the meaning of their emotions, their

aspirations to cultivate certain affections and sentiments, and worried about the role of passions in the momentous events of public life. The figures whose lives and feelings are traced here all exhibited what Phyllis Mack calls “reflexive emotionalism ... [the] desire both to feel and to analyze feelings.”

William Reddy, one of the foremost theorists of the historical study of emotions, has argued that our knowledge of emotions is *always* mediated. There is necessarily “a gap between experience and expression ... between feeling and language.” Reddy supplies the term “emotives” to describe the words, phrases, and gestures by which we interpret or translate feeling sensations into emotional expressions. It is these written emotives, both “spontaneous” or “conventional,” that provide one general kind of evidence for historical inquiry. As Barbara Rosenwein contends, how we interpret and express feelings is constrained by “our emotional vocabulary and gestures, ... our conventions, values, and even implicit ‘theories’ of emotion.” Those “implicit” assumptions about emotions were brought nearer the surface by the tumult and debates of the Enlightenment era.

This study will also be exploring emotion as a “domain of effort.” The Cornwallis individuals wrote as often about the feelings *to which they aspired*, as much as those they actually experienced. Alline’s desire for ecstatic communion

---

with God, and Bailey’s polite Christian sentimentalism, as very different as they were as emotional styles, shared the view of emotions as a domain of effort, as they each sought to cultivate particular affections. This, too, brought emotions to the surface in their writings, and compelled them to draw upon a variety of philosophical and theological discourses about passions and sentiments.72

A particular concern of this study is the role of emotions in creating, maintaining, and reconfiguring communities. While feelings are, in one sense, the most private of experiences, it is often in their public expression and shared description that emotions acquire their meaning. Early modern people had a profound sense of the social dimension of emotions. To emphasize this corporate and cultural context for feelings, historian Barbara Rosenwein has coined the term “emotional communities.” It is not that such groups are particularly “emotional”; rather, emotional communities “share important norms concerning the emotions that they value and deplore and the modes of expressing them.”73 As they did in Cornwallis Township, several emotional communities can overlap in a given society at one time, and debates between them helped to define the emotional styles of those communities.74 By attending to the several emotional communities—political

---

72 For an insightful approach from another discipline, see Ole Riis and Linda Woodhead, A Sociology of Religious Emotion (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).
74 Rosenwein, Generations of Feeling, 3.
and religious—that overlapped or competed in this one township, this study is a microhistory that looks outward. Of course there remains the question of the representativeness of Cornwallis or any of the individual case studies. To be sure, there are unique elements and idiosyncrasies in these stories, but by embedding their accounts in the contexts of both local and transatlantic emotional communities, and by using the writings of these British North Americans to illuminate the widely accessible and debated discourses about emotions, the study speaks to some of the fraught emotional experiences and pressing intellectual questions of the Enlightenment Atlantic.75

The contention of this study is that ordinary people drew upon several kinds of resources to help them make meaning of their emotions, and to navigate the revolutionary changes in political and religious communities. In addition to their own sense and experience, they also appropriated the discourses about affections and sentiments that were debated throughout the Atlantic world. There was not a hard line between learned culture and common experience. When revolutionary committees or Loyalist militias policed the attachments and affections of citizens, when church members met to help one another feel more deeply or more properly, and when both religious and political leaders raised their voices against “enthusiasm,” it is unsurprising that ordinary people became adroit participants in transatlantic debates about emotions, if not always the masters of their own feelings.

Commonplace Loyalty:
Handley Chipman's British Affections and American Sympathies

Under the heading, “Remarkable Events of Providence,” Handley Chipman, Esq., began the body of his commonplace book with this timeline:

About the year 1388 much Popish hypocrisy was discover’d to Amazment
About the year 1488, The reformation from Popery was at a great height in Germany, &c.
And in the Year 1588, The Spanish Armada was destroyed that was Sent against England in Queen Elizabeth’s day, &c.
And in the Year 1688, Our Nation was deliver’d from Popery by King W/m the 3d and Queen Mary coming on the Throne of England, &c.¹

Working from the precise dates of 1588 and 1688, and by massaging the earlier dates, Chipman tightly plotted the move from “Popery” to Protestantism, with English liberty providentially established by naval prowess and the Glorious Revolution. It is an outline of English history—and an expression of passionate British identity—that could have been written anytime during the eighteenth century. What makes Chipman’s document remarkable, however, is that it was written by a former New Englander living in Nova Scotia during the early months of 1776. At that time and in that place—mere months after the outbreak of revolutionary hostilities, and with the participation of Nova Scotia still unclear—it was not at all certain how the chronology would be concluded. He could only write,

It is a most awful and very Melancholy time now in our Nation, on account of the war Great Britain is Engaged in with her Colonys in North America ... What the Year 1788 may bring forth, God alone knows.

Handley Chipman expressed political passions that have become difficult for us to imagine. He was, without contradiction, a proud New Englander and an ardent British subject. He had a whig's passion to safeguard liberty and a monarchist's deep affection for the King. Chipman was, in short, a loyalist before the Loyalists. This emotional and political juxtaposition was not unique among British Americans, and indeed this kind of loyalism may have been their default disposition for most of the eighteenth century.² It is challenging to recover the emotions of loyalism before the Revolution, however—obscured as they were by the increasing polarization of American politics in the months leading up to 1776, and because historians have been more interested in the emergence of Patriot feelings.³ An examination of

---

² Brendan McConville offers the most recent case for American colonists' devotion to the King throughout the eighteenth century. Eric Nelson offers a different view of American perceptions of the King. He allows that colonists may have had an emotional connection to the King, but he argues that they were primarily "whigs" in their constitutional views, placing their trust in a limited monarchy, the King-in-Parliament. While McConville argues that the Revolution turned colonists from monarchists into whigs, Nelson argues it turned them from whigs into royalists, with a new concern for royal prerogative (over against a Parliament they viewed as unfriendly to American interests). Chipman's example would seem to confirm McConville's argument about American devotion to the King, but it also suggests that Americans could be both whigs (constitutionally) and monarchists (emotionally). McConville, The King's Three Faces; Eric Nelson, The Royalist Revolution: Monarchy and the American Founding (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2014), esp. 239 note 29. See also Richard L. Bushman, King and People in Provincial Massachusetts (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1985); and Keith Mason, "Loyalism in British North America in the Age of Revolution, c. 1775-1812," in Loyalism and the Formation of the British World, 165. For the case for defining loyalism's long history, in distinction from the American Revolution, see Bumsted, Understanding the Loyalists, 48-9; Bannister, "Planter Studies and Atlantic Scholarship," 30-2; Bannister and Riordan, "Loyalism and the British Atlantic;" and Mancke, "Idiosyncratic Localism," 176.

³ On the need to examine British and Loyalist, and not only Patriot, emotions, see Pearsall, "The Power of Feeling?", 665, 669-671.
Chipman’s writings contributes to such a recovery, and also, more generally, highlights the emotional dimensions of early modern political identity.

Chipman’s expressions of strong, loyal British affections illustrate the persistence of such an emotional and political possibility up to the eve of the American Revolution—and even beyond. The coming of the Revolution did not diminish Chipman’s feeling of Britishness, though, as a former New Engander with sympathy for colonial complaints, the ruptures of those years were profoundly unsettling, mixing his loyalism with sadness. Before moving to Nova Scotia in 1761 as part of the Planter migration, Handley Chipman (1717-1799) had lived on Cape Cod, Martha’s Vineyard, and in Newport, Rhode Island. Variously a cabinetmaker and the owner of a large distillery in New England, in Nova Scotia he was a Justice of the Peace and a farmer. Living in Nova Scotia from the end of the Seven Years’ War, through the American Revolution, and into the French Revolution, Chipman could not make easy assumptions about his identity as a British North American.

Chipman was a Briton with a New England accent, in both voice and temperament. His writings provide an individual perspective on what historians have labeled anglicization—that cultural process by which eighteenth-century

---

Americans became more—not less—British. Instead of the cultural drift that might be expected a century after settlement, colonists became more integrated into the British Atlantic world, due to a combination of factors including imperial centralization, transatlantic religious awakenings, a common print culture, and a shared culture of consumption. Provincials like Chipman self-consciously constructed a loyal British identity by the offices they held, the Protestant beliefs they shared, the tea they consumed, and the metropolitan magazines they read. They happily envisioned a steadfastly British future for the American colonies.

Emotions were an important aspect of this Anglicizing convergence. Britons experienced a sense of belonging to the Empire; they embraced the “Protestant interest,” in part, because of fearful anti-Catholicism; pride and confidence swelled with Britain’s military victories and territorial gains; and British subjects nurtured a warm affection for the King, a monarchist sentiment that was particularly

---


6 The “new” British history has emphasized that ideas such as “Britain” or “Britishness” were not givens—they had to be consciously constructed and maintained through culture and policy. The literature is vast, but see especially J. G. A. Pocock, “British History: A Plea for a New Subject,” The Journal of Modern History 47, no. 4 (1975): 601-21; Colley, Britons; and Wilson, The Sense of the People. In a wide-ranging essay, Nancy Christie explores how British North America can be located in this historiography; “Introduction: Theorizing a Colonial Past: Canada as a Society of British Settlement,” in Transatlantic Subjects, 3-41. For the complexities of defining Britishness in Nova Scotia, see Eamon, Imprinting Britain, 16-8.
passionate in the American colonies. Passion, writes one historian, “gave the first British empire coherence.”

Chipman articulated his political feelings in his manuscripts, which included a commonplace book created in the unsettling early months of 1776, and a diary kept from 1794-96, in which he reflected on his emotional experience of the Age of Revolutions. His handwritten compositions are an important counterweight to the printed sources most often consulted to reconstruct national feeling. Historian Michael Eamon, for example, has recently argued that the eighteenth-century newspapers of Halifax and Quebec helped to “imprint” an idealized sense of Britishness on colonial readers. Yet political identity was not passively received; individuals engaged in a process of self-fashioning for their political emotions. Reading and structured note-taking were means of actively shaping “how individuals understood their own membership of communities,” as they decided which events had heightened significance for them. Britons like Chipman actively and feelingly negotiated a way forward through their reading and experiences, sometimes literally writing their own version of Britishness.


---

7 McConville, *The King’s Three Faces*, 105.
9 Eamon, *Imprinting Britain*. See also Landsman, *From Colonials to Provincial*, 32-34.
The tall, slender volume of 244 pages is a self-made anthology of selections that Chipman compiled from his reading in a number of genres: contemporary news, *bon mots*, moralizing poetry, interesting facts, reports of unusual events, and historical chronologies. While the creators of some early modern commonplace books followed John Locke’s model of highly structured collections of quotations arranged by topic, Chipman’s was a miscellany, in which extracts from his reading were transcribed page by page. His verse preface asserted his dual purpose for commonplacing:

And Thus pains I have taken to amuse my mind.
O that God herein may to me be really kind.
And help me and mine to Improve them Aright
And Serve him, my God, with all my heart & Might.¹²

Chipman’s pairing of *amusement* with *improvement* suggests that his reading experience combined pleasure with self-fashioning.

The materials Chipman chose for constructing his political affections were especially drawn from metropolitan magazines and colonial almanacs. Creating his

---


¹² Chipman, *Commonplace Book*, xii.
commonplace book in 1776, he extracted items from back issues—from the 1750s and 60s—of periodicals such as The Gentleman’s Magazine and The London Magazine. The selections from these London periodicals reveal how one British American imagined his place in a transatlantic British emotional community. Chipman transcribed material from colonial almanacs from the 1760s and 70s. These ubiquitous publications were “the empire’s basic historical-political literature,” helping to shape the British affections of American colonists.

Chipman’s commonplace book makes his engagement with all of these texts visible, a practice that, as historian David Allan has observed, was a means of “expressing and thus for reinforcing one’s own patriotism through selective textual appropriation.” Chipman’s selections, then, provide some insight into the complex political emotions that he chose to express and reinforce at a moment of uncertainty in British America.

---


15 Allan, Commonplace Books and Reading, 233.
Internalizing a historical narrative

Chipman wrote and copied historical chronologies into his commonplace book, creating and internalizing a particular narrative of British history. It may be hard to imagine lists of names and dates as gripping reading material, but chronologies have a long history and remained a popular genre of historical writing during the eighteenth century. Chipman composed or transcribed seven such timelines in the space of only a few months, demonstrating how historical culture helped to shape his emotional connections to Britain.

Headed with titles such as “Memorable Events of Providence” or “Remarkable Events,” the commonplace timelines were drawn from several kinds of print sources. Best known are the chronologies found in almanacs, presenting a “highly selective and imaginative resumé of world history.” Some of Chipman’s chronologies drew upon the annual reviews or thematic surveys regularly published in the London gentlemen’s magazines (one of which even had the subtitle, the


17 Chipman, Commonplace Book, 5, 10-11, 11-17, 20, 21, 33, 135-136.

18 Colley, Britons, 22.
“Monthly Chronologer”). Chipman compiled the longest of his commonplace chronicles, with 250 entries over seven pages, from the three-volume *British Chronologist*. Another book-length source was *The Chronological Remembrancer*, the title suggesting that many would turn to these works as aids to memorization. The chronologist aids the historian, claimed one volume’s preface, by giving “system to description and regularity to facts.” They did this by “erecting landing places ... for the Reader’s recollection.” Another publication less loftily but more forthrightly declared itself to be “Designed for the Pocket, in order to set People right in Conversation.”

Despite their claims to objectivity, however, chronologies were necessarily selective histories, conveying a particular narrative and evoking certain emotions. The chronologies that Chipman read (especially in almanacs) and those he created can be understood in the broader context of a historical culture fostered in the decades after the Glorious Revolution of 1688—what one historian describes as the “royalization of public life and political time.” “Britishness” came to be identified with Protestantism (and anti-Catholicism), constitutional liberties, territorial

---


20 *The Chronological Remembrancer* (Dublin: James Hoey, 1750).

21 *The British Chronologist*, I; emphasis in original.


expansion and naval prowess, and devotion to the Hanoverian monarchy. In the early eighteenth century, imperial officials began to transform the calendar, promoting the popular celebration of royal birthdays, military victories, and milestones in English Protestantism. While ceremonial culture helped Britons to “perform” those events, chronologies marked out that historical narrative in print so that it could be internalized.24 That Chipman not only read and copied such timelines, but actually composed his own, suggests the extent to which he emotionally identified with that narrative of Britishness.

Eighteenth-century British chronologies put the events since the Glorious Revolution in the longest possible context, connecting them to ancient history. One of Chipman’s timelines reaches back to the world’s creation, providing the differing dates calculated by Greek and Roman Catholic Churches, rabbinical writings, the Holy Scriptures, and “profane” history.25 Another begins with the birth of Jesus Christ, and takes in such other momentous events as “Rome burnt by Command of Nero” and “the Art of Printing found out,” before eventually concluding with the capture of Louisbourg.26

The early history of England was well represented in the commonplace timelines. Chipman noted that the word ‘Parliament’ was first used in 1205, that “the common people in England [were] Still in Slavery” in 1375, and that the first

24 On “internalizing,” see McConville, The Three Faces of the King, 200-1. On the use of the calendar for the cultivation of English national identity, see David Cressy, Bonfires and Bells: National Memory and the Protestant Calendar in Elizabethan and Stuart England (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1989); and Wilson, Sense of the People, 21-4. For adaptation of the calendar in American identity-making, see Waldstreicher, In the Midst of Perpetual Fetes.
25 Chipman, Commonplace Book, 10.
planting of cherry trees in England was in 1540. One chronology focused almost exclusively on English exploration and colonization, and another on the emergence of England as a trading nation.27

A contest between “popery” and Protestantism ran through the chronologies. A few key moments in the European and English Reformations were noted, as were translations of the Bible into English. Anti-Catholic anxieties were expressed in the numerous entries about the Gunpowder Plot, including its discovery in 1605, the conviction of the conspirators in 1606, and, in that same year, Parliament’s Act for a “Yearly thanksgiving for Discovery of the powder Plot.” The central event in the narration of England’s history as a Protestant nation was unquestionably the Glorious Revolution of 1688, about which Chipman wrote, “Our Nation was deliver’d from Popery by King Wm and Queen Mary coming on the Throne of England.” Another chronology exclusively recorded “Memorable Events of Providence Since the Revolution in 1688.”28 The coronations, victories, proclamations, and deaths of England’s royalty feature prominently in the chronologies: Henry VIII, Elizabeth, Charles I, James I, Charles II, James II, Anne, and the Hanoverian kings are all noted. A separate entry from 1760 listed the current royal family, including their births and marriages.

Many entries reflected Chipman’s identity as a Briton in North America. While he exhibited a general interest in Britain’s martial victories, his numerous entries on the 1745 attack on Louisbourg detailed the specific dates of New England troop movements and the number of guns on Warren’s ships. And while the

27 Chipman, Commonplace Book, 20, 33.
milestones of what we might call generic Protestantism were certainly included, so too were moments in George Whitefield’s itinerancy in New England. Chipman folded these American events into a larger British narrative.

Chipman’s transcription and creation of historical timelines demonstrates the importance of historical culture in the construction of British identity, and how internalizing a particular historical narrative helped to shape common imperial passions. Crafting these chronologies during the unsettling events of 1776 was a way for Chipman to rehearse and reaffirm this narrative, and to make some emotional sense of British American anxieties. It is also notable that Chipman continued to locate his British American identity in England’s long history—ancient constitutions, royal lineage, imperial exploration. The Declaration of Independence, drafted only months after Chipman’s chronologies, reflected the conscious choice not to ground the new American nation in that same historical culture. As Benedict Anderson observed, there was a “profound feeling that a radical break with the past was occurring”—notwithstanding the many historical continuities that such a declaration glossed over.29 Despite his anxieties, Chipman remained committed to plotting his North American identity in that long British timeline. More generally, Chipman’s resolutely historical text speaks to the importance of “humility in the face of the past” to his expression of loyalism and political moderation.30

29 Anderson, Imagined Communities, 193. I am grateful to Elizabeth Mancke for making this point about Chipman’s continuing commitment to a historically-grounded identity.
30 Robert M. Calhoon, Political Moderation in America’s First Two Centuries (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 16, 298.
Commonplace Loyalty

Affection for the King was at the centre of Chipman’s political feelings, and in this he was a typical eighteenth-century British American. He copied into his notebook some effusive poetic lines from a 1762 almanac on the transfer of the crown from George II to George III:

The best of Kings has Laid his Scepter down,
And George the Third adorns the British Crown
New Conquered Realms join to his boundless Sway
And Savage Chiefs their willing Homage pay
He Reigns o’er Realms to former Kings unknown
Whose Vanquish’d Monarks due Subjection own.31

The verse lauded the superiority of Britain’s monarch above all contenders, as well as the global reach of the Empire. The encomium, “best of Kings,” here applied to George II (d. 1760), was in turn used to laud George III. Boston engraver Nathaniel Hurd, for example, produced a 1762 print entitled, “Britons Behold the Best of Kings,” featuring George III flanked by William Pitt and James Wolfe. The inscription reads, “Beloved by the Bravest of People. Justly Admired by all. By his Enemies Dreaded. May he live long and happy. No Evil and Corrupt Ministers are to Approach his Sacred presence. Let none but such as Imitate his Virtues, have any Power. Then shall Britannia be Blést for Ever.”32 The “best of kings,” then, was not only an abstract statement about British monarchical polity, but also a personal attachment to a particular King’s virtues.

---

No less exuberant was the “remarkable address” to the King from the formerly French subjects of Grenada, written in 1765. They declared their new British King to be “the Sovereign of the Seas, the Conqueror of the age, the pacifier of Europe, and the illustrious object of the Love of the most flourishing of all Nations.” They praised “the Splendor and glory, which your Majesty gives to Great Britain and to the name of British Subjects.” Informed by their own experience as a conquered nation, they remarked on his military victories—a “rapidity of conquest, of which the astonished universe Scarcely finds any Example in History”—and his treatment of former enemies—“your benevolence for all mankind, the greatness of your Soul, and the profound wisdom of your Councils.” Is it any wonder, they asked, that the King rules over “happy Britons”?

The Grenadian address also demonstrates how royal affections did real political work. The petitioners were no doubt aware that the affections of a conquered people were not incidental to the peaceful functioning of an empire attempting to extend its authority into new regions. Moreover, the affectionate ties between King and subjects also provided the basis for petitioning. Their address requested the King to grant them, “without distinction, every Advantage of a British Subject” which would render him “the object of the Admiration, the Confidence, and Affection of the Conquered people, and that in a Manner as honourable to himself as advantageous to his Country.” They continued:

We beseech your Majesty to permit us to assure you, that your Majesty has no subjects more faithful and thankful, more jealouse of the Support and increase of your glory, none in whose hearts you

---

33 Chipman, Commonplace Book, 176-77. The address is selected from the Gentleman’s Magazine (June 1765), 285.
reign more Sovereignly and who are more warmly disposed to Serve their New Country, with their Lives and fortunes, than your Subjects of Grenada.

The monarchy was conceived as a relationship between a benevolent Parent and loving dependents, giving both parties reciprocal (if uneven) responsibilities.34 By lauding the benevolence of the King in his treatment of enemies, the new subjects were employing that royal disposition as a standard by which the King’s conduct might be measured. They offered their loyal passions as evidence that they were ready to contribute as subjects. The emotional language of this address, then, was not merely a manipulative sop, but was actually a performative appeal to the nature of monarchical governance. By copying the text into his commonplace book, Chipman rendered it a “remarkable” example of how loyal subjects should feelingly address their Sovereign, and how the Empire was expanded and structured by emotional ties, as well as conquest and bureaucracy. If the King’s conquered subjects could express such a fulsome declaration of their devotion, how much more should those born with the privileges of English liberty express their warm, loyal affections?

Chipman chose to reaffirm his affection for the King by including these selections at about the same time that Thomas Paine’s *Common Sense*, published in January 1776, was proposing to overturn Americans’ passionate cult of monarchy, declaring “There is something exceedingly ridiculous in the composition of monarchy” and that the “monarchy in every instance is the Popery of

34 On petitions, see Bushman, *King and People in Provincial Massachusetts*, 46-54. On how emotional ties helped to structure the empire, see McConville, *The King’s Three Faces*, 106-112.
government.” Chipman’s fervently royalist excerpts were far more representative, right up to (and perhaps beyond) the eve of the War of Independence, and a reminder of just how revolutionary Paine’s anti-monarchical passion really was.

In addition to his personal ardour for the King, Chipman also conveyed a strong commitment to the House of Hanover, over against its sometime Stuart rival. This was not simply a matter of genealogical curiosity. For eighteenth-century British Americans, the Stuarts represented Catholicism and tyranny, while the Hanoverians secured the Glorious Revolution’s Protestant settlement and its benevolent, limited constitutional monarchy. Chipman excerpted one contributor’s caustic mockery of another writer’s attempt to prove the validity of the Stuart claim. Only “deluded people,” the article claimed, would contend against “the Legitimate and right Line.” Chipman added his own poetic comments:

O what is it deluded man will not Embrace,  
Ah when Ignorance and Self-will do take place.

Devotion to the Stuart monarchy, he claimed, was irrational and corrupt, while the Hanoverian line was the genealogy of liberty.

Chipman thrilled at the extent of Britain’s military victory and acquisition of territory at the conclusion of the Seven Years’ War. He recorded a French author’s reflections on the North American colonies, made before British conquests in St. Augustine and Quebec. The observer noted that though England had a “Chain of Colonies … reaching to Spanish Florida,” the French possessions stretched “without

---

35 Paine, Common Sense, 69 and 76.  
36 See McConville, The King’s Three Faces, 8, 83-92, and on the rehabilitation of the Stuarts in political culture, 193-202.  
37 Chipman, Commonplace Book, 117.
bounds up the Country,” enclosing the English and Spanish colonies.\textsuperscript{38} French colonies, the author boasted, “may be Said to form a kind of bow, of which those of the other Nations are the String.” With great relish, Chipman observed how the map had been redrawn after Britain’s victory in the Seven Years’ War:

But now thanks to divine providence we are in possession not only of the String but bow also, and doubtless with a Common blessing may Still keep it in Spite of any Earthly power whatever.

Contemporaries and historians alike have noted, “the sheer enjoyment the British public seems to have felt amidst the cascade of imperial triumphs”—the victories supplying much-needed relief after the uncertainties and national self-doubts of the war years.\textsuperscript{39} Any doubts that had arisen due to the century’s back-and-forth conflicts with France were set aside, and the narrative of an ascendant Protestant empire was confirmed.

Yet even stories of British military defeat could elicit patriotic feelings. In March 1776, Chipman copied Nathaniel Ames’s poem on Braddock’s Defeat, more than two decades after one of Britain’s most ignominious military losses.\textsuperscript{40} At the start of the French and Indian War, in 1755, Major General Edward Braddock was to lead British regular troops to capture the French Fort Duquesne in the Ohio Valley, but they were overwhelmed and outmaneuvered by a combined French and

\textsuperscript{38} Chipman, Commonplace Book, 99; quoting \textit{The London Magazine} (October 1754), 506-7.
\textsuperscript{40} Chipman, Commonplace Book, 51-2; quoting Nathaniel Ames, \textit{An astronomical diary: or, almanack for the year of our Lord Christ, 1756} (Portsmouth, NH: D. Fowle, [1755]). On Braddock’s defeat and the Seven Years’ War, see Fred Anderson, \textit{Crucible of War: The Seven Years’ War and the Fate of Empire in British North America, 1754-1766} (New York: Vintage Books, 2000).
Indigenous force at what became known as the Battle of the Monongahela. Ames’s poem articulated several emotions. It invited the reader to enter into a sympathetic *pathos* with the “Noble Heroes, most Ignobly Slain,” a meditation on “Britain’s bleeding Glory.” But loss would not be the last word. With confidence in Britain’s martial prowess, the poem boasts, “This foul Defeat Shall full revenged be.” Written several months after the events it describes, the poem mentions hopeful rumours that the tide of the war was turning, and that Britain’s perpetual enemy would be defeated: “The Proud Gallic Powers / Prostrate themselves before the Leaden Show’rs ... / How Like the Leaves the dying Frenchmen fall.” Chipman, copying the poem years afterward, would have felt the satisfaction of knowing just how extensive was Britain's victory in the wider conflict. The poet asserted that the moral character of the British army was worthy of regard. He declared, “Your Soldiers are Like their great Leaders—true.” He also drew a sharp contrast between the “skulking” battlefield behaviour of the French and Indigenous “others” and the nobility of the British: “Behold our Camp from fear, from Vice refin’d / Not of the filth, But flower of human kind.” The putative morality of their military was yet another reason for Britons like Chipman to feel pride in imperial expansion. Other selections in the commonplace book focused on the virtuous character of British soldiers while impugning the Spanish with being more motivated by finding gold mines than spreading the gospel.41

Chipman shared in the veneration of popular figures in Britain’s public life. Among those represented in the commonplace book was William Pitt the Elder,

41 Chipman, Commonplace Book, 57, 113-14.
whig champion and architect of Britain’s victory in the Seven Years’ War. Pitt’s popularity was perhaps even greater in America, reflecting his steady support of colonial causes. Chipman copied in its entirety the paean to Pitt that appeared, with his image, on the cover of Bickerstaff’s Boston Almanack for 1772:

Hail first of Patriots whose Extensive mind
Revolves the vast concerns of mankind,
Contending Realms accept control from thee,
And Britain’s Glory hangs on thy decree.
War, deals destruction, Peace her olive brings,
As thy supreme direction, governs Kings.
Whene’er thou bid’st, the wreaths of conquest fall,
The guide, the friend, the guardian of us all.42

Chipman did admit, at the bottom of the page, that the verse “Exalts too high,” but still chose to include its expressive celebration of a Briton who elicited such strong feelings throughout the empire.

Few themes could rouse the passions as did English liberty. Britons traced their history as a narrative of freedoms secured from the tyranny of kings, popes, and enemies, and took pride in the enshrinement of those liberties in the English constitution. Yet liberty was to be protected, as much as celebrated. Like other British Americans in the eighteenth century, Chipman was influenced by the whig tradition of political writers—a loyal “country” opposition to courtly power—who upheld vigilance against corruption and tyranny.43 Brendan McConville argues that

---

42 Chipman, Commonplace Book, 30; quoting Bickerstaff’s Boston Almanack For the Year of our Lord, 1772 (Boston: John Fleeming, 1771), front cover.
metropolitan and colonial experiences of this tradition were often different. For most of the eighteenth century, while colonists ascribed a greater role to the King in guarding their liberties by providing a check to ministerial power, metropolitan whigs were more indifferent to the Hanoverian monarchy. In Chipman’s commonplace book that difference is noticeable in the contrast between the selections on endangered liberty from metropolitan magazines, and the strongly monarchist items from colonial almanacs. There is more than a little irony that Chipman’s more whiggish commonplace selections were drawn from metropolitan sources, while his more monarchist pieces came from American almanacs. The dovetailing of loyalism and criticism suggests how nuanced Chipman’s political emotions could be.

The long history of English liberty was often traced to the thirteenth-century Magna Carta, a discussion of which appears early in Chipman’s volume. Excerpted from a 1768 almanac, the item described “Magnacharta” as “the great Charter of the

---

44 The King’s Three Faces, 50, 76-80.
45 William Benton identified a category of colonial leaders whose whig ideology led them to first agitate as Patriots during the imperial crisis, but then faced with the possibility of American independence, “switched sides” to become Loyalists. William Allen Benton, Whig-Loyalism: An Aspect of Political Ideology in the American Revolutionary Era (Madison, NJ: Farleigh Dickinson University Press, 1969). See also Leopold S. Launitz-Schürer, Loyal Whigs and Revolutionaries: The Making of the Revolution in New York, 1765-1776 (New York: New York University Press, 1980); and Calhoon, Political Moderation, 80. Ruma Chopra has demonstrated how widespread whig ideology was among New York colonists, including those who later became Loyalists; see Unnatural Rebellion: Loyalists in New York City During the Revolution (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2011), ch. 1. Chipman seems to have held his whig critique of arbitrary power alongside his loyal monarchism. It is, of course, difficult to know how he would have acted in a more polarized political environment.
The short paragraph outlined the document’s early history, in which kings “several times confirmed, and often broke” their oaths to “faithfully and inviolably to observe the things therein contained.” Apparently for want of space at the bottom of his page, Chipman left out the almanac’s assertion that, “This excellent charter, so equitable and beneficial to the subject, is the most ancient written law in the kingdom.” He does, however, include his own brief but poignant parenthetical comment, “O that it was now observ’d”—a remark that implies a sorry gap between the nation’s legacy of constitutional liberties and its contemporary experience.

In a series of entries on liberty and faction, Chipman expressed his anxious devotion. Supplying the heading, “Of English Liberties,” Chipman selected lines from a 1764 letter to the editor of The Gentleman’s and London Magazine, complaining of the English excise tax on cider. The tax, intended to recoup some of the costs of the Seven Years’ War, was as unpopular in England as the Stamp Act was in America, and was similarly interpreted as an overreach of government. The letter continued, “If there is to be no alteration in the Cyder act, farewell to English liberties, which has Cost this Nation So much blood & treasure.” Chipman paraphrased the letter, and then inserted this pessimistic commentary: “O what do we ever git again that is once yielded up[?]” He then noted the author’s typically whig worry about power

---

46 Chipman, Commonplace Book, 5; quoting Bickerstaff’s Boston Almanack For the Year of our Lord, 1768 (Boston: John Fleeming, 1767).
and tyranny: “Power, Like Avarice, has a devouring appetite, which increases the
more it is fed, and thus Government becomes Arbitrary.”

Chipman was also disquieted by attempts to curtail the freedom of the press. In an entry on “Faction and Licentiousness,” he copied a letter-writer’s contention that “attempts are now made on the Liberties of the people or the Liberty of the press, that guardian of all our other Liberties.” He claimed that acts that restricted the press with the flimsy justification of political “faction” were nothing more than the “artful insinuations of ministerial writers.” And in what appears to be his own emotional summation of the magazine’s feature on, “Laws in England, Subversive of the Rights of Englishmen,” Chipman wrote:

It is a Lamentable thing that people are So regardless of Liberty. Liberty can only be guarded in a free State with a jealous eye; indifference opens a door to Lay a foundation for Slavery, which has been the Case in most Nations.

Chipman’s British loyalism was tinctured with lament. While he took pride in the nation’s history of constitutional freedoms, he was angry at ministerial attempts to limit those liberties, and grieved that many subjects took them for granted. He prized, in the words of one of his selections, that most political of passions—“zeal in Asserting the Rights and Liberty of the Subject.”

It is striking that in early 1776, this former New Englander chose to express both his ardent British and royal affections and his whig criticism of ministerial

---

47 Chipman, Commonplace Book, 148; quoting from The Gentleman’s and London Magazine (Dublin), (March 1764), 178-79.
48 Chipman, Commonplace Book, 147; quoting from The Gentleman’s and London Magazine (Dublin), (March 1764), 178.
49 Chipman Commonplace Book, 148. For the heading, see The Gentleman’s and London Magazine (Dublin), (March 1764), 179.
50 Chipman Commonplace Book, 149, quoting from an unidentified source, dated 1763.
authority—views that he did not regard as contradictory. Indeed, for much of the eighteenth century, Chipman’s emotional and political stance was typical for British Americans, rather than extraordinary. With the intensification of the American imperial crisis and the onset of the War of Independence, however, it was increasingly difficult for British Americans to avoid the polarization of their political emotions.

Having established Chipman’s full-throated British affections, one might ask, is anything particularly North American about his perspective and feelings? To be sure, on the very first page of the commonplace book, Chipman established his New England bona fides—he began his family notes with the declaration that his grandfather married the daughter of “the first man that Set foot on Plimoth Shore in New England from the first Vessel that came to bring Settlers into those parts.” On the other hand, he also stressed his British pedigree; one grandfather was born in “Do[r]setShire in Old England” and the other was “a Londoner.”

Chipman’s British identity seems to have coincided with his aspirations for North American society. He reproduced Nathaniel Ames’s poem, “On America,” written in 1762, when the British future of the American colonies still seemed secure:

America, kind Heav’ns peculiar care
Vast heaps of Nature’s Stores are treasur’d here,
Here the kind Earth produces yearly grain,
Soften’d by waters and descending rain
In time thy Towers will vie with Europe Pride,

51 Chipman, Commonplace Book, 1.
52 On eighteenth-century views of the future of America within the British Empire, see Potter, Liberty We Seek, chs. 6, 8.
And Scepter’d heads will Gladly here reside.\(^53\)

The poem described the colonial development of the natural bounty of North America, and envisioned that one day royalty would reside there, and not just in distant Europe. For Chipman, his North American and British loyalties ran side by side, in a way reminiscent of Benjamin Franklin’s pre-revolutionary view that, “the Foundations of the future Grandeur and Stability of the British Empire lie in America.”\(^54\) That sentiment, expressed by Ames and Franklin in the early 1760s, may have seemed less assured in the early months of 1776 when Chipman copied them into his notebook. Yet it was a political vision he consciously preserved.\(^55\)

**Imperial affection and subjection**

The last fifty pages of Chipman’s commonplace book were devoted to his careful note-taking and commentary on Cadwallader Colden’s *The History of the Five Indian Nations of Canada*, a decidedly British history of the Haudenosaunee

---

\(^{53}\) Chipman, Commonplace Book, 47; quoting Nathaniel Ames, *An astronomical diary: or, almanack for the year of our Lord Christ, 1762* (Portsmouth, NH: D. Fowle, [1761]).


\(^{55}\) In his important revisionist argument about the identity of Loyalists, Edward Larkin contends, “Understanding themselves as imperial subjects, loyalists saw no necessary contradiction between their local identity as Americans and their national identity as Britons;” Larkin, “What is a Loyalist?” (unpaginated). Jane Errington argues that for some this remained the case even after the American Revolution, as Loyalists and American settlers to Upper Canada maintained this kind of bi-focal political sensibility. Although such people “clearly had strong political and emotional ties to the empire, they saw no contradiction between this and their commitment to the New World and to their old homeland.” Jane Errington, *The Lion, the Eagle, and Upper Canada: A Developing Colonial Ideology* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1987), 7.
Confederacy. Colden’s agenda in writing his *History* was to convince readers that imperial relationships founded in mutual affections and friendship were more secure than those that relied upon heavy-handed coercion. By supplying British officials with a more accurate and sympathetic history, he hoped it would be possible to repair the tenuous alliance between the British and the Haudenosaunee, to adopt a policy that appealed to their affections, rather than attempted to subject them. Chipman proved to be receptive to this argument, and read the book as a study in English, French, and Haudenosaunee political virtue. The relationship between subjection and affection in Britain’s North American policy was never timelier than during those tense early months of 1776 when Chipman meditated on Colden’s text.56

In his notes and comments, Chipman portrayed the loyalty of the Haudenosaunee. Selfless devotion to their own people elicited Colden’s (somewhat condescending) admiration that, “None of the Roman heroes have discover’d a greater Love for their Country … than these Barbarians have done.”57 He qualified his praise by claiming that the Haudenosaunee’s “noble Virtues” were “sullied” by indulging in “that Cruel passion, Revenge.” In his own words, Chipman likewise commended the Five Nations for their political fidelity:

---


Possibly it cannot be found that any Christian Nation has kept to their alliance with So much Strictness and truth for so Long a time as the five Nations has with the English, even from 1664 to this year 1776.

By carefully note-taking his way through Colden’s ethnographic study, he became sympathetic enough to Haudenosaunee history and culture to challenge, at least in part, the discourse that set Indigenous “Others” over and against British “civilization.” He concluded, “Thus hath these Savage Nations in many respects taught the English Lessons of Morality far Exceeding what many of us have taught them, but it is to be Lamented we have taught many Vices to them formerly altogether unknown.”\(^{58}\)

Chipman also read Colden’s *History* as a comparative study of French and English imperial policies, assessing which approach was better suited to win and retain the affections of the Haudenosaunee. In summarizing the breakdown of the French alliance with the Five Nations, he observed a pattern: “The French, behaving roodly to the five Nations Still and Sometimes deceiving them,” and noted their cruel treatment of Indigenous prisoners of war. He commented that such conduct had the inevitable result that, “All the Nations that had Shewn friendship to the French now openly came to the English, Seeking their friendship and Alliance.”\(^ {59}\) Violence and duplicity were no foundations for loyalty.

Were the English any more deserving than the French of the affections of the Haudenosaunee? Drawing on his own experience with New England traders, as well as his reading of Colden, Chipman admitted that, “doubtless the English has wronged them ofte in Trade [and] … in the purchase of Lands.” But he qualified

\(^{58}\) Chipman, Commonplace Book, 216-17.

\(^{59}\) Chipman, Commonplace Book, 241, 243.
that admission by suggesting that those wrongs were committed “not as a body, but by individuals.” What then of imperial relationships? He wrote that (unlike the French), “The English prosecuted their Measures ... only with the Arts of Peace, Sending their people among them in a very friendly Manner.” Chipman concluded his meditation, “Thus we have gone through the Material transactions which the five nations had with the English, in which we find the English pursuing nothing but peaceable and Christian Measures, and the five Nations Living in the Main Like friends.” And as he so often did, Chipman also expressed himself in verse:

Thus is concluded [this] Account of the English
In which there doth not appear much blemish,
in their transactions with the five Nations.
But they Conducted with honesty and Patience.

Chipman’s assessment of English relations with the Haudenosaunee appears to have been (perhaps naively) more positive than Colden’s. The History, after all, was written in the early decades of the eighteenth century to urge British officials to change their policy, to return to friendship as a form of diplomacy so that the Covenant Chain could be repaired. Yet it may be that Chipman was also reading with a later set of imperial tensions in mind, at a moment when American colonists were resisting what they perceived to be the coercive treatment of British subjects. On Chipman’s reading of Colden, British imperial policy in North America was vindicated as benevolent, an assessment that confirmed his own loyal affections.

\[\text{60} \text{ Chipman, Commonplace Book, 216-17.}\]
\[\text{61} \text{ Chipman, Commonplace Book, 228.}\]
A melancholy history of Britain’s eighteenth century

Did the unfolding events of the American Revolution cause an alteration in Chipman’s political passions? His commonplace book was completed only a few months before the Declaration of Independence, and in Nova Scotia political allegiances were in turmoil for the duration of the conflict. Diary entries made more than a decade after the conclusion of the Revolution reveal Chipman to have maintained his affectionate loyalty for Britain and the Crown. Nevertheless, he expressed profound sadness at the changes wrought by the Revolution, much of which he felt could be blamed on the pride of his ungrateful nation and the “haughty Zeal” of an “arbitrary ministry.” Even as he prayed for the King, he worried about the war underway with France and the abhorrent possibility of a “Government without a King.”

In a particularly long entry in his diary for 1794, Chipman used expressive, emotional language to reflect on the wars of his lifetime, and to comment on the role that public affections played in those events. He lamented, “O what Sad Wars and bloodshed has there been almost ever since I have been a free man of age ... and great overturns has been made by the Wars in the time.” He traced the “overturns” of four major conflicts in his lifetime, and found much to mourn in the recent history of the nation he continued to love.

King George’s War (1744-1748), Chipman claimed, “Ended not much to the Credit of our Nation.” For American colonists the war started propitiously enough

---

62 Handley Chipman, Diary (1794-1796), Chipman Family Fonds, Esther Clark Wright Archives, Acadia University, Wolfville, Nova Scotia, D1931.001.4.2, entry for Aug. 30, 1794. Hereafter cited as Chipman Diary. All the Chipman quotations in this section are from this long entry, unless otherwise noted.
with the capture of Louisbourg in 1745. As Chipman proudly noted, “Cape-Brittain ... was taken mainly by the New England forces with the favour of thy holy Providence.” New Englanders interpreted the conflict as a turning point of eschatological significance, a victory securing Protestant colonists from the Catholic threat to the North. Chipman’s longest commonplace chronology, discussed earlier, memorialized numerous individual moments in the battle. So it was profoundly disappointing when “we did give [Louisbourg] up to the french,” as a condition of the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle (1748).

The pattern of victory being swallowed up by the broader consequences of a war was repeated in Chipman’s description of the Seven Years’ War (1754-1763). Like other Britons, especially in North America, Chipman surged with pride at the expansion of the empire at the war’s conclusion:

In the Course of thy alwise providence ... our Nation gained Victory by Sea and Land against the French and Spainard almost every where, taking a Vast many and Some very Valuable places from them, as well as great treasures by Sea.

Once again, Chipman interpreted the victory as providential, a triumph for Protestantism as much as the British Empire. Yet despite the extent of Britain’s conquest, the war was settled with “an inglorious peace.” Chipman was disappointed that, notwithstanding its territorial gains, Britain was forced to concede some “Valuable Islands and other places that we had Captured.” Of even more significance, the defeated French and Spanish were not made to pay restitution for the costs Britain incurred in the war—“Expences, great and Enormous Expences.”
Besides the territorial and fiscal legacies of the Seven Years’ War, Chipman pointed to its moral outcome, which he expressed in emotional terms. He perceived, first, that with the victorious conclusion of the war, “the Nation appeared to be much Lifted up with Pride.” After the uncertainty of the long conflict, a spirit of national self-sufficiency and hubris dominated civic life. Not only did “Vital religion” decay, but even a concern with “the form of Religion” or public morality had waned. Victory apparently did Britain little spiritual good. He lamented “that no better thanks should be given nor returns made to God, who had given the Nation so many remarkable and most Uncommonly Glorious Victories and Conquests.” Gratitude, rather than pride, he argued, was a more appropriate public feeling for the health of the nation.

Pride may have been a general malaise, but Chipman also blamed many of Britain’s subsequent troubles on the arrogance of a few. “The Nation has had, from that time to this ... a very Arbitrary and Imprudent Ministry.” Chipman charged that the arbitrary measures taken to deal with war debt led to the American Revolution, “the ruin of our Nation, and a means of dismembering Great Britain ... the Loss and distress of the Nation, which they now feel.”

In their “haughty Zeal” and “forceable ways and means,” the ministry attempted to impose new taxes on all Britons, both “Island People” and American colonists. Of the 1765 Stamp Act, levied not long after Chipman settled in Nova Scotia, he observed, “Americans thought it very Oppressive,” and then added, “as really it was.” He recalled the “great and Unspeakable joy of the American Provinces and Colonies” when the Stamp Act was repealed. The lesson was not learned,
however, and the arbitrary parliamentarians shortly thereafter imposed new direct duties on a “Multitude of Articles.” Seeing the renewed “bluster and certain opposition” to those measures, all of the acts were again repealed, except for “a duty on Teas.” Parliament unwiseiy “Stood resolutely to it” and backed up their determination by measures that the colonists knew as the Intolerable Acts—including the suspension of colonial charters, appointing judges from England, and other “Arbitrary steps.” The unnecessary and tragic result:

Great Britain broke out into a most terrible and bloody War against them, which ended as it did in the dismembering of thirteen fine prosperous Provinces and Colonies from Great Britain, and obliging Great Britain to acknowledge them free and independent States for Ever, to the grief and Sorrow of thousands.

Chipman’s emotional reflection on the American Revolution was complex. On one hand, he entirely sympathized with the colonists’ resistance to imperial overreach in the years following the Seven Years’ War. His longstanding whiggish criticism of the “Arbitrary and Imprudent ministry” echoed American reaction. He assigned little blame to the colonists for the conflict. Yet Chipman narrated the birth of the United States as a tragedy for greater Britain, rather than a triumph of liberty. He poignantly concluded, “for while they was together, to the Eye of reason, no Power could Vie with them. But now they are Separate they are both weakened.”

Chipman’s consideration of the fourth major military conflict of his lifetime, the French Revolutionary Wars (beginning in 1792), further elaborated his political affections. His dominant feelings are unmistakable: “O what Lamentable Slaughter and blood Shed has there been, by means of the present War, from the Sad Confusion in France, and the War with them.” Writing in 1796, only months after the
stunning early victories of Napoleon Bonaparte, Chipman’s prognosis was grim:
“Looks very Melancholy.” Despite his sympathies for the Americans, Chipman had not become a republican. He was troubled that France had set up a “Goverment without a King.” He observed that there was “discontent and disturbance ... in England on Account of the War,” including the agitation of many whigs that the French Revolution heralded the future of liberty. Chipman prayed, “O that Matters may not come to Extremities, Least ... it be the final ruin of our Nation.” For him, criticism of arbitrary measures in governance was not incompatible with loyalism, and did not inevitably lead to revolt. Rather, he viewed the republican changes in America and France as extremities that promised ruin, rather than liberty.

Despite his pointed criticisms and melancholic feelings, Chipman still retained a commitment to the monarchy and affection for the King. In his diary, he wrote a prayer for the King and the royal family. He sympathetically recalled “the trouble and great Anxiety thousands were under ... when our King George 3d was for a considerable time not capable of transacting affairs of the kingdom, by reason of his Senses being impared.” It was important for his political as well as spiritual feelings, he wrote, to remember, “with what thankful hearts the most of the Nation was filled with on his recovery.” Chipman offered an assessment of the King’s reign: “He has been, I trust, in the main a well-designing King, and what has been amiss has been, it appears, owing to an ill-conducted Ministry, particularly Lord North’s.” Though hardly effusive praise, it demonstrated how Chipman managed his monarchism with his political criticism. He continued to pray for the King, that God would “preserve his precious Life, Stil a very great blessing to the Nation,” and for
the Queen ("pious and ... Amiable"), the Prince of Wales, and "every branch of the Royal family." Despite all that had been "overturned" by the wars of his lifetime, and despite his criticism and melancholy, Chipman still considered Britain "our Nation and Land."

**Providence, Comfort, and Critique**

The chronology that began Chipman’s commonplace book was headed, “Remarkable events of Providence.” It appeared to frame a whiggish narrative of British history with all the standard eighteenth-century elements: Protestantism, naval prowess, and constitutional liberties. These “remarkable” historical events were memorialized and internalized because Britons felt they demonstrated divine direction in their nation’s history. But the American Revolution unsettled any inevitability to that narrative. “What the Year 1788 may bring forth, God alone knows.” In the same vein, at the end of his commonplace book, Chipman poetically linked providence and the uncertainty of the unfolding American Revolution. He began:

Thus is fill’d this 244 page Book,  
For me and mine therein to Look,  
And to observe God’s providence  
In transactions many years Since.

He then referred to the long conflict between the French and English in North America, and humbly demurred, “But God alone, he has done this.” He continued, poignantly connecting that earlier conflict with present upheavals:

And may [God’s] name be prais’d herefor

---
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And the English Nation Sin abhor,
And Settle Peace and Unity,
Least by our feuds we pine and die.

1776. Amen.  

Perhaps providence was not so straightforward. But he did not abandon the idea, and providence was prominent in the diary he kept in the mid-1790s. Chipman’s deployment of the idea of providence in the long diary entry for August 30, 1794—notably, half a dozen years after 1788—suggests how he was able to make emotional sense of history, religious belief, and national loyalty.

The older Chipman was no less ready to use the language of providence to reflect upon British history. He confidently recalled that the taking of Louisbourg by New Englanders was with “the favour of ... holy Providence.” The extensive British victory in the Seven Years’ War was won “by alwise providence.” Yet Chipman did not see his nation’s history through rose-coloured glasses. Every “remarkable” moment of providence, in his telling, was paired with a lamentable example of mismanagement or bloodshed.

Having committed several pages of his diary to a troubling account of British history, he paused, as if to explain why he included these historical recollections in his otherwise spiritual diary. He explained: “I do it to keep these things in Remembrance for [God’s] Glory and my Soul’s real good.” It was, for Chipman, an intentional discipline of faith, as well as citizenship. “All is well,” he asserted, “in the proceedings of thy Providence. ... This, this thought Comforts my Soul and alays my

---
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doubts and fears when things has a gloomy Aspect on my mind.”67 His belief in providence gave Chipman comfort at those times when history seemed to contradict, rather than support, confidence in his nation. Rather than using providence as religious window-dressing for British progress, Chipman seems to have invoked the doctrine because he could not easily narrate such a linear national story: he *trusted* that there was divine purpose in history, though he could not always see it.

Likewise, Chipman drew on the idea of providence to mediate his affection and his dissent. His deployment of that belief was— in the words of historians Tony Claydon and Ian McBride— anxiously *aspirational* rather than triumphantly descriptive.68 As Chipman said of the euphoria after the conquests of the Seven Years’ War, God-given victories were not an invitation to national hubris; instead, they imposed humbling moral obligations for which the nation was accountable. The perceived gap between the divine purpose of Protestant Britain and its sad, bloody history left room for Chipman’s expressions of lament and critique. Without exchanging either his affectionate loyalty or his belief in providence, Chipman could—and did— write about the uncertain future (rather than the inevitable progress) of the British nation.

The moderation so evident in his spiritual journal complemented his political views, which were shaped, in part, by his reading of metropolitan periodicals. Based
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on both kinds of sources, Chipman's was the loyal Augustan moderation described by Robert Calhoon: “promoting and securing British power and stability” and at the same time, “conscientious enough to worry about the strength, cohesiveness, and even [or, for Chipman, especially] the virtue of the British nation and empire.”

**Conclusion**

In October 1781, the same month that General Charles Cornwallis surrendered at Yorktown, Chipman was cursed as “an Old Rebel dog.” The accusation, made by Timothy Newman, a known drunk and disturber of the peace, was nothing more than a timely slur. And yet Newman was not alone, then or since, in his suspicions that former “Yankees” in Nova Scotia shared the passions of American Patriots, no matter how muted by their ostensible loyalty. However, the sentiments expressed in Chipman’s commonplace book should put to rest any lingering questions about his loyalties. In its pages, he articulated his deep affection for British constitutional liberties, his pride in imperial expansion, and his devotion to the King. He offers a portrait of what constituted loyalism before the Revolution—not as a reactionary impulse, but as a set of feelings and ideas that were shared by perhaps most British Americans during the eighteenth century. Elizabeth Mancke observes that Nova Scotia remained a space where “loyalism” retained a wider, less polarized meaning:

> The ideological polarization in some parts of Anglo-America also created new meanings for loyalism and patriotism, definitions that no

---

longer represented ranges on a spectrum of sentiment but rather quite circumscribed points. In Nova Scotia most people continued to use a definition of loyalty that was defined not in the heat of the revolution, but by the range of loyal behavior that had been acceptable in more peaceable times.\textsuperscript{71}

Chipman’s writings help to recover this broader range of loyal affections and sentiment, demonstrating that those Nova Scotians whom an older historiography called the “pre-Loyalists” actually represented a broad, deep tradition of loyalism, despite the suspicions of later Loyalist refugees.

Chipman’s writings also portray how very Anglicized the feelings and commitments of one New Englander had become, and offers insights into how Britons in provincial spaces, far from the metropole, fashioned a sense of attachment to the empire. He used his commonplace book as a space for fashioning his political emotions, for making them his own. It is a document that speaks to his agency as a reader, and to the self-consciousness with which he selected, arranged, and considered the elements that constituted his political affections and identity. The prominence of chronologies, for example, illustrates how important historical culture was in the construction of Britishness. Historians have described how imperial officials used the calendar and festivals to shape such a historical consciousness, but on Chipman’s handwritten pages, it is more apparent how active individual subjects were in internalizing and adapting such deeply-felt historical narratives. Similarly, it has been well understood that print culture contributed significantly to feelings of national belonging, but it is another thing to observe how

\textsuperscript{71} Mancke, \textit{Fault Lines}, 81. See also Bumsted, \textit{Understanding the Loyalists}, 48-9; Norton, \textit{British-Americans}, 7; Jane Erringinton, "Loyalists and Loyalism in the American Revolution and Beyond," \textit{Acadiensis} 41, no. 2 (2012), 173; and Bannister, "Planter Studies and Atlantic Scholarship," 31-2.
an individual reader interacted with those texts to create a digest of their own feelings and convictions.

That Chipman’s commonplace volume was created during the contested early months of 1776 only underlines the significance of his emotional self-fashioning. Rather than allowing himself to get caught up in the passions of that political moment, as many of his former American neighbours did, Chipman disciplined his emotions with history—putting the present in a longer narrative that he had internalized. Likewise, he transcribed selections from his reading to reinforce his loyal affections. He copied the “remarkable address” of the Grenadians to remind himself of the language of warm devotion, and perhaps to shore up his confidence in an expanding empire. He wrote extensive notes on Colden’s *History* to reiterate the notion that affectionate friendship and the cultivation of sympathy were essential to the success of the British Empire. Such emotional virtues were not merely sentimental courtesies, superfluous to the hard realities of military might and bureaucratic organization; to the contrary, social affections bridged differences and distance. During a tumultuous period, Chipman reaffirmed his own political sentiments, and reflected on the kinds of imperial emotions that he thought would be necessary for America to have a future in the British Empire.

Chipman’s diary reflections dating from the 1790s, looking back on the wars Britain had fought during his lifetime, continued to express a complex set of political emotions. On the one hand, his laments about British policy reveal the extent to which he sympathized with the complaints of the American revolutionaries. Taken in isolation, his statements about the Stamp Act or the “arbitrary” measures of the
British ministry could conceivably have spurred more fractious, even rebellious, passions. Instead, Chipman reaffirmed his British loyalty, choosing to fold his lament into his loyalty, adopting an aspirational hope for his nation’s future.
Textual Affections: 
Handley Chipman and Contested Protestant Emotions

In the final pages of his ledger, just below an inventory of the tools in the blacksmith's shop, and next to a recipe for medicinal “black water,” Handley Chipman jotted what could be described as field notes from the intersection of evangelical piety and Enlightenment epistemology:

Mr. E. T. said that Mr. T. told him his own wife's Son in Law & daughter opposed his praying in the family & asking a blessing at table. Mr. T. told me, but Mr. Lockwood Saith to me the Story is false.

These people pronounce people converted without knowledge.

Julia Ann pronounced Mr. D's Daughter Lately Converted without any just grounds at all, as he told me & So did M.B., I am told. The Girl & her father both told me that Julia Ann told her She might now Sing Yankey dudle as much as She pleased, as She was converted, with many other things to Same purport.¹

Chipman recorded these notes circa 1792-93, when some members of the Cornwallis New Light Congregational Church (of which he was then a member) began to claim that sudden spiritual impressions gave them certainty about the conversion of various individuals in the community, including Mr. D's young daughter. For “these people”—a distinctive emotional community within the New

¹ Handle Chipman, Ledger [No. 3] (1771-1799), Esther Clark Wright Archives, Acadia University, Wolfville, NS, 1900.048-CHI/1, page 302 [undated entry, ca. 1792-93]; emphasis in original. Hereafter cited as Chipman, Ledger.
Light church—*feelings* seem to have replaced more traditional forms of spiritual assurance.

The report that Julia Ann told the young “convert” that she might sing “Yankey dudle as much as She pleased” seems, to modern readers, amusing and harmless enough. But this license to sing such “worldly” songs was apparently in opposition to the strict morality of the church community, and, more importantly for observers like Chipman, the justification—“as much as She pleased, as She was converted”—represented a troubling instance of antinomianism—the idea that the “elect” were no longer subject to external rules and order.

At about this time, Chipman filled a notebook with long essays outlining his concerns about relying on feelings and sudden impressions, and about the “Bodily Extasies” that New Light preachers were encouraging, to the detriment of congregational order. As a moderate evangelical who came of age during New England’s Great Awakening, Chipman valued the religious affections and zeal in preaching, but as his ledger notes suggest, what constituted appropriate evangelical emotions was a contested question even within the Cornwallis New Light church.

This contretemps in Cornwallis was not merely an internecine local dispute. Nova Scotia New Lights were grappling with questions about emotions that preoccupied philosophers and theologians—and many, many ordinary people—throughout the eighteenth century. For evidence that Nova Scotians were aware of these debates, one need only to turn back one page in Chipman’s ledger to the inventory of a shared local library. The catalog is headed, “List of Book[s] in Mr.
Graham’s People and Some others’ Library.” Listed are the titles and authors of 108 books, organized into sections on “divinity,” “history civil & ecclesiastical,” and “miscellanie.” Among the volumes are several books on affections, passions, or sentiments. From Charles Chauncy’s broadside against enthusiasm to Adam Smith’s ethics of sympathy, the titles reflect the variety of eighteenth-century discourses about emotions. The library inventory, Chipman’s ledger notes, and his other manuscript writings demonstrate that these transatlantic debates about emotions and sentiment were read and appropriated in local settings. Nova Scotians engaged these questions as they made sense of their own or their neighbours’ religious affections, and as they contested the boundaries of local and transatlantic emotional communities.

Chipman sought to moderate the religious affections. On the one hand, he emphasized the experiential piety of the Great Awakening, was active in the New Light community, and participated in an affectionate devotional and textual culture. On the other hand, Chipman emphasized interiority, the management of the passions, and prioritized the long-term disposition of the heart over the ecstasy of the moment. He attempted to kindle personal feeling without overwhelming the social affections, and to cultivate evangelical experience without slipping into enthusiasm. It was an often-tenuous balancing act.

---
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Reading emotions in a colonial library

The books catalogued in the back of Chipman’s ledger reflect how emotions were described, cultivated, feared, regulated, and debated during the eighteenth century. The provenance of the library is unfortunately not known with certainty, though it was in some way associated with the members of the Cornwallis Congregational Church (“Mr. Graham’s people and some others”), and it suggests there was a vigorous local culture of reading. Shortly after minister Hugh Graham (1758-1829) arrived in the town in 1785, he admitted with some surprise in a letter to his parents in Scotland that he found the congregation in the town more intelligent and “more Enquiring about Points in Religion” than he expected. In time he would also find that it was a place where religious ideas and emotions were contested.

The library featured many of the “steady sellers” of English Protestant devotional culture, from its Puritan roots, through the affectionate piety of early eighteenth-century English dissent, to the warm (and contested) affections of the evangelical revivals. Puritan “heart religion” was well-represented by Richard

---


Baxter’s *Saints Everlasting Rest* (1650), in which readers were guided through considerations of heaven (or other biblical themes) designed to affect both heart and mind.\(^5\) Baxter’s address assumed that human happiness was primarily a heavenly goal, rather than an earthly reality. This view was shared in other library volumes, including Étienne François de Vernage’s *The Happy Life, or The Contented Man* (1706) and Matthew Henry’s *The Pleasantness of a Religious Life* (1714).\(^6\) Yet these works also reflected changing expectations about happiness in the era of the Enlightenment; alongside the hope of heaven, orthodox writers increasingly emphasized the possibility of this-worldly happiness and religious pleasures.

Against stereotypes of dour, passionless Puritans, Matthew Henry asserted, “They did not renounce Pleasure, when they embrac’d Religion.”\(^7\)


\(^7\) Henry, *Pleasantness of a Religious Life,* 158; emphasis in original.
Companion (1704) and John Willison’s Sacramental Meditations and Advices (1747).  

In his diary, Chipman reported using such guides to raise his own religious affections. In 1794, he wrote,

> When reading in my family Mr. Henry on the Institution of the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, and of dear Jesus’ Sufferings, I was so overwhelmed I could not contain myself as I would, Strangers being present. O how burdened to my Soul did Sin appear, and Sweet and Affecting my dear redeemer’s undertaking for my redemption.

Having prepared himself by reading and meditating, Chipman said, “In a heavenly frame did I go to meeting,” and reported that he “very Sencibly pertook” of the sacrament “in a Spiritual Manner to my Spiritual Nourishment.” Chipman’s use of such devotional texts was not passive; he recorded his “Soul Satisfying delight” in his diary, “pen[ning] here the Sweet and blessed remembrance of it,” essentially creating a new devotional text for future recollection.

The library also contained several prose works by English hymn-writer and practical theologian, Isaac Watts (1674-1748), including Discourses of the Love of God and the Use and Abuse of the Passions in Religion ... to which is prefix’d A plain

---

Matthew Henry, The Communicant’s Companion: or, instructions and helps for the right receiving of the Lord’s Supper, 13th ed. (London: R. Ware, 1746); John Willison, Sacramental Meditations and Advices, Grounded upon Scripture-Texts, Proper for Communicants to Prepare their Hearts, Excite their Affections, Quicken their Graces, and Enliven their Devotions on Sacramental Occasions (Edinburgh: Thomas Lumisden, 1747).
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and particular Account of the Natural Passions, with Rules for the Government of them (1729). This influential pair of treatises differentiated between natural passions and religious affections, and provided directions for the regulation of the emotions. Watts attempted to reconcile affections to reason. He was representative of the eighteenth-century view (among both devotional and philosophical writers) that the affections were a form of knowledge involving both mind and heart:

The Affections being once engaged, will keep the Soul fixed to divine Things. The Sense of them is imprest deeper on the Mind, by the Exercise of devout Passions, and it will abide there much longer. Even where Reason is bright, and the Judgment clear, yet it will be ineffectual for any valuable Purposes, if Religion reach no further than the Head, and proceed not to the Heart: It will have but little Influence, if there are none of the Affections engaged. Notions of Religion in the Understanding, without any Touch upon the Passions, have been compared to the Stars in a Winter Midnight, bright and shining, but very cold.

If Watts’s Discourses represented something of a polite Protestant consensus on the passions, other volumes in the Cornwallis library demonstrated the contentious nature of emotional discourses, particularly in the wake of the Great Awakening. The catalog lists Jonathan Edwards’s History of Redemption (1739), his Some Thoughts Concerning the Present Revival of Religion in New-England (1742), and Charles Chauncy’s Seasonable Thoughts on the State of Religion in New England.

---

12 Watts, Discourses of the Love of God, 164.
Edwards and Chauncy represented opposing perspectives in the intense debate about emotions during the Great Awakening. Edwards offered a moderate theological defense of the revivals, and a philosophical framework for distinguishing “gracious” from merely “natural” affections. He admitted that there were emotional excesses during the Great Awakening, but did not on that account abandon the prominence of affections in the spiritual life: “Though there are false affections in religion, and affections that in some respects are raised high, that are flashy, yet undoubtedly there are also true, holy and solid affections; and the higher these are raised, the better.” It was a delicate balance to maintain. Chauncy (1705-1787) opposed the revivals and their emotionalism as irrational “enthusiasm,” and in *Seasonable Thoughts* catalogued the Great Awakening’s most egregious excesses.
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Nevertheless, even Chauncy in his own way maintained the importance of well-managed affections, rather than ignoring emotions altogether.\(^{16}\)

Not all of the relevant titles in the Cornwallis library were theological in nature. Most notably, the library contained Adam Smith's *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* (1759), which one historian has described as “perhaps the most thorough work codifying the culture of sensibility.”\(^{17}\) Smith proposed that sympathy and other “social passions” could provide the basis for ethical, moral behaviour. (More will be said about Smith’s philosophy in later chapters.)

The Nova Scotia readers of the Graham library, then, knew that emotions could be raised or regulated, classified or cultivated, meditated upon or fought over. But emotions could not be ignored. They knew that ideas about emotions changed over time, and that feelings prompted some of the most contentious debates of the eighteenth century. These were themes that had immediate bearing on their own lives in British North America—from the fashioning of their personal piety, to the ways that migration had strained their own affectionate ties, to the furor—in both politics and religion—caused by the power of feelings in the public sphere. And as the manuscript writings of Handley Chipman demonstrate, Nova Scotians were not merely passive readers: they were active participants in these transatlantic conversations, adapting those ideas and debates to local controversies.

---


Textual Affections

Chipman produced a series of manuscript books, four of which are now extant, that are best described as self-made scripture commentaries. Just as his commonplace book revealed—by his selection, arrangement, and commenting—Chipman’s political passions, so his self-made scripture commentaries and theological abridgements reflected his religious affections. Putting his pen to these pages, this Nova Scotian “authored his piety.”

As an act of devotional reading and study, Chipman transcribed, abridged, paraphrased, and commented upon several large works of theology. In one volume Chipman abridged printed commentary on the biblical books of Job and the Psalms, mostly by English Puritan Matthew Henry (1662-1714). Two other volumes summarized the “Contents of the Chapters of the Old Testament & Short Comments thereon,” each page discussing a single chapter of the Bible (1 Samuel to Hosea, in the surviving volumes). Those books drew upon commentaries by several seventeenth- and eighteenth-century authors. A fourth book contains “Some Short Sketches of Metaphors, Parallels, &c, on Scriptural, Spiritual Matters,” selecting material from books by Benjamin Keach (1640-1704) and John Brown (1722-1787). Chipman drew on lengthy scholarly discussions and multiple sources to write disciplined (if idiosyncratic) summaries that fitted onto one or two pages in a consistent, readable format. These were ambitious undertakings. The existing

manuscripts—originally part of multi-volume series—together contain over one thousand pages, and reflect a habit of extensive reading and study.19

The books were not the product of a passive copyist. Chipman created them as a devotional discipline, for the purpose of cultivating religious affections. Just as his commonplace book reflected an engaged reader’s agency in selecting, arranging, and commenting to shape his political emotions, so his theological volumes portray Chipman sifting and evaluating his sources, turning study into a heart-felt spiritual experience. The significant effort, but also the spiritual purpose, for these literary creations, is evident in an editorial comment made in one of his volumes:

Thus I have got thro’ with a great number of Metaphors respecting Saints and Parellels, &c ... short Sketches from Sound Divin[e]s of Several Denominations, as I first proposed, which, thanks to God, has, I trust, been a means of Some Spiritual Consolation to my Soul, which made the task, to me, instead of being a Burthen, very delightful and pleasant, altho’ I have followed it almost Steadily, every day and Evening, for above a week past.20

The devotional discipline of daily reading and writing afforded Chipman “Spiritual Consolation.” As one scholar of Puritanism notes, “The reading and study of religious texts, though an intellectual activity, did not primarily or finally have an intellectual end. The exercise of the rational faculty opened the way to a changed heart.”21 For Chipman, such rigorous study nourished the mind, but his purpose was also to know scripture with the heart, to find it “delightful and pleasant.”

19 Handley Chipman, Scripture Commentaries (1789), 1931.005-CHI/3; idem, Scripture Commentaries (1797), vols. i and ii, 1931.005-CHI/3; and idem, Essays, 1793, part iii (“Some Short Sketches of Metaphors [and] Parallels on Scriptural, Spiritual Matters”), 2007.004-CHI/1. All are in the Chipman Family Fonds, Esther Clark Wright Archives, Acadia University, Wolfville, NS.
21 Hambrick-Stowe, Practice of Piety, 157-8.
Chipman’s religious reading is best understood in the context of transatlantic Protestant devotional culture. Protestantism encouraged individual believers to read the Bible for themselves, and had a vigorous print culture to promote devotional reading and theological study. This devotional culture was nicely expressed on the title page of one of the commentaries from which Chipman copied: “The Whole render’d of singular Advantage to Persons of every Religion and Capacity; and design’d to promote the Knowledge of the Scriptures, and the Practice of sincere Piety and Virtue.” Chipman had one of the largest libraries in the Planter townships, and had access to many of the most influential texts of Protestant piety, including works by Richard Baxter, John Flavel, Isaac Watts, Phillip Doddridge, and Matthew Henry. Chipman also exhibited the habits of this devotional culture, particularly his focus on personal spiritual experience.

Transcribing texts, as Chipman did, was an intensive kind of reading practice. For someone whose handwriting was as neat and consistent as Chipman’s, copying was a slow, deliberative process—line by line, word by word, letter by letter. It was a practice uniquely adaptable to spiritual meditation, ruminating on the sentiments of the text. The intensity of reading—close, attentive, repeated reading of a text—was one aspect of what historians have described as a
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“traditional” reading strategy. Early modern readers employed this kind of reading with devotional texts to internalize their message and affect the heart.25

Chipman intended his studious transcriptions to lead beyond the page; they were, as he described them, “Meditations and Soul Contemplations.”26 He was heir to a long tradition of spiritual reading, which remained an integral aspect of Puritan spirituality.27 Reading a text was followed by meditation (ruminating on its message), and then contemplation (prayerful communion with God). Such reading was a form of “affective appropriation”—drawing the meaning of a text into one’s heart.28 The books that Chipman transcribed often included instructions for this meditative practice. In his exposition of the Psalms, for example, Matthew Henry often made use of the phrase, “In Singing this, and praying it over...” as a way of modeling how to meditatively internalize the scriptures. Chipman included many of these moments of instruction in his notebooks. Several of these direct how one’s religious affections should be influenced by a particular passage of scripture:

“In Singing this, & praying it over we Should not only have our hearts filled with an holy awe of God, but borne up with a Chearful Confidence in Christ, in whose mediation we may comfort & Encourage our Selves, and one another.”

“In Singing this, we Should git our hearts much affected with the Excellency of the word of God, & much affected with the Evil of Sin, the danger we are in of it, & by it, & fetch in help from Heaven against it.”
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25 Hall, Cultures of Print, 61-8; Hambrick-Stowe, Practice of Piety, 159-60.
26 Chipman, Scripture Commentaries (1797), i.491.
27 Hambrick-Stowe, Practice of Piety, 161-75.
“In Singing this we Should Meditate on the Sufferings & Resurrection of Christ, till we Experience on our own Souls the power of his resurrection & the fellowship of his Sufferings.”

Devotional guides such as Henry's often suggested that readers imaginatively identify with the circumstances of the biblical narrative. Or they might urge readers to reflect on a particular aspect of the salvation story, especially the suffering and resurrection of Christ, to better apply those doctrines to their own experience:

“meditate ... till we Experience on our own Souls,” till “our hearts [are] filled” and “our hearts [are] much affected.”

Chipman adopted another striking form of heart-felt meditation in his manuscript books on the Old Testament. At the bottom of each page is a two-line prayer of Chipman's composition, beginning with the words, “O my Soul.” Consider for a moment the sheer number of these homespun invocations: several hundreds of them in just two of a longer series of such books. The phrase, “O my Soul” signals the application of the text to the most personal, interior aspect of his being. The daily repetition of that phrase indicates the cultivation of a habit, developing a reflexive pattern of thinking and meditation.

Some of the “O my Soul” prayers directly addressed reading and meditation as a spiritual practice. Chipman emphasized the application or “improvement” of scripture, as well as intellectual knowledge: “O my Soul, may every observation of Scripture truth be Suitably improved by us for our real Benefit.” Reading and meditation could also remedy the problem of the unfeeling heart, and rouse one's
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religious affections: “O my Soul, how often, to our Sorrow, do we find our Heart dull & Lifeless. When we read these holy transports, O quicken, quicken us, by thy Spirit, O our God.”

Of course even the most devout reader could encounter scriptural passages or commentary that seemed to lack spiritual relevance. After encountering such a dry discussion, Chipman prayed matter-of-factly, “O my Soul, blessed be God, this is not very material. O that we may Love God.”

Even this humorous moment of candour suggests that he was constantly seeking in his reading those themes that were most “material” to heartfelt piety.

Chipman’s prayers were often meditations on specific religious emotions. He prayed for a greater capacity for love and gratitude toward God: “O my Soul, may we be always Suitably Affected with God’s Goodness & wonderful Providences to his Church & People, and Seek to Love him more & better.” He also drew on the language of habitual disposition, to emphasize the long-term cultivation of particular emotional responses, rather than only the ecstasy of the moment: “O my Soul, may I always be of a Merciful disposition, and always make it as our Steady rule, to do as we would be done unto, Amen.” But not just any emotions would do, so he prayed to know the difference between authentic and affected religious emotions: “O my Soul, Let us not be deceived by specious pretences and Shews in Religion. But may we Enjoy true Vital Religion in our Heart. Amen.”

Chipman’s rigorously disciplined habit was to abridge and paraphrase long scholarly

---

32 Chipman, Scripture Commentaries (1797), i.755.
33 Chipman, Scripture Commentaries (1797), ii.1017.
34 Chipman, Scripture Commentaries (1797), i.572.
35 Chipman, Scripture Commentaries (1797), ii.817.
36 Chipman, Scripture Commentaries (1797), ii.999.
discussions into the space of a single page, attentive to how the text in question addressed experiential piety, and writing a prayer that meditatively applied that reading to his own heart and soul.

Textual meditations occasionally led to “Soul Contemplations”—to a spiritual experience beyond the page. On one occasion while meditating on his heavenly hope, he breathlessly recorded in his diary, “my Soul Exult[s] in Some measure while I am thus praying and writing.” At another time, while describing how God sometimes granted believers a sense of assurance of their salvation, he wrote that God was “at this very time So doing to my Soul.” He continued in a direct, stream-of-consciousness address to God, writing, “[I] have now at this very time Sweet Communion with thee.” And again, “O dear father, I bless thee that thou art indulging me with free communion with thee, and for what I have and do enjoy at this Sweet Moment.” Some hours later, when he resumed his writing, he reflected on the spiritual pleasure he enjoyed when meditative writing became contemplation: “O I thank thee, I thank thee holy father for that Glow of Sweet Comfort and Communion I have had this forenoon with thee, which has taken me off from the historical Course of my writing, to close Communion and prayer to and with thee.”

Chipman’s self-made scripture commentaries demonstrate the centrality of the heart in the devotional culture of transatlantic Protestantism. Readers in Dissenting England, Puritan New England, or in Chipman’s Nova Scotia read many of the same devotional texts, and adopted many of the same reading habits. In some

37 Chipman, Diary, April 5, 1794.
38 Chipman, Diary, August 30, 1794; emphasis added.
39 Chipman, Diary, August 30, 1794.
ways, Chipman was a mediating figure in this culture: not himself a biblical scholar, but instead a student and popularizer of that literature, creating a new devotional text for others. As he demonstrated in his own meditative, contemplative practice, such reading was meant to enable the enjoyment of “true Vital Religion in our Heart.”

“Close and very Soul Searching”: Early evangelicals and the heart

Chipman’s moderate, affectionate evangelical piety was also shaped through personal connections. In his family memoir, he traced a “genealogy of piety,” highlighting family associations with religious leaders of Puritan New England and in the emerging evangelical movement. In his family memoir, he traced arms-length connections to prominent Puritan leaders such as Increase and Cotton Mather. He mentioned his father’s tenure as an agent of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel (SPG), and his mother’s membership at the Boston church of Benjamin Colman (1673-1747). And he wrote about his wife’s grandfather, the Congregational minister and author, William Homes.

40 On the creation of these “wrote books” for others, as well as himself, see Chipman’s comments at: Essays, iii.108-109; Scripture Commentaries (1797), ii.1083; Diary, 639; Family Memoir, 1796, 1931.005-CHI/4/1.25; and Will and Codicil (typescript copy), 1799, 1900.001.1. All items from Chipman Family Fonds, Esther Clark Wright Archives, Acadia University, Wolfville, NS.

41 For the phrase, “genealogy of piety,” see Chipman, Scripture Commentary (1797), on 1 Chronicles 3.

42 On the family acquaintance with the Mathers, see Chipman, Family Memoir, 44-5.

43 On father John Chipman’s association with the SPG, see Charles Edward Banks, The History of Martha’s Vineyard, Dukes County, Massachusetts, vol. 2 (Boston: George H. Dean, 1911), 40. For his family connection to Benjamin Colman, see Chipman, Family Memoir, 37. Colman was a key figure in the transatlantic Protestant correspondence network that generally promoted the Great Awakening and facilitated many of its important publications. At Colman’s Brattle Street Church, Jane Chipman would have been exposed to the “catholick
During his years in Newport, Rhode Island, before moving to Nova Scotia, Chipman knew George Whitefield and Sarah Osborn, significant figures in the story of Anglo-American evangelicalism. Only a few details of these Newport acquaintances are now documented, but Chipman clearly expressed his affinity for the approach to the affections that Whitefield and Osborn promoted, and did so at a time when these were contested ideas. Chipman’s Newport connections, like his reading in Protestant devotional culture, helped to frame his experience of Henry Alline’s revivalism and the controversies in the Nova Scotia New Light community.\(^{44}\)

Chipman attempted to combine Puritan orthodoxy with experiential piety that spoke to the heart. It is a theme that emerged as he discussed the preaching of William Homes (1663-1746), a Congregational minister and author in his family tree. Homes, he wrote, had a reputation as being “very Sound in principles and Authodox,” and “Remarcably Grave in his publick devotion.”\(^ {45}\) His sermons, which Chipman suggested were probably somewhat plodding, were, however, not without piety” for which the congregation was known—attempting to integrate experiential orthodoxy with the Enlightenment moral philosophy of the affections. Susan O’Brien, “A Transatlantic Community of Saints: The Great Awakening and the First Evangelical Network, 1735-1755,” American Historical Review 91, no. 4 (1986): 811-32; John Corrigan, The Prism of Piety: Catholick Congregational Clergy at the Beginning of the Enlightenment (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991); and Thomas S. Kidd, The Protestant Interest: New England after Puritanism (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), ch. 1. On Homes, see Chipman, Family Memoir, 43-57; and Joseph Sewall and Thomas Prince, “Preface” to William Homes, The Good Government of Christian Families Recommended: As That Which Will Contribute Greatly to Their Peace and True Happiness. To Which Is Added, a Discourse on Secret Prayer (Boston: D. Henchman, 1747), iii-x.

\(^{44}\) Although he migrated to Nova Scotia as a boy, Henry Alline was also from Newport, Rhode Island.

\(^{45}\) Chipman, Family Memoir, 52. Thanks to Prof. Sylvia Brown, Dept. of English, University of Alberta, for the observation that Chipman’s misspelling, “authodox,” likely reflects his non-rhotic “Yankee” dialect of English.
some evidence of “heart religion.” In one of his printed addresses Homes said that, “It is the Heart that God chiefly regards in our religious Performances,” and that in duties such as family prayer, what matters most is that, “our Hearts be rightly affected towards [God].” Elsewhere he suggested that spiritual reading was not only meant to prepare people for heaven, but was also, “for the Immediate Enjoyment of God.”

Yet Chipman felt that the traditional Puritan sermon style dampened rather than kindled the affections of hearers. Homes’ practice in preaching was “first, to speak something Large on the purport of his Text, then to raise a Number of Docterrinul heads, ... then, devide them also into many parts or heads, So that the greater part of the time by far was taken up in Explanation of Said Doctrinal heads. then the application or improvement of the Sermon ... would ... be very Short.” Chipman, on the other hand, preferred a different style of preaching: “Short and Comprehensive discourses ... Large on the application or Improvement.” Emphasizing the religious affections, he argued that, “Such Comprehensive preaching is most Eddifying and profitable to the Soul, Especially when the Application is Close and very Soul Searching.” Chipman did not have any quarrel

46 Chipman, Family Memoir, 54-6.
47 Homes, Good Government of Christian Families, 40; and idem, A Discourse Concerning the Publick Reading of the Holy Scriptures by the Lords People, in Their Religious Assemblies (Boston: B. Green, 1720), 34.
with Homes’s Puritan doctrine, but he did advocate for a more direct and confident address to the heart.49

Chipman found such a direct address to the heart in the preaching of the Great Awakening’s “Grand Itinerant,” George Whitefield:

I much admire the Close Soul Searching Comprehensive way and Method of Preaching that much famed, pious Minister of the blessed Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Rev’d Mr. George Whitefield had, whom I was well acquainted with.50

The extent of Chipman’s acquaintance with Whitefield is unknown, though it is likely that he first heard Whitefield during his September 1740 visit to Newport.51

Whitefield preached several times to large audiences, and he recorded in his journal that he was “enabled to...preach with much Flame, Clearness and Power.”52

Whitefield was warmly received by the minister and hearers at First Congregational Church, where the Chipmans were members.53 On one day, Whitefield “went to

49 Chipman noted on another occasion that his minister in Cornwallis had preached a sermon “with more Life and Vigour than usual.” The difference, he said, was that, “the word by [God’s] Assistance went from the heart to me.” Chipman, Diary, Sept. 8, 1794.

50 Chipman, Family Memoir, 57.


52 Whitefield, Continuation of Whitefield’s Journal, 43.

53 Chipman was admitted to membership in the Second Congregational Church in Newport in 1736, when he was 18 years old, and his first wife, Jane, was admitted to the church in 1740 after their marriage. By 1744, they had transferred their membership to Newport’s First Congregational Church, where latter-day Puritan Nathaniel Clap was the longstanding minister. On their membership, see Second Congregational Church Book, nos. 838 and 838B,
venerable Mr. Clap’s, and exhorted and prayed with a great Multitude, who not only crowded into the House, but thronged every Way about it.”\textsuperscript{54} Chipman perhaps met the evangelist for the first time at this gathering at his minister’s house.

One historian has suggested that the marked difference between Puritan preaching, which to be sure did make intentional addresses to the affections, and the preaching of Whitefield was that he “spoke simply and overwhelmingly to the passions of the heart.” Informed by his early love of the stage, “Tears, passions, and consolation fused in Whitefield’s sermons to produce a new and powerful form of preaching.”\textsuperscript{55} Whitefield used his actor’s sensibility to speak with passion and to the heart-felt imagination of his hearers. In the weeks after Whitefield left Newport, he visited the Connecticut River Valley, where Sarah Edwards (wife of Jonathan Edwards) heard him preach. Her assessment captures the features that seemed to draw Chipman to him:

He makes less of the doctrines than our American preachers generally do, and aims more at affecting the heart. He is a born orator … It is wonderful to see what a spell he casts over an audience by proclaiming the simplest truths of the Bible. I have seen upwards of a thousand people hang on his words with breathless silence, broken only occasionally by a half-suppressed sob … A prejudiced person, I know, might say that this is all theatrical artifice and display; but not so will any one who has seen and known him … He speaks from a

\begin{flushright}
First Congregational Church Book, nos. 832, 833, and 836D, Newport Historical Society, Newport, RI. I am grateful to Mr. Bert Lippincott for research assistance. Also see Chipman, Family Memoir, 71-5.  \\
\textsuperscript{54} Whitefield, Continuation of Whitefield’s Journal, 42.  \\
\end{flushright}
heart all aglow with love, and pours out a torrent of eloquence which is almost irresistible.\footnote{Sarah Edwards, Letter to James Pierpont, Oct. 24, 1740, as quoted in Cunha, “Whitefield and Literary Affect,” 194.}

It might be said that Whitefield used the \textit{passions} (feeling responses of the moment) as a way of shaping the \textit{affections} (the longer-term disposition of the heart). For Chipman, the New England encounters with Whitefield’s “Close Soul Searching Comprehensive way and Method of Preaching” would shape, in part, his own evangelical piety as well as the way he interpreted the message of Henry Alline and Nova Scotia New Lights.

Handley and Jane Chipman were also drawn into the orbit of evangelical teacher and author, Sarah Osborn (1714-1796). Osborn, who taught and operated a boarding school in Newport, Rhode Island, attended the same Congregational church as the Chipmans. She experienced an evangelical conversion through the Newport visits of Whitefield and fellow itinerant Gilbert Tennent (1703-1764), and became a regular correspondent of many of the leading Protestant ministers of her generation. A recent biography of Osborn has recovered an awareness of how prominent she and other women were in the evangelical movement and in the American Enlightenment.\footnote{Catherine A. Brekus, \textit{Sarah Osborn’s World: The Rise of Evangelical Christianity in Early America} (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013), and idem, “Sarah Osborn's Enlightenment: Reimagining Eighteenth-Century Intellectual History,” in \textit{The Religious History of American Women: Reimagining the Past}, ed. Catherine A. Brekus (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007), 108-41. See also Samuel Hopkins, \textit{Memoirs of the Life of Mrs. Sarah Osborn} (Worcester: Leonard Worcester, 1799); and \textit{Familiar Letters, Written by Mrs. Sarah Osborn, and Miss Susanna Anthony, Late of Newport, Rhode-Island} (Newport: Newport Mercury, 1807).} Fittingly, Jane Chipman was a member of the women's
religious society that met in Osborn’s home. This society met at least once each week to read of scripture and other devotional books, and for religious conversation and prayer.

During the time that Jane Chipman was a part of this religious society, Osborn published *The Nature, Certainty and Evidence of True Christianity* (1755). Framed as a letter, the book was written in response to a friend’s doubts about spiritual assurance—how could a person have confidence in their salvation? How could one *know*, and not doubt? Osborn answered, “By the *Evidences of a Work of Grace* wrought in [the] Soul.” Though a deeply existential question for individuals, this was also an important epistemological problem in the Enlightenment.

Osborn’s emphasis on “certainty” and “evidence” connected religious experience to Lockean empiricism; her stress on the *affections* resonated with Enlightenment moral philosophy. As eighteenth-century observers, under the

---

58 On Chipman’s participation in this religious society, see Sarah Osborn, Diary, April 13, 1757 and January 2, 1762; as cited in Brekus, *Sarah Osborn’s World*, 198, 382. I am grateful to Catherine Brekus for our conversations about this Newport connection.


influence of Enlightenment rationalism, became more confident in a rational, ordered universe, they looked to *experience* and information from the senses (not authorities or tradition) as the basis of knowledge about that world. Religious experience, including one’s own feelings, was a form of evidence, just like other natural phenomena. As historian Sarah Rivett explains, “The status of the soul became increasingly intelligible through the display of human affections, as emergent currents of moral philosophy transformed understanding of the human faculties.”

Passions provided empirical information about the soul.

To be sure, Enlightenment philosophy was not the only source for such experiential, feeling language. Evangelicals also drew from a rich vein of Puritan affective piety. Yet the dovetailing of Enlightenment empiricism and religious experience gave evangelicals a greater sense of certainty, of assurance. So in

---


64 Revising a longstanding assumption that evangelicalism and Enlightenment were necessarily opposed, recent historiography has explored the extent to which evangelicalism was shaped by the Enlightenment. David Bebbington has offered the most sweeping and revisionist interpretation of evangelicalism as an Enlightenment religious movement, indeed arguing that, “The Evangelical version of Protestantism was created by the Enlightenment.” This argument finds a place in Bebbington’s larger project of exploring how evangelicalism was shaped by the various cultures it has inhabited, including nineteenth-century Romanticism and twentieth-century Modernism, as well as eighteenth-century Enlightenment. He identifies spiritual assurance as one of the most significant adaptations; *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain*, quotation at 74; and on assurance, 42-50. Brekus’s positioning of Sarah Osborn extends this argument, especially on assurance and experience. See also Jonathan M. Yeager, *Enlightened Evangelicalism: The Life and Thought of John Erskine* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011). For studies that dispute that there was an “evangelical Enlightenment,” see Avihu Zakai, *Jonathan Edwards’s Philosophy of History: The Reenchantment of the World in the Age of Enlightenment* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003); Jonathan I. Israel, *Enlightenment Contested: Philosophy, Modernity, and the Emancipation of Man, 1670–1752* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), esp. 38; and idem, *Democratic Enlightenment: Philosophy, Revolution, and Human Rights, 1750–1790* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), esp. 43. Other historians have emphasized *continuities*
answer to the question, “How do I know this God is mine, and that I am not deceived?” Osborn turned to her own religious experience for such assurance: “I’ll tell you truly what God has done for my Soul, and what I call Evidence of a Work of Grace.”

The evidence that Osborn sought in her soul? Affections. Osborn explained that she had once been indifferent or even hostile to many evangelical doctrines—the existence of God, the mediation of Christ, the hope of heaven. Now, however, she felt differently, and those new feelings witnessed to an inner, spiritual change. She described her religious affections in the language of desire: “Yea, God caus’d my Heart to go out after Him in strong and vehement Desires … He appear’d to me to be in Himself the most lovely and desirable Object.” She pointed to the “ardent Longings, and Pantings, which [God] at sometimes excites in my Soul.” Note that Osborn credited God with causing and exciting these new sentiments. Like Jonathan Edwards (and unlike the optimism of Enlightenment philosophers), she believed that God furnished a new “sense of the heart,” supplying by grace what nature could not.


65 Osborn, Nature, Certainty and Evidence, 3-4; emphasis in original.
Osborn suggested that the most reliable emotional evidence was observable over the long term, and not only in moments of ecstasy:

And tho’ Grace is not always alike in Exercise; (no I am sometimes dull and lifeless as to Exercise) yet blessed be God it has been the habitual and settled Bent of my Soul for many Years, to choose God, his Christ, and Grace for my Portion in all Conditions, both adverse and prosperous.68

For Osborn, the religious affections that mattered most were not those that impulsively flashed and just as quickly burned out. Instead, she (and most moderate evangelicals, like Chipman) valued those that had been internalized enough to be, in the language of theorist Pierre Bourdieu, a habitus even in changing circumstances—or, in Osborn's own words, “the habitual and settled Bent of my Soul.”69 Alongside this basic disposition of the heart, Osborn also spelled out a number of specific affections or habituated emotions that she considered “evidences of Grace”:

That you do hate Sin as Sin; that you do love Holiness for its own sake, and God because an holy God; that you love his Law, and long perfectly to obey; that you do prize Christ as a King, as well as Saviour; that you do love his Image in his Children; that you do love your Enemies; and are wean'd from this World, and all its trifling Enjoyments; that you are reaching after greater Degrees of sanctifying Grace.”70

---

69 Scheer, “Are Emotions a Kind of Practice,” esp. 201. Considering emotions as “practices” maintains not only their internalization, but also their embodiment. The phrase, “settled bent of the soul” was also used in the same way by itinerant Gilbert Tennant, a confidant of Osborn’s; Tennant, Sermons on important subjects, adapted to the perilous state of the British Nation (Philadelphia: James Chattin, 1758), 264.
70 Osborn, Nature, Certainty and Evidence, 14-5; emphasis in original.
It was an ambitious plan of emotional formation. Osborn, however, expected a *gradual* change of feelings; sincere *aspiration* ("that you ... long perfectly to obey"), and not only the achievement of emotional maturity, could provide assurance of an inward change.

Feelings, of course, were a subjective measure. But Osborn attempted to ground her assurance in the empirical observation of specific experiences and particular emotional responses. She contrasted this method with "enthusiasm," which based certainty on special revelations and sudden impulses. She explained, "*These, my dear Friend, are what I call Evidences of a Work of Grace:* and for my part I had rather be able to read them, than to hear a Voice from Heaven telling me, *I am a Child of God.*"\(^71\) Despite the alluring certainty that such a mystical experience might promise, Osborn preferred to "read" the more observable evidence of new and changed affections. Osborn and other moderate evangelicals, like Chipman, then, drew upon Enlightenment modes of thinking, rather than "enthusiastic" impulses, as they shaped an affectionate and experiential evangelical piety.

**“Pious and Godly Mr. Henry Allin”**

Among Chipman’s “wrote books,” in his distinctive handwriting, is a transcription of the journal of Nova Scotia evangelist Henry Alline (1748-1784). The New Light itinerant, about whom much more will be said in subsequent chapters, sparked religious awakenings throughout the colony’s young settlements during the period of the American Revolution. Critics of the charismatic Alline and his followers

---

charged them with enthusiasm and unthinking emotionalism, with heterodox theological views, and with sowing separatism among the region’s tentatively transplanted Congregational churches. Yet to Chipman, he was “Pious and Godly Mr. Henry Allin[e].” Chipman transcribed and apparently circulated Alline’s journal, which had originally been written in shorthand, helping to shape Nova Scotia New Lights into a coherent emotional community in the two decades before the journal was eventually published in Boston. Given Chipman’s personal religious history and his textual participation in the culture of transatlantic evangelicalism, his warm support of Alline helps to locate the itinerant in wider contexts. Some contemporaries (and historians following them) described Alline as the “Whitefield of Nova Scotia.” For Chipman, this was more than an honorific, he having known both itinerants, and at least once in his journal he cited the words of Whitefield and Alline together as twinned examples of assured evangelical piety.

In 1777, Chipman wrote a letter to two Nova Scotia ministers to defend Alline’s ministry, and to explain some of the turmoil in the Cornwallis Congregational Church. Though much of the letter expressed Chipman’s concern for order in church government, he was unequivocal in his support of Alline:

---

72 Chipman, Family Memoir, 64.
73 Handley Chipman, Transcription of Henry Alline’s Journal [ca. 1785?], Esther Clark Archives, Acadia University, Wolfville, NS, 1900.048-CHL2. The journal was later published as *The Life and Journal of the Rev. Mr. Henry Alline* (Boston: Gilbert & Dean, 1806), and has been reprinted in a scholarly edition: *The Journal of Henry Alline*, ed. James Beverley and Barry Moody (Hantsport, NS: Lancelot Press, 1982). I am grateful to Barry Moody (Acadia University) and David Bell (University of New Brunswick), and Patricia Townsend (Esther Clark Wright Archives) for conversations about the provenance of the shorthand, transcribed, and published versions of the journal.
74 For example, Rawlyk, *Canada Fire*, 5.
75 Chipman, Essays, ii.117.
I have heard him, and am acquainted with him, [and] I must acknowledge I like him much ... and this I am sure I never saw so many sin sick souls since I liv'd here as there now is, and some near and dear to me, and that caus'd, I certainly see, by God's blessing on Mr. Allen's preaching.  

The reference to “sin sick souls” pointed to the “awakening” effect of Alline’s ministry on the town—that many previously indifferent individuals had become spiritually concerned, and were starting to seek conversion. Chipman had no difficulty whatsoever communicating disapproval of individuals with whom he differed, but of Alline, he wrote, “I like him much.” Chipman’s continued commitment to orthodox Puritan theology and Congregational order suggests that he heard Alline’s preaching as consonant with that tradition—though certainly in its more affective stream.

Chipman’s opinion of Alline seems to have been shared by his Nova Scotia contemporary, Liverpool merchant and diarist, Simeon Perkins (1735-1812). Like Chipman, Perkins was a moderately evangelical Congregationalist. A significant leader in the Liverpool Congregational Church, he later embraced Methodism. Perkins heard Alline preach on many occasions during his Liverpool itinerancy, from 1781-1783, and declared that he was “much pleased with his performances.”

In February 1783, Perkins recorded in his diary:

Mr. Alline Preached both parts of the day & Evening. A Number of People made a Relation of their Experiences after the Meeting was concluded & Expressed Great Joy & Comfort in what god had done for them. Mr. Alline made a long Speech, Very Sensible, Advising all Sorts of People to a Religious Life, & gave many directions for their outward

---

76 Chipman to Daniel Cock and David Smith, June 30, 1777. Esther Clark Wright Archives, Acadia University, Wolfville, NS, 1931.005-CH1/2.
walk. This is a wonderfull day & Evening. Never did I behold Such an Appearance of the Spirit of God moving upon the people Since the time of the Great Religious Stir in New England many years ago.\textsuperscript{78}

Perkins’ comments mention the “Very Sensible” nature of Alline’s preaching, and the effect of that preaching in encouraging people to give “a Relation of their Experience” to the church. By drawing a comparison between Alline’s ministry and the “Great Religious Stir in New England”—surely the Great Awakening of the 1740s—he, like Chipman, located Alline within the evangelical tradition.\textsuperscript{79} It is, of course, possible that Chipman and Perkins overlooked or were unaware of aspects of Alline’s written or preached message that may have changed their views, but the approbation of these two well-read laypeople suggests that his New Light message fell within an acceptable range of evangelical Protestant teaching.

Chipman’s warm devotion to Alline is all the more intriguing, given the stridency of his opposition to the enthusiasm that emerged in the New Light movement in the early 1790s. If Chipman thought that Alline’s experiential piety managed to avoid the extremes of enthusiasm and formalism, events in the Cornwallis New Light church over the next decade proved how tenuous such a balance could be.

\textsuperscript{78} Diary of Simeon Perkins (1780-1789), Feb. 16, 1783; see also Feb. 3, 1782.

\textsuperscript{79} In his diary entry for March 17, 1784, Perkins mentioned a meeting about whether Liverpool New Lights could use the Meeting House, and expressed his disapproval. His reasons for this position? “That Mr. Alline had denied the Fundamental Articles of the Christian Religion.” Diary of Simeon Perkins (1780-1789), 222. This comment stands out from Perkins’ other positive remarks, and begs the question, what changed? One possibility is that the publication of Alline’s Two Mites in 1784 may have aired some of his less orthodox theological positions—views that may not have been as clear in his preaching. It is interesting that Chipman, who was at least as orthodox as Perkins, did not register such a qualification, at least in his existing writings. See George A. Rawlyk, Wrapped up in God: A Study of Several Canadian Revivals and Revivalists (Burlington, ON: Welch Publishing Company, 1988), 49-50.
Affections and “Extasies”: Debating emotions in Nova Scotia

When it came to the regulation of the passions, or the pursuit of happiness, or the experience of religious ecstasies, Nova Scotians—like others in the early modern world—had to define the style and boundaries of their own emotional communities. Certainly they drew upon the discourses and ideas that they read in volumes such as those found in the Graham library, and adapted them to their local circumstances. They also made their own contributions. In January 1793, Chipman wrote and circulated three long essays (bound together in a volume comprising 460 handwritten pages), two of which were intended to try to bring the New Lights back from the brink of enthusiasm. Those essays show that there were deep divisions in the community about the embodiment and sociality of religious emotions, and about affections and assurance. Chipman’s handwritten essays not only reveal the specifics of a local religious controversy, they also show how Nova Scotians grappled with some of the most vexing questions about emotions throughout the Enlightenment and evangelical Atlantic world.

The division in Chipman’s Cornwallis-Horton New Light community became apparent in May 1790, when Lydia Randall rose in a church meeting to declare

---

80 Handley Chipman, Essays, 1793. Bound together: 1) “Some observations on the Sad Practice of Some of our New Light Preachers and Exhorters...”; 2) “A Discourse concerning The Resurrection of the Body of Mankind, ... also Sundry Matters about Errors in our Church here, called New Lights...”; and 3) “Some Short Sketches of Metaphors [and] Parallels on Scriptural, Spiritual Matters.” Chipman Family Fonds, Esther Clark Wright Archives, Acadia University, Wolfville, Nova Scotia, 2007.004-CH1/1. Hereafter referenced as Chipman, Essays, i, ii, and iii. Only the first two essays touch on the contentions about emotions in the New Light church; the third, on scriptural metaphors, was discussed above as one of Chipman’s self-made theological anthologies.
herself "against all the orders of the Church, and that they were but outward forms and Contrary to the Spirit of God."91 When minister John Payzant talked with Randall after the meeting, he was told that, "she had seen by the Spirit of God, that Baptism and the Lord Supper, with all the Disciplin[es], of the Church, was contrary to the Spirit of God and his Gospel, and that Marriage was from the Divel." These views spread locally, and in August 1791, several members and adherents of the New Light church also expressed their opposition to sacraments and church government, “Declaring them to [be] of no use to them in these Days.”92 Such exterior forms, they said, were “none-assenual [non-essential]” since true religion was an exchange between the Spirit of God and the soul.93

The group believed that they had received a “new dispensation” of divine teaching by the Spirit of God, that they “had great discoveries beyond what ever was known before.” In short, Payzant wrote, “They were very Zealous in it.”94 On the one hand, the “new dispensioners” could be seen as an expression of evangelical individualism. On the other hand, however, more moderate evangelicals (like Chipman and Payzant) pointed to the group’s claims to new revelations and

92 Horton-Cornwallis New Light Church Minutes (1778-1795), Aug. 1791. Esther Clark Wright Archives, Acadia University, Wolfville, NS.
93 Journal of John Payzant, 53.
94 Journal of John Payzant, 45.
discoveries as typical of enthusiasm. Hugh Graham, minister of the Congregational
curch, similarly described the enthusiastic disorder among the New Lights:

Without prejudice it may be said ... that being unenlightened by
knowledge, and united by delusion, animated by party spirit and
carried away by religious zeal, they seem to vie with each other in the
wildness and absurdity of their opinions and practices and they seem
to breathe fire and vengeance against each other and against
everybody else.85

The differing emotional communities in the church literally lined up on
opposite sides of the meetinghouse during a June 1792 conference, when another
debate dissolved into “confusion and clamour,” the members physically sorting
themselves according to their opposing views: “those who were resolved to walk
together in the Ordinances of the Gospel as usual declared their minds by dividing to
a particular part of the house.”86 For several more months, the “new dispensation”
preoccupied the congregation before many of the participants turned from its
excesses. Chipman subsequently worked out his reactions and understanding of
these debates and divisions in his essays. In them, he addressed specific emotional
aspects of this rift, exploring the physical and social implications of particular
religious affections.

“Bodily Extasies”

In his first essay, “Some observations on the Sad Practice of Some of our New
Light Preachers and Exhorters,” Chipman focused on the “Distortions of [the]
bodies” of New Light preachers in the pulpit, and on the “Distorted Conduct” of

85 Quoted in Maurice W. Armstrong, The Great Awakening in Nova Scotia, 1776-1809
(Hartford, CT: American Society of Church History, 1948), 119.
86 Horton-Cornwallis New Light Church Minutes (1778-1795), June 1792.
many members of the New Light community.\textsuperscript{87} The disordered emotions these itinerant preachers bodily expressed, worried Chipman, threatened to sow disorder in the church, the “body of Christ.” And yet Chipman was not advocating unfelt preaching or an unaffected congregation. Though certainly written as an intervention in this very local dispute, the essay drew upon wider debates about the corporeal and corporate dimensions of religious emotions.

Divided into two parts, Chipman began his essay with, “Some observations on the Sad Practice of Some of our New Light Preachers and Exhorters, in their Distortions of their bodies while they are Praying, Preaching, Exhorting, &c, by their wringing and twisting their Bodies to a Strange Degree.”\textsuperscript{88} Although John Payzant was the ordained minister of the Horton-Cornwallis New Light Church, several young men served as itinerant preachers or lay exhorters throughout the region. It was what Chipman perceived as the “Distortions, Adgitations, and Gestures of Body” among these preachers that occasioned his polemic, singling out the actions of several preachers as particularly egregious.\textsuperscript{89} “Mr. Joseph Dimock, who I have Seen So wring and twist his Body in Preaching, &c, that when Meeting was done, he has wiped the Sweat off of his face, and then wrung his handkerchief, which has run in a Manner in a Stream, and I verily believed he had not a dry thread in his Shirt.” Brothers Edward and James Manning, Chipman reported, had “odd Postures of Body” and Edward Manning “used frequently to make such a Noise [in his throat] in

\begin{footnotes}
\item[87] Chipman, Essays, i.1.
\item[88] Chipman, Essays, i.1.
\item[89] Chipman, Essays, i.15.
\end{footnotes}
his Preaching and Praying that perhaps not half his Sentences could be understood, but he Seem to be got over it in Some Measure."90

Chipman marshaled several overlapping arguments against these energetic gestures during preaching. He thought that this kind of animated preaching posed a danger to physical health, claiming that, “Such Distortions of Body is Exceeding Spending to Nature, weakening and destroying the Constitution fast.”91 He cited examples of sweaty preachers going into the cold air and developing a fever, and he mentioned instances of overstraining the voice and lungs.92 At worst, a preacher of this sort might “endanger his Life.”93 Chipman also suggested that there was a link between unwise physical exertion and unstable mental health, that these excesses could render a preacher a “weakly, Crazey Person.”94 The association between religious enthusiasm and madness was a familiar one in the early modern era. Charles Inglis described enthusiasm, for instance, as “the reveries of a disordered head, or heated imagination,” and cited the example of Halifax Methodists slipping into “insanity” and becoming “maniac.” Defining enthusiasm as a symptom of overheated passions provided a physical, rather than authentically spiritual, explanation.95

90 Chipman, Essays, i.2, 3, 4.
91 Chipman, Essays, i.4.
92 Chipman, Essays, i.5, 10.
93 Chipman, Essays, i.6.
94 Chipman, Essays, i.7.
95 Inglis, Steadfastness in Religion and Loyalty, 22, 24 (note). The attempt by moderate religious writers to explain enthusiasm in purely physical terms—in order to distance those behaviours or groups from what they considered true or rational religion—had the unintended consequence of undermining even orthodox supernatural claims. See Heyd, Be Sober and Reasonable; and Taves, Fits, Trances, and Visions.
This ecstatic preaching drew a range of responses from New Light hearers. Some could not take their eyes from a style of preaching that differed from so many staid pulpit oratories; they were simply “revitted” by the spectacle. Others were distracted and unsettled by this mode of preaching: “They have been forced to turn their Eyes from the Preacher or Exhorter, that they might hear the Person but not See his Bodily Extasies, which so discomposed them.” Like Chipman, this class of hearers was in the “discomposing” situation of being sympathetic to the matter of New Light preaching, but finding its manner painfully off-putting.

If not “Bodily Extasies,” then what? What, according to Chipman, was the proper place of the affections in preaching? Despite his reservations about some bodily manifestations of intense religious feeling, Chipman agreed that, “the work of the Lord ought to be done with great Vigour.” Deep feeling was absolutely necessary. He insisted, “I would by No Means be thought that I would uphold and approve of ... Ministers or Exhorters having no Life nor Activity of Body in his Preaching. No by no means.” Referring likewise to a minister’s leadership of the “Publick Exercises” of worship, he declared, “I Love to See a Man or Minister Earnest and very Zealous in the Publick Divine Service.”

Not just any zealous display would do, however. It should be “an Earnestness and Zeal according to knowledge.” While some preaching styles distracted from—or even supplanted—the content of the message, Chipman valued affections that

96 Chipman, Essays, i.3.
97 Chipman, Essays, i.8.
98 Chipman, Essays, i.6.
99 Chipman, Essays, i.8.
100 Chipman, Essays, i.10-11.
101 Chipman, Essays, i.10-11; emphasis added.
arose out of particular gospel doctrines: “But Especially I delight and Joy to See the Speaker inwardly Affected with the pious Matter of Divine truth or Truths he is Delivering, that So it may be discoverable what is delivered comes from the Heart. Such-like Preaching and Exhorting appears to me Most Likely to go to the Heart.” In contrast to the New Light preachers whose words could not be understood, and whose gestures distracted from their message, Chipman emphasized the connection between the mind’s understanding of religious knowledge and the heart’s affective inclination toward to that teaching. Chipman asserted, “O it is very Evident that Scripture Truths plainly, fully, and intelligibly taught, yea Taught, has a wonderful aptness or influence for to Awaken and rouse the Conscience and Enter the heart.”

While the New Light preachers exhibited their religious emotions through dramatic physical displays, Chipman emphasized interiority: “inwardly Affected,” and coming from “the Heart.” Chipman emphasized the depth, authenticity, and reasonableness of feelings more than their bodily expression. In the words of one of his favourite authors, the pleasure of religion “may at second hand affect the Body ...
but its Residence is in the hidden Man of the Heart.” Yet, Chipman’s language of interiority obscured the reality that emotions are embodied. As Monique Scheer observes, “attending to ‘inner’ experience is a practice, it is also always embodied, dependent on brain cells, bodily postures, and the disciplining or habituating of these.” The exuberant preachers actively demonstrated their feelings, while Chipman actively restrained his. Both approaches were embodied (though in different ways), and both emotional styles were a “publick Performance” of one kind or another.

The second part of Chipman’s manuscript essay moved from the embodied expression of emotions to the place of affections in the “body” of the church. Even if feelings were located in the heart, they had social contexts and public implications. In this section, Chipman intended “to make Some observations on the Conduct of those who Manifest great Satisfaction in the conduct and practice of those Preachers and Exhorters before mentioned in their Distortions, Adgitations, and Gestures of Body in their Publick Performance in Divine Service, Saying they care not how they come, So they come in the Spirit of the Lord.” In other words, he rejected the claim that the public performance of emotion was a matter of indifference. He argued that it mattered a great deal “how they come.”

103 Henry, The Pleasantness of a Religious Life, 28; emphasis added.
105 Chipman, Essays, i.8.
106 The covenant and articles of the New Light church used the term “imbodied” (or “embodied”) to describe the formation of a local (“visible”) congregation of the “Church of Christ.” Articles of Faith and Church Covenant, Horton-Cornwallis New Light Church, 1778 [Copy, ca. 1801], Esther Clark Wright Archives, Acadia University, Wolfville, NS.
107 Chipman, Essays, i.15.
Some pulpit displays of religious feeling were simply unsociable. Chipman apparently did not doubt the authenticity of the religious experiences of preachers like Dimock or the Manning brothers; he seemed willing to concede that their ecstatic affections had spiritual value. Nevertheless, in the social setting of public worship, uninhibited or unintelligible displays of emotion ignored the fact that feelings also had a corporate aspect. Chipman drew on the New Testament book of 1 Corinthians to argue that individual experience (however sincere) needed to be balanced with a concern to build up the whole body of the church. The principle was simply, “that their friends might be Eddified as well as themselves.” Chipman’s worries about “distortions” in the body of Christ at Cornwallis presented in microcosm the broader question about evangelicalism’s heightened individualism: did the focus on private religious experience and judgment undermine or edify society? Were some religious passions too unsociable? Chipman urged New Lights to moderate their religious affections. He attempted to fashion an emotional community that cultivated personal religious experience and the social affections. “As the Christian Religion is in itself a Sober and reasonable thing, It Should not by the Ministers of it, be made to Look wild, Unintelligible or Senseless.”

“Infallible knowledge in thus knowing a real Christian”

What can—and cannot—be known from emotions? In a second manuscript essay, “A Discourse concerning The Resurrection of the Body of Mankind, ... also Sundry Matters about Errors in our Church here, called New Lights,” Chipman

108 Chipman, Essays, i.17.
109 Chipman, Essays, i.25.
addressed what he felt were several “Gross, Scandalous Errors” in the New Light church’s teaching and practice. These erroneous views were being “hugged and spread abroad to an Amazing degree, and to the great prejudice and hurt of the Growth of Vital Piety among us here in this Town.” Chipman wrote that some of the local New Lights were claiming that they had received “Infallible knowledge in thus knowing a real Christian.” The basis for this certainty was “an Inward Impulse of their minds.” Chipman attempted to discredit such “enthusiastic” claims as a form of reliable knowledge, even as he insisted that other kinds of affections carried weight as rational evidence.

Membership in the New Light church was premised on evidence from the heart. Like other Congregational churches, the “covenant and articles” of the Horton-Cornwallis New Light Church expected members to give “satisfying Evidence of A work of grace In their Hearts whereby they are united to Jesus Christ.” Yet in this case, individuals were claiming to have certainty about a work of grace in the hearts of others, and were relying on their own emotions and special impressions as evidence.

Some of their choices appeared surprising. Chipman reported that such declarations were made to some who “never made the least pretentions to their

---

10 Chipman, Essays, ii.105-114, quotations at 108, 115, and 120. The largest part of this 150-page essay is “A Discourse concerning The Resurrection of the Body,” in which Chipman examined historical heresies concerning the resurrection, and then presented a systematic examination of biblical passages on the theme. He drew upon works by Matthew Henry and Benjamin Keach, among others, and wove together his own comments with paraphrases and quotations.

11 In the Articles of Faith and Church Covenant for the Horton-Cornwallis New Light Church, see the “Articles on Church Order,” no. 6 (also see no. 5). See Rivett, Science of the Soul, for the epistemological questions raised by seeking such “evidence.”
being converted.”¹¹² Even more unexpectedly, the New Lights “on a Sudding [sudden], Set their Eyes on Young Children, and told the Parents that Such and Such a Young Child would Infallibly Reign with them in Glory”—even when the parents denied the children had displayed any strong religious leanings.¹¹³ These confident assertions were made on the basis of “neither the Relation of the Persons’ Experience told [to] them, nor any tokens of Grace by their Life and Conversation”—but on the basis of sudden, inward impressions.¹¹⁴ This emphasis on immediate, esoteric knowledge finally led Chipman to label the New Lights’ beliefs as “wild Enthusiastic principles.”¹¹⁵

And yet Chipman was not prepared to give up on the possibility of spiritual assurance. Although Chipman vehemently opposed claims of “infallible knowledge,” this section of his essay was replete with the vocabulary of evidence, knowledge, and certainty. As discussed above, assurance was one of the distinctive features of eighteenth-century evangelical Protestantism: Enlightenment empiricism meeting experiential piety. Assurance had also been an important theme in Puritan spiritual writing, but often by its notable absence, compared with the confidence of evangelicalism. Under the influence of teaching by the likes of Whitefield and Alline, for the heirs of the evangelical awakenings, a degree of certainty about one’s own spiritual state was usually an expectation, rather than an exception. Chipman recalled remarks that these evangelical preachers had made in his hearing: “I once

¹¹² Chipman, Essays, ii.121. See also the brief notes in Chipman, Ledger, 302 (discussed at the beginning of this chapter).
¹¹³ Chipman, Essays, ii.121-123.
¹¹⁴ Chipman, Essays, ii.120.
¹¹⁵ Chipman, Essays, ii.139.
heard Mr. Whitefield Say, he had not had [doubts] for years, but added, but God alone only knows how Soon I may. And I have heard our dear Mr. Henry Allen [Alline] often Say the Same, with great thankfulness.”

Chipman also employed a biblical image, now obscure, of spiritual assurance—a “white stone of converting grace.” The metaphor was drawn from Revelation 2:17, where it is written that Christ will give true believers “a white stone, and in the stone a new name written, which no man knoweth saving he that receiveth it.” When such a “Certain assurance” is given, Chipman wrote, “they Seldom Scruple it or have even a doubt of it.”

Both Whitefield and Alline used this metaphor in their preaching. Whitefield, for example, interpreted it to mean that a true believer exhibits characteristics such as joy, peace, long-suffering, and meekness. He said, “As for my own part, I had rather see these divine graces and this heavenly temper stamped upon my soul, than to hear an angel from heaven saying unto me, Son, be of good cheer, thy sins are forgiven thee.”

The “white stone” was a changed heart, rather than a sudden impulse. In other words, while he did believe a person could receive certain knowledge about their soul, he located the grounds for such confidence in a transformation of the affections, rather than the kind of special heavenly revelation that the Cornwallis “new dispensationers” were claiming.

116 Chipman, Essays, ii.117.
117 Chipman, Essays, ii.117.
Chipman’s essays appear to have been written in the months after the most explosive confrontations, though his own membership in the New Light community was in doubt. Chipman and his minister, Payzant, adopted very different strategies for negotiating the inflamed passions and animosities in the church. Payzant urged tenderness, and thought that there was “no other way, but, let them get some expereance in their new scheme, which would convince them or some of them, the danger of it.”\(^{119}\) Payzant thought Chipman made the situation worse. He described Chipman as standing “so much against them that he drove [them] as far on the other hand,” his lack of patience giving even greater strength to the group’s “Schismatical notions.”\(^{120}\) By 1793, Chipman had requested his dismissal from the church but he hoped that these essays would clarify the theological and emotional issues, and perhaps persuade the church to return to a more moderate evangelical sensibility. He did so, however, from the periphery of the emotional community he had helped to form.

**Conclusion**

In Chipman’s will, written months before his death in 1799, he directed, “All my Books printed and wrote I would have carefully preserved and kept in a Library for the families to read. ... A list of them will be found among my wrote books in a little book by itself with a brown cover, being 25 pages.”\(^{121}\) Chipman’s record of reading suggests that he and other Nova Scotians were active participants in

\(^{119}\) *Journal of John Payzant*, 45.

\(^{120}\) *Journal of John Payzant*, 46, 52; Horton-Cornwallis New Light Church Minutes (1778-1795), Aug. 6, 1792, and April 1, 1793.

\(^{121}\) Chipman, Will and Codicil, 1799.
transatlantic print culture, including Protestant devotional culture and the century’s vigorous debates about passions, affections, and sentiment. His many “wrote books” are evidence that these transatlantic conversations were also local concerns, as Nova Scotians attempted to make sense of their experiences and reconfigure the boundaries of religious and emotional communities.

His will also created an endowment of fifty pounds (at least $8,000 USD today) to be equally divided among the township’s Congregational, Anglican, and New Light churches, for the purpose of creating an annual memorial sermon; it was to be preached on consecutive days in the respective churches, from August 31 to September 2. Most importantly, Chipman directed that the annual sermon be preached “in a very Soul Searching Scriptural manner,” on a very specific theme:

against Quenching the Motions & strivings of the Holy Spirit of God, and the checks of Conscience (God’s Vice-regent in the Soul) and more especially by those whom God hath brought home to himself by Regenerating Grace, &c, and that have been made to taste in deed and in truth that the Lord hath been Gracious to them, by the manifestation of his Consolating love to their Souls, whereby they bring double guilt on their Souls and for which God will sorely Chastise them sooner or later even in this Life.

Chipman’s directions strike some of the signature notes of his affectionate piety. His insistence that the sermon be addressed “in a very Soul Searching Scriptural manner” recalls his admiration for the “Close Soul Searching Comprehensive” preaching of George Whitefield.122 His emphasis on God’s “Consolating love to their Souls” echoes the New Light message of Henry Alline, addressing divine love to the “inmost Soul.” And notwithstanding that some of the “wrote books” mentioned in his will attempted to curtail what he perceived as the enthusiasm of the New Light

---

122 Chipman, Family Memoir, 57.
church, Chipman’s directions for the memorial sermon insisted that the “Motions & strivings of the Holy Spirit” not be “quenched.” Religious affections remained central to the evangelical message that Chipman wanted to perpetuate in Cornwallis Township.

The memorial sermon was, notably, to be preached in each of the town’s three churches. Similarly, Chipman’s pallbearers were to be chosen equally from the three congregations. Ultimately, Chipman’s religious aspirations proved impossible for a single congregation to satisfy. Having attempted to foster a balance between orthodox theology and affectionate experience, between order and zeal, Chipman appears to have conceded, at least in death, that it was difficult for any single church to keep these emphases in equilibrium.

The affective piety of early evangelicalism emerged in the same contexts as the eighteenth-century culture of sentiment—sometimes in harmony, sometimes striking a discordant note, sometimes a complementary counterpoint. Likewise, Chipman’s manuscript meditations, and the local emotional conflicts that provoked his manuscript polemics, were a form of local participation in transatlantic conversations and debates.
“Enthusiasm in politicks, as well as religion”:
Jacob Bailey’s Emotional History of the American Revolution

Enter Parson Teachum, attended with a Liberty Mob and a number of friends.

Teachum: Gentlemen, I am summoned before your tribunal as a very great offender. Pray let me know the crimes with which I am charged.

Joab, the Brigadeer and chairman of the committee, rises with an important face.

Joab: Hem, hem, Sir, hem, you are accused of being unfriendly to the cause, of having an undue attachment to Great Britain, and of being disaffected to the noble struggles of America for freedom.

Teachum: Sir, whatever accusations may be offered against me, I profess myself a friend to my country.

Joab: We shall make it appear even to demonstration that you are prodigious inimical, and approve all the proceedings of the British court. In the first place, you have been guilty of refusing to read a proclamation for a continental fast, out of a barefaced and daring contempt of the congress. 2. You read a proclamation from Tom Gage against vice, immorality & profanity. 3. You have advised people to continue quiet and peaceable and to mind nothing but their own business. ...

Joab: What have you to say about advising people to be quiet and peaceable and to mind nothing but their own business?

Teachum: If this is a crime I must confess myself guilty for I have recommended the advise of St. Paul—‘study to be quiet and mind your own business, lead quiet and peaceable lives in all godliness and honesty.’ Now, since it is my
concern to preach the gospel of peace, I cannot think it out of character to urge the practice of this gentle virtue.

*Joab:* However proper a Sermon of this nature might have been formerly, in quiet and peaceable times, they are wholly out of season at present. It is a cursed doctrine at this day. What—advise the people to peace and quietness when we want to have them all fire and fury, when the welfare and salvation of our country demands the most vigorous and obstinate efforts of resistance, and when the resolves of congress call aloud for vengeance, blood, and slaughter?¹

*Passion* dominates the dramatized version of the proceedings of the Committee of Correspondence from Pownalborough, Maine (then part of Massachusetts) in May 1776. Entitled, "The Humors of the Committee, or, Majesty of the Mob," the dramatic sketch was written by the Anglican minister, Jacob Bailey (1731-1808), thinly veiled as "Parson Teachum."² Feelings are at the base of the Committee's case that the parson is a 'Tory;' they accuse him of "having an undue attachment to Great Britain, and of being disaffected to the noble struggles of

---


The parson’s affection for Britain is “undue” because unnatural, an aberration of the hostility he should feel for a tyrannical power. Later in the drama, the Committee passes a similar resolve that he has “an undue attachment in his heart to the ministerial tools and Butchers ... a secret and inward enmity to the glorious cause of liberty, and wishes from the bottom of his soul success to the British tyrant.” It is just as unnatural that he should be “disaffected” with the nobility of the American cause of liberty. The parson denies this characterization of his feelings, but the Committee is resolute in the inspection of the parson’s heart, as well as his outward compliance with Congress’s directives.

The binary representation of political feelings, of course, obscures the fact that the rebellion in the colonies created and was dependent upon a new emotional landscape. Not many years earlier, it was possible to have natural attachments to both Britain and one’s American locale, to see the cause of American liberty in distinctly English terms. Loyalists like Bailey wondered in 1776 whether their affections to Britain and America could continue to run in the same direction.

Bailey’s drama on the “Majesty of the Mob” also highlights his grave concern that a revolution organized by such “unfeeling committees” endangered the harmonious sympathies and “gentle virtues” that held a people together. In the playwright’s version of events, the chair of the Committee of Correspondence

---

3 The non-fictional Committee similarly charged that Bailey “discover’d an undue Attachment to the Authority claimed by Great Britain over the united Colonies, and thereby has given great Reason to believe that he does not wish Success to our Struggles for Freedom.” DHSM, 14.349.

4 Bailey, “Humors of the Committee,” 27.

5 For his description of the Committee of Correspondence as an “unfeeling committee,” see Bailey to Mrs. ___, Nov. 24, 1778 (letterbook copy), Bailey Papers, 91-21.
admits that instead of “peace and quiet,” the revolution required “fire and fury” and “vigorous and obstinate” feelings if it were to fulfill the Continental Congress’s call to “vengeance, blood, and slaughter” in the cause of liberty. Historians of emotion have echoed Bailey’s insight on this point (if not his barbed sentiments), that colonial leaders had to accomplish a revolution of feeling for their rebellion to succeed: weakening—indeed, stigmatizing—ties of sentiment with Britain and affection for the King, and embracing the fury of less refined passions. In Bailey’s telling, the trampling of gentle virtues and natural affections undermined the justice of the American rebellion; unfeeling committees could only give birth to an unfeeling, insensible people.

This chapter traces Jacob Bailey’s emotional history of the American Revolution. It begins with a brief overview of Bailey’s Loyalist ordeal, and examines the transatlantic culture of polite sensibility and sentiment that lay at the base of his loyalty. A cosmopolitan concept of connection allowed Bailey to cultivate his British loyalty and a strong sense of American belonging, without emotional contradiction. Bailey’s polite cosmopolitanism was on display in his unpublished history of New England, written in the years before his Loyalist ordeal. By piecing together the remaining manuscript copies of this understudied history, this chapter highlights the centrality of political and religious emotions in his narrative.

---

6 See especially Eustace, *Passion is the Gale*. Bailey’s description of the Committee of Safety provides a poignant illustration of what historian William Reddy has called an “emotional regime,” highlighting how emotions are related to structures of power. Sociologists Ole Riis and Linda Woodhead observe that such structures are called “regimes” for a reason—“There are inducements to conform and sanctions for non-compliance.” Reddy, *Navigation of Feeling*, 55, 61-2; and Riis and Woodhead, *Sociology of Religious Emotion*, 11.
Enthusiasm and seditious passions, according to Bailey, were intertwined threads running through New England history, opposing polite religion and loyal affections, and helping to explain the emergence of the American Revolution. The discussion concludes with a look at Bailey’s reflections on what he perceived as the necessary connection between refined feelings and civil society, and the threat that the rough and unfeeling rebellion posed to both. The next chapter follows Bailey as a disaffected Loyalist refugee in Nova Scotia.

“The unhappy temper of the times”: Bailey’s Loyalist ordeal

The American War of Independence intensified Bailey’s already-conflicted experience as an Anglican missionary for the Society of the Propagation of the Gospel (SPG). Born in Rowley, Massachusetts, to a family of modest means, the benevolence of patrons enabled Bailey to attend Harvard College (graduating class of 1755). Two years after being approved as a Congregational minister, Bailey, like a growing number of other New Englanders of his generation, went down the Canterbury trail, converting to the Church of England. For Bailey, Anglicanism was

---


the embodiment of the “polite Christianity” he had imbibed at Harvard. An amalgam of Reformed Protestantism, a Shaftesburian emphasis on the affections, neoclassical aesthetics, and metropolitan manners, the transatlantic culture of polite Christianity was expressed by English writers such as Isaac Watts (1674-1748) and Elizabeth Singer Rowe (1674-1737), and was fostered in New England by early eighteenth century figures including Benjamin Colman (1673-1747), Mather Byles (1706-1788), and the poet John Adams (1704-1740). “The design was to make society both religious and polite.” From this religious culture Bailey shaped a faith that was supernatural and affectionate but decidedly not enthusiastic, an aesthetic that emphasized the sublime, and a strong commitment to cosmopolitanism. All of these themes (and not merely reactionary religious “toryism”) contributed to his expression of loyalism before the American Revolution. Historian David Shields describes this polite Christianity, in words that could have been written for Bailey himself, as a “synthesis of politeness and Reformed Christianity [that] provided a

James B. Bell, The Imperial Origins of the King’s Church in Early America, 1607-1783 (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004); Bell, A War of Religion; Nancy L. Rhoden, Revolutionary Anglicanism: The Colonial Church of England Clergy During the American Revolution (New York: New York University Press, 1999), ch. 2; John Frederick Woolverton, Colonial Anglicanism in North America (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1984); and Calhoon, Loyalists in Revolutionary America, 208-17.

middle way for those embarrassed at homespun yet uncomfortable with courtly finery.”\(^\text{10}\)

In January 1760, Bailey travelled to London to take holy orders, including the oaths that would shortly thereafter set him at odds with revolutionary sentiments. His conversion to Anglicanism and his journey to the metropolis neatly embodies the anglicization of eighteenth-century colonial life, as pre-revolutionary Americans grew more closely tied to Britain through trade, consumer culture, religion, and polite society.\(^\text{11}\) From London, Bailey wrote to one correspondent about the metaphorical, as well as literal, distance he had travelled: "At length, after encountering a variety of scenes, striving with a thousand vexations, and breaking thro' all the obstacles that surrounded me, I obtained a liberal education, conquered my prejudices, and by the assistance of a favourable providence am safely arrived—notwithstanding the cruel dangers that threatened me—to the Metropolis of Great Britain.”\(^\text{12}\)

"Cruel dangers" also awaited Bailey at Pownalborough (now Wicasset), in eastern Massachusetts, where he served as a missionary for the SPG. A number of factors conspired to make life difficult for him as he attempted to plant Anglicanism on the eastern ‘frontier’ of New England. There was personal animosity between Bailey and two former Harvard classmates, Jonathan Bowman and Charles Cushing, prominent officeholders resentful of the community influence accorded to their

---

\(^{10}\) Shields, *Civil Tongues*, 224.

\(^{11}\) On anglicization in relation to the growing numbers of American-born clergy in the colonial Church of England, see Bell, *Imperial Origins*, ch. 10. Thompson’s description of Bailey’s time in London is vivid and insightful; see *The Man Who Said No*, 87-161.

social inferior. Bailey also appears to have been the victim of a political proxy war among the Kennebec Proprietors who invested in settling the region, with tensions between Bailey’s Anglican patron, Silvester Gardiner, and Boston mercantile whigs. And as elsewhere in New England, there was a long-simmering tension between the Congregational establishment and the growing Anglican presence. Compounding those tensions were the relative scarcity and deprivations of a marginal community still struggling to establish itself. All of these variables were intensified further by the imperial crisis of the 1760s and 70s, and the growing anti-British and anti-Loyalist sentiment.

As early as October 1774, Bailey wrote to friends about his treatment en route to Boston, that he was “repeatedly insulted upon the road ... insulted, threatened, and mobbed.” He generalized about the role of popular harassment in the colony: “Nothing could be more dangerous than journeying on the road. The unhappy temper of the times, the perpetual mob ... the barbarous and bloody threatenings which are continually thrown out against all who have any dependence upon great Britain must render it very unsafe to venture from home.”

---

15 Bailey to Mr. and Mrs. Bracket, Oct. 26, 1774 (letterbook copy), Bailey Papers, 91-20.
diary more tersely—but no less fearfully—noted, “Abroad. Fled from the mob.”"16

Closer to home, a liberty pole—that quintessential symbol of popular whig politics—was erected near Pownalborough’s Church of England.17 Bailey also confessed that he was haunted by the spectre of betrayal among the townspeople: “We ... regard the approach of a neighbour with suspicion and timidity, least he should advance with some hostile message, or form a design of betraying us to the malignant powers.”18

Nevertheless, the campaign against Bailey was largely fueled and executed by Bowman and Cushing and the official means at their disposal, rather than the local populace. As the dramatization above suggests, Bailey was harassed as a “tory” by the Pownalborough Committee of Correspondence, ordered several times to appear before them. As elsewhere in New England, Bailey’s performance of Anglican worship was increasingly politicized; he faced pressure for continuing to pray for the King, and for his fidelity to the oaths that were part of his ordination vows.

Although a 1777 town meeting voted that Bailey was “not inimical to the peace,” the magistrates issued a warrant for his arrest. To avoid this arrest, Bailey left his family in the night, and began “roving about” New Hampshire for several weeks until the warrant expired.19 Bailey expressed the extent of his ordeal to one correspondent in 1778:

16 Bailey, Sept. 26, 1774, Diary 1774, Bailey Papers, 95-16.
17 Bailey to an unnamed correspondent, Dec. 29, 1774 (letterbook copy), Bailey Papers, 91-20.
18 Bailey to Mr. ___, Dec. 10, 1778 (letterbook copy), Bailey Papers, 91-21. See Leamon, Reverend Jacob Bailey, ch. 5, 6.
19 Bailey to Mr. Domet, Aug. 26, 1778 (letterbook copy), Bailey Papers, 91-21.
I am uncertain what may be my fortune the next moment. ... I am surrounded with a lot of surly & savage beings who have power in their hands and murder in their hearts, who thirst and pant and roar for the blood of those who have any connection with or affection for Great Britain. ... In recounting my vexations, not to mention, poverty, rags, hunger and perpetual anxiety of mind sufficient [to] wear down the most vigorous constitution, I have been twice assaulted by a furious Mob, four times hauled before an unfeeling committee, sentenced to heavy bonds and harried from one tribunal to another, three times have I been driven from my family by the fury of my persecutors, and obliged to preserve my freedom by roving about in distant parts of the country, two attempts have been made to shoot me.20

He continued by admitting, "I must confess that these trials, together with the appearance of publick affairs are sufficient to overthro’ a courage and fortitude superior to mine. But as yet I have never yet been either allured or terrified to renounce my principles, so I have taken a firm resolution not to be guilty of treachery, rebellion, or treason to preserve myself from ruin.”

Despite his resolve, there appeared no prospect other than ruin or imprisonment should Bailey remain in Pownalborough. He obtained leave in 1778 to travel to Boston to petition the Assembly for permission to leave Massachusetts for Nova Scotia. His petition emphasized his material circumstances, rather than his principled loyalism. He explained that he had gone three years without salary from the SPG or from his poor parishioners, with the result that he was “reduced to such poverty and Distress as frequently and for a considerable time to be destitute of even the Necessaries as well as the comforts of Life and has been obliged to dispose of almost all his moveable effects to Support himself to this time.” He therefore

20 Bailey to Mrs. ___, Nov. 24, 1778 (letterbook copy), Bailey Papers, 91-21. For a similar inventory of his ordeals, see Bailey to Rev. Mr. Badger, July 1, 1779 (letterbook copy), Bailey Papers, 95-26.
asked that, “he may have Liberty to depart with his family (consisting only of his Wife and infant Babe) to some part of Nova Scotia, and to Carry what few Effects he has left, the whole not amounting to One Hundred Dollars and consisting of a few necessary Articles of Furniture.” The move to Nova Scotia would allow him, he hoped, to resume missionary work for the SPG and to “get Bread for himself and Family.” He urged the Assembly to consider his “Extreme necessitous and distressing circumstances” in granting this liberty.21 The assembly did indeed issue Bailey permission for removal to Halifax. During a long winter of waiting for passage, and under virtual house arrest, he counted the days until he could finally escape “this region of sturdy malice and implacable revenge.”22

A “narrow and contracted spirit”: Bailey’s emotional history of New England

If Jacob Bailey’s history of New England can be believed, the rebellion of the American colonies was no surprise. It was, according to Bailey, only the latest (if most violent and divisive) expression of deeply ingrained and self-interested resistance to royal authority. The “passion for liberty” that animated revolutionary mobs was the most recent example of a long American history of political and religious enthusiasm. Bailey traced this emotional history in his unpublished book manuscript, *Compendious History of the most important concerns in the history of New-England*. The book surveyed New England’s history from the seventeenth-century arrival of European settlers up to the middle of the eighteenth century.

21 Bailey, Petition to Council at Massachusetts Bay, July 28, 1778 (copy), Bailey Papers, 92A-125.
22 Bailey to Mrs. ___, Nov. 27, 1778, and Bailey to Rev. Weeks, Nov. 28, 1778 (letterbook copies), Bailey Papers, 91-21.
Although it was never published, most of the manuscript can be reconstructed by piecing together several draft notebooks among Bailey’s papers. The *Compendious History* provides a valuable Loyalist perspective on New England history. He, like other Loyalist historians, attempted to isolate the themes of radical Puritanism and self-interested independency from the larger narrative of British American history. By critiquing such a parochial perspective, Bailey was advocating a more cosmopolitan set of political affections, in which local or national identity need not conflict with broader Enlightenment sympathies. In place of such parochial self-interest, Bailey aspired to the universal benevolence of the transatlantic culture of sentiment. Neither was Bailey’s loyalism defined by narrow Britishness, any more

23 I have reconstructed Bailey’s *Compendious History of the most important concerns in the history of New-England* (1774) as follows: 1638-1656 (Bailey Papers, 98-1), 1660-1676 (Bailey Papers, 98-2), 1670-1720s (Bailey Papers, 98-3), 1727-1740 (Bailey Papers, 98-4), 1740s-Great Awakening (Bailey Papers, 99-8A), rough notes on 1746-1755 (Letterbook 1774-75, pp. 8-9 [unnumbered]; Bailey Papers, 91-20). The extant volumes include approximately 230 quarto-sized pages. The first four chapters and probably some later ones are now missing, as are a few pages at the beginning or end of some notebooks. The numbering of the chapters is continuous in the first three notebooks (chapters v-xxii; items 98-1 to 98-3) but differs for subsequent notebooks. My references to the manuscript indicate numbered sections (§) within each chapter. There is one notebook that contains similar historical material, and is numbered in the Bailey Papers as part of the series, but it actually appears to be part of a different history on the “Eastern Country” of Massachusetts (now Maine), about which more below; see notebook on 1650-1721, Bailey Papers, 98-5.


25 See Gould, *Writing the Rebellion*, ch. 5, for Loyalist accounts of the “radicalism” of Puritan New England as dangerous to the transatlantic Anglo-American community.
than it was by American separatism; rather, being a Briton made him a citizen of the world.26

As he neared completion of the manuscript in 1773-74, Bailey proposed its publication to Boston printer, Ezekiel Russell, inquiring whether he thought it would be “acceptable to the publick.” He described the project as “a short History of the most important transactions in New England, to which is prefixed a brief description and natural History of the country. I imagine it will contain about 300 pages duodecimo pretty close print.”27 At about the same time, Bailey was also working on a similar project, on the Indigenous, settler, and natural history of the “Eastern Country” of Massachusetts (now Maine). He proposed this book, in two volumes, to Boston printers Mills and Hicks, as “an entertaining description of the Eastern Country, ... the manners & customs of the indian inhabitants, together with the surprizing progress of the late settlements, interspersed with some curious anecdotes.”28 Bailey was confident that the manuscripts would make it into print. In

26 In an important essay, Edward Larkin demonstrates the cosmopolitan character of loyalism, a viable alternative to both American and British versions of nationalism; “Cosmopolitan Revolution,” 52-76. For the argument that Britishness was not necessarily at odds with cosmopolitanism, see Karen O’Brien, Narratives of Enlightenment: Cosmopolitan History from Voltaire to Gibbon (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997). For cosmopolitanism as an aspect of polite Christianity, see Shields, Civil Tongues, 236.
27 Bailey to Mr. Russell, Nov. 1, 1773 (letterbook copy), Bailey Papers, 95-16. See also Bailey to Russell, Jan. 21, 1774, in which he was optimistic that subscriptions could be procured if necessary; Bailey Papers, 95-16.
28 Bailey to Messrs. Mills and Hicks, Nov. 1, 1773 (letterbook copy), Bailey Papers, 95-16. There are other brief descriptions of this project and its progress in letters to Mills and Hicks, on Nov. 26, 1773, and Jan. 21, 1774 (letterbook copies), Bailey Papers, 95-16. These letters reveal that Bailey was also supplying printers Mills and Hicks with corrections and updated information on public houses and religious services on the road between Boston and Quebec, for inclusion in their edition of Bickerstaff’s Boston Almanack. For a partial draft of the natural history manuscript, see “A Description and Natural History of the new intended province between New Hampshire and Nova Scotia,” [ca. 1774], Bailey Papers, 98-6.
December 1773, Bailey wrote to his brother, "Several printers in Boston have engaged me to prepare for the press a short history of N England, about 300 pages in 12o and a description of the Eastern country below Casco in another vol. containing about 200." As it turned out, however, neither book was printed, their publication most likely interrupted by the War of Independence. Bailey's *Compendious History* was written with a brisk style for a general readership. Though not primarily a work of original research, his synthetic narratives drew on a range of contemporary sources and historical accounts, including publications by William Hubbard, Cotton Mather, Pierre-François-Xavier de Charlevoix, and Thomas Hutchinson. As he worked on more recent events, he also weighed evidence from contemporaries. Unfortunately, the surviving drafts do not include a preface in which Bailey might have commented on his methods,  

29 Bailey to Amos Bailey, Dec. 18, 1773 (letterbook copy), Bailey Papers, 95-16. Bailey asked his brother to inquire locally about subscriptions for the work's publication. He also said in the letter that two gentlemen offered him seven guineas for his manuscript play about the Penobscot sachem, Madockawando (1630-1698), for the purpose of publication, but Bailey refused.  

30 Bailey's extant papers do not include many letters from mid-1774 through 1778.  

31 Bailey did not use footnotes for his sources, and only occasionally mentions them in the text. See for examples, Bailey, *Compendious History*, ch. xiii, § 3, Bailey Papers, 98-3 (Hutchinson); ch. xx, § 3, 98-3 (Charlevoix); Bailey, [History of Eastern Country], § 17, Bailey Papers, 98-5 (Hubbard). His booklists at the bottom of his monthly diary summaries also contain clues to his sources. For example, in December 1773, while he was writing the *Compendious History*, he purchased Hutchinson's second volume, Cotton Mather's biography of William Phips, and Mary Rowlandson's captivity narrative; Bailey, booklist for Dec. 1773, Diary and Letters, 1772-73, Bailey Papers, 95-15. Thomas Hutchinson, *The History of the Colony of Massachusetts-Bay, from the first settlement thereof in 1628* (Boston: Thomas and John Fleet, 1764) and *The History of the Province of Massachusetts-Bay, from the charter of King William and Queen Mary, in 1691, until the year 1750* (Boston: Thomas and John Fleet, 1767); Cotton Mather, *Pietas in Patriam: The life of His Excellency Sir William Phips* (London: Samuel Bridge, 1697); [P. Charlevoix], *An Account of the French Settlements in North America* (Boston: Rogers and Folwe, 1747); Mary Rowlandson, *A Narrative of the Captivity, Sufferings and Removes of Mrs. Mary Rowlandson* (1682; many editions); William Hubbard, *A Narrative of the Troubles with the Indians in New-England* (Boston: John Foster, 1677).  

32 For examples, see Bailey, [History of Eastern Country] § 30, Bailey Papers, 98-5; Bailey to Mssrs. Mills and Hicks, Jan. 21, 1774 (letterbook copy), Bailey Papers, 95-16.
perspectives, or the uses his history may have served. From his text, however, it appears that Bailey attempted to balance historical judgment, didactic lessons, and an entertaining narrative style—an approach that may have been influenced by his years as a schoolmaster.\textsuperscript{33} As with much of his writing, Bailey's history is shot through with emotion; evoking sympathy for the victim of a violent mob, outrage at the merciless treatment of prisoners, or warm admiration for courageous underdogs.\textsuperscript{34} Such emotions energize the narrative, but they also had the didactic purpose of shaping the feelings of readers. Not infrequently, Bailey inserted moral commentary, such as this aside: "Affection, benignity, and benevolence are chiefly due to our friends and the more worthy part of our fellow creatures, but Truth, Honour, and Integrity may be demanded by the most perfidious enimy."\textsuperscript{35} It appears that Bailey wrote his history to persuade as much as to educate, addressing the current crisis by describing some of the historical tendencies that led to that moment.\textsuperscript{36}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{34} On the role of sympathy in eighteenth-century histories, as well as novels, see Phillips, \textit{Society and Sentiment}, ch. 4.
\textsuperscript{35} Bailey, \textit{[History of Eastern Country]}, § 22, Bailey Papers, 98-5.
\textsuperscript{36} Bailey intended to publish the book anonymously. In a letter to his brother in 1773, Bailey urged him to keep the book’s publication in confidence, saying, "I design to keep my name as secret as possible." Similarly, he wrote to printer Ezekiel Russell, "I must repeat that I desire my name may be concealed." It is difficult to know how significant this decision was,
The New England of Bailey’s *Compendious History* was no “city on a hill.”

Describing the New England errand, he wrote that, “It was the pride and ambition of our Ancestors to erect a pure church in the wilderness which might become the admiration and envy of the christian world and flourish with increasing glory to the remotest period of time.”37 But Bailey had no such admiration. He found New England Congregationalists intolerant of difference, and he claimed that although they were jealous of their own religious liberty, they denied such liberty to others.

As an early example, Bailey discussed how Puritan leaders of the 1640s received Samuel Gorton (1593–1677), a settler and leader of a religious sect. In what Bailey described as an over-reach of their authority, Boston magistrates sent an armed force to compel Gorton to appear before them on charges of blasphemy. His possessions were seized, he was sentenced to hard labour, and was threatened with death for continuing to teach ‘heretical’ views. Bailey remarked, “Mankind should be thankful that out of Spain and Turkey, we seldom meet with such severe exertions of spiritual tyranny and arbitrary power.”38 He went on to inventory the “severe persecution” of the Quakers, a group he condescendingly described as “deluded but

---

harmless sectaries.” Despite repeated petitions from dissenters or even the directives of royal commissioners, New England leaders “had no inclination to allow Liberty of conscience.” It seems clear that Bailey narrated these and other instances of religious intolerance as the larger historical context for his experience as an Anglican missionary facing the resentment of establishment Congregationalists.

Bailey often commented on the emotional tenor of New England Puritanism, which he characterized as a “Narrowness of spirit and contracted disposition,” or an “ancient rigid spirit.” He wrote sardonically about the Puritans’ “solemn” strictures against matters of clothing or behaviour, such as “the heinous sin of wearing long hair.” He argued that while the infractions themselves should be matters of indifference to religious leaders, such legalism had serious consequences for personal virtue and for civil society:

Solemn stifness and gloomy severity is extremely favourable to the more pernicious vices of the mind—it produces uncharitableness and spiritual pride, renders men morose, unsociable, and ill natured, induces them to treat all mankind except their own party with contempt and frequently ends in the destructive exercises of hatred, revenge, and cruelty.”

Ironically, Bailey’s “polite” and “rational” critique of Puritanism was echoed by New Lights, that the focus on external conformity often left the heart untouched.

The *Compendious History* paid particular attention to the often-fraught relationship between Indigenous people and European settlers. Bailey suggested

---

39 Bailey, *Compendious History*, ch. ix, § 1, 2, Bailey Papers, 98-1.
41 Bailey, *Compendious History*, ch. viii, § 1, Bailey Papers, 98-1; ch. xiv, § 1, 98-3.
that had early settlers been more attentive to their professed concern to christianize
Indigenous North Americans, there would have been “an union in religious
sentiments and ... a lasting friendship and affection between the two nations,”
instead of the succession of wars and atrocities that he chronicled.\footnote{Bailey, \textit{Compendious History}, ch. viii, § 5, Bailey Papers, 98-1.}
Bailey’s attempt to write from a more detached viewpoint is evident in his discussion of King
Philip’s War (1675–1678), and especially his portrait of Wampanoag leader,
Metacom, or King Philip (1638–1676). Of Metacom’s plan to expel the English from
his territory, Bailey wrote, “Had his success been equal to the vastness of his design,
or the firmness of his resolution, he would have been represented by unconcerned
writers as a mighty hero, and a generous deliverer of his country.” However, this
was not, according to Bailey, the Metacom of New England historiography: “It
cannot be denied that our N. England writers have painted his character in the
darkest colours, and this method they have generally observed towards all who
opposed their interest or acted contrary to their inclinations, however great and
worthy in other respects.”\footnote{Bailey, \textit{Compendious History}, ch. xi, § 4, Bailey Papers, 98-2.}

Bailey was particularly critical when describing instances of the cruel
treatment of Indigenous prisoners of war at the mercy of New Englanders. After the
death of Metacom, a great many of his people ceased their hostilities and
surrendered themselves to the settlers. Bailey catalogued the brutality of the
settlers’ response: “Many were killed upon the spot where our forces invested them,
thousands were driven into captivity, and of those multitudes who surrendered
upon a promise of preservation, as many as were actors in the late scenes of
hostility were condemned and executed at Boston; and most of the remainder were
harried from their native country and sold for slaves beyond [the] Sea.”

Bailey indicted these actions as “inhuman” and “barbarous.” Drawing
attention to his New England roots—but attempting to transcend that perspective—
Bailey wrote, “I must acknowledge that tho’ several of my Ancestors have perished
in these conflicts with the Indians, I cannot embrace the sentiments of many people
nor justify any acts of needless severity.” He claimed that the Wampanoag had just
as much right to engage in this war “as any nation in Europe.” Conversely, he
charged that the settlers would be viewed “with detestation and horror” by
disinterested observers for their cruel treatment of prisoners of war. The cruelty
of early settlers toward native inhabitants also had an effect on their own hearts and
society. Bailey contended that while “Tenderness is natural to the heart of man …
wanton cruelty is a science, and it requires a considerable degree of study and
application to divest ourselves of those soft and tender affections which are so
essential to simple and unadulterated nature.” Bailey was intimating that the
violence of colonization, in addition to the havoc it wreaked on Indigenous
communities, also had long-term consequences for settler society, making it
insensible to social affections.

Written during the imperial crisis of the early 1770s, Bailey’s *Compendious
History* characterized New Englanders as unwilling to accept British authority, an
“indisposition which prevailed thro the colonies to comply with the king’s

46 Bailey, *Compendious History*, ch. xi, § 29, Bailey Papers, 98-3; see also chs. xx and xxii, and
Bailey, [History of Eastern Country], § 14, Bailey Papers, 98-5.
47 Bailey, [History of Eastern Country], § 15, Bailey Papers, 98-5.
instructions.”\textsuperscript{48} One of the most striking episodes in Bailey’s narrative is his
description of the fraught administration of Governor Edmund Andros, when the
colonies were reorganized as the Dominion of New England (1686-1689). New
Englanders resented the revocation of their original charters, the stricter
enforcement of the Navigation Acts, and the imposition of the Church of England in
Boston. Even as a royalist, Bailey appears to have had no love for Andros’s strong
arm tactics, writing of his “arbitrary intentions,” restrictions on the “liberty of the
press,” and his “despotic sway.”\textsuperscript{49} Nevertheless, what comes to the fore in Bailey’s
account is the role of the “mob” in overthrowing Andros’s imperial authority. He
wrote that after news of the Glorious Revolution reached New England, the people,
“animated with one spirit, rose in arms … to suppress the growing authority of their
tyrrannical masters.” In breathless prose, Bailey reported that in Boston, “the
multitudes poured along the streets like a mighty torrent, and nothing could resist
their dauntless fury.” He described the people as “an enraged populace”—
“victorious insurgents,” “ungoverned and restless.” Bostonians successfully seized
Andros and the instruments of government, and fired by that example the people of
Providence seized colonial administrator Joseph Dudley “with loud acclamations of
riotous joy [and] carried him away.”\textsuperscript{50} Bailey’s summary remarks on the rout of
Andros emphasized (with just a note of grudging admiration in this instance) what
he considered to be an intransigent, reflexive opposition to authority as the defining
characteristics of New England culture:

\textsuperscript{50} Bailey, \textit{Compendious History}, ch. xiii, § 6, 7 Bailey Papers, 98-3.
This undertaking is a striking instance of that daring and intrepid spirit for which this country has always been so remarkable. The emigration of their forefathers was occasioned by sullen discontent and a dissatisfaction to government and their descendants in every age have been rather disposed to despise rather than to reverence authority.  

Bailey admired the new Massachusetts charter, judging that it “secured both the authority of the King and the liberty of the people.”

Enthusiasm was a flexible category of analysis for Bailey. He turned to “extravagant freaks of enthusiasm” to help explain the influence of Squando and Madockawando, Abenaki religious leaders of later seventeenth-century Maine. In fact, Bailey’s interest in Madockawando (about whom he wrote at length elsewhere) may have been as a comparative study of enthusiastic elements that he also observed among Protestant groups. He postulated that some kind of religious reverence was ingrained in human nature. “For this reason,” he wrote, “the most wild, romantic and inconsistent impostures, who make solemn and confident pretences to visions, extacies, and revelations, never fail to secure disciples and prosilites.” Bailey was not skeptical of the supernatural elements of religion, but he was profoundly suspicious that enthusiasts were often appealing to the irrational passions for very unspiritual reasons. He also applied the idea of enthusiasm to the witchcraft trials at Salem in 1692-93, saying that “a kind of epidemic madness had seized the minds of people, which spread like some contagious disease or rather like the fire of enthusiasm, thro’ every rank and order.” The phenomenon was marked

---

53 Bailey, [History of Eastern Country], § 16, Bailey Papers, 98-5.
54 Bailey, *Compendious History*, ch. xv, § 1, Bailey Papers, 98-3.
by unsociable and irrational elements. On the one hand, people in Salem indulged their “private resentment[s]” and the “malignant passions.” On the other hand, he asserted that too much interest in “the misteries of darkness,” a preoccupation with which “arouses the attention, astonishes the mind, confounds the understanding, and drives the imagination to the most extravagant excess.”

There are few historical figures that did not merit at least a line or two of moral commentary in the *Compendious History*, but Governor William Phips’s (1651-1695) unjust treatment by Massachusetts’s leaders exposed, for Bailey, their unfeeling character. In reporting the sudden conclusion of Phips’s administration, Bailey stated that he was “of an open, generous and friendly disposition, but of a warm and precipitate temper,” unlike his enemies among the colonial elite, with their “malignant designs,” “deepest cunning, the darkest hypocrisy and the most phlegmatic insensibility.” Bailey allowed that Phips’s behaviour was not immune to criticism, observing that, “his passion was certainly in some instances unrestrained and hurried him into acts of unjustifiable imprudence.” But he appears to have had a particular fondness for Phips, perhaps because of his humble shepherding roots in Bailey’s Kennebec region of Maine. As he described Phips’s unlikely rise to prominence and his subsequent treatment by Boston elites, Bailey almost seems to have slipped into autobiographical reflections on his own aspirations and sad experience:

---

By courage and application, united with a secession of fortunate accidents, he rose from the dust of obscurity, from the very lowest condition in life to be the greatest man in his country. But a man of this character must ever be remote from happiness and true enjoyment, since the meaner parts of mankind will always regard him with envy, and those in higher stations with contempt.  

Though a lifelong New Englander, Bailey perceived himself as an outsider to the Congregational and merchant establishment, a sense that coloured his narrative. As Bailey’s narrative turned to the early decades of the eighteenth century he remarked on the cultural changes—in manners, education, and consumption—that modern historians have described as “the refinement of America.”

The inhabitants of New-England were now greatly improved in knowledge and politeness, the language became more refined, wealth and elegance abounded and the arts of luxury and genteel enjoyment began to prevail. The roughness of manners and pious deportment of our forefathers were now disposed and frequently ridiculed as affectation and hypocrisy.

He described a thoroughgoing set of transformations, including a moderation of even the more severe aspects of Puritan piety to which that he had earlier drawn attention. What did not change, claimed Bailey, was the New England aversion to imperial oversight: “Little remained to distinguish us as [our forefathers’] genuine offspring except [for] that opposition to the authority of our parent country which so strongly marked their characters.”

The Great Awakening of the 1740s, which Bailey called, the “religious commotions,” embodied his greatest concerns about religious enthusiasm and social

---

61 Bailey, Compendious History, ch. 1, § 1, Bailey Papers, 98-4.  
62 Bailey, Compendious History, ch. 1, § 1, Bailey Papers, 98-4.
order. Bailey suggested that this religious revival was as astonishing as the Salem witchcraft trials, and even “more boundless in its extent and important in its consequences.” He called it nothing less than a “revolution [of] religion.”

Bailey argued that the lackluster state of religion among Congregational churches helped explain the success of this revolution. He portrayed passive Christian hearers, content to “get to heaven with as little noise and disturbance as possible,” and unexceptional ministers without any real understanding of either books or human hearts. He claimed that their sermons, though “plain and sensible,” were “encumbered with a multitude of subtle divisions” and “were delivered to their sleeping audiences with a heavy uniformity of accent, void of all graceful action, and in a language rather calculated to lull the passions into profound repose, than to arouse and stimulate the heart.”

The contrast with George Whitefield, according to Bailey, could not be greater. Whitefield, that “celebrated rambler,” “understood the secret of moving the passions, and urged the most weighty and striking subjects, with all the force of language, and a violence of action which nothing could resist.” Bailey described the sobering effect of Whitefield’s preaching on the people of New England, who “continued under uncommon impressions of religious concern,” and laid aside all kinds of secular enjoyments, and “vice became ... unfashionable.” Whitefield’s role in the events Bailey described was to initiate, while it was left to others to further stir up the people. After his departure, Presbyterian itinerant Gilbert Tenant, whom

---

63 Bailey, *Compendious History*, Bailey Papers, 99-8A; the document is unpaginated.
Bailey described as “rather more rampant and furious in his applications than Whitefield himself,” left the people in the “most raging excesses of ungoverned zeal.”

As a historian of New England’s eastern frontier, Bailey described York, Maine (not far from his own Kennebec region), as the centre of this “religious commotion.” In forceful language, Bailey portrayed the “convulsions” of revival meetings as overwhelming sensory and physical experiences: “some screaming out under the most sensible agitations of distress, and confessing their guilt in the bitterest agonies of their soul, whilst others exclaimed in the wildest transports and loudest exaltations of joy.” The more dramatic “visions, extasies, prophesies, trances and spiritual ravings” resulted when “the passions [were] presently roused and agitated into a violent fermentation, till all the faculties [were] incited to rebel against the authority of reason.”

Among Bailey’s concerns about religious enthusiasm was his worry that the “religious commotions” intensified New England’s existing resistance to authority. Comparing the religious and political upheavals, Bailey remarked that “enthusiasm, like sedition, is more contagious than the pestilence,” and he worried that this movement “began to threaten religion with total anarchy and ruin.” Bailey argued that the spiritual liberty and self-righteousness engendered by the revivals was overturning social order, portending a dangerous disregard for social harmony, family government, and civil laws. In this “surprising revolution” the settled clergy of New England “lost their influence, and a period was put to their dominion.”

---

Unsettling the very township structure of New England, “the most senseless itinerant, empty of all rational improvement and ignorant of letters—if he had assurance enough to plead an inward designation from heaven, and favoured with a potent pair of lungs ... had it in his power ... to ruin the authority of the most prudent, learned and pious divine.” Bailey considered the events of the 1740s as another troubling episode in the region’s history, linking religious enthusiasm with political sedition.

Bailey’s history of New England is a narrative of passions and interests—the passions of a populace easily stirred up to religious or political enthusiasm, and the narrow self-interest of Boston elites all too willing to manipulate them. Charging New Englanders with a “narrow and contracted spirit,” Bailey contended that they were insensible to the bonds of affection with Britain that enlarged rather than restrained American prosperity.\(^65\) The Compendious History expressed loyalist convictions shaped before Bailey’s revolutionary ordeal, when he still assumed America’s future remained within the British Empire, and while he had no reason to doubt that he would continue to serve the people of the Kennebec. The timing is important because it helps to challenge the stereotype that loyalism was primarily reactionary. Loyalism was, for some, a part of a coherent set of beliefs about the world and America’s place in it.\(^66\) Unquestionably, the onset of anti-British and anti-Loyalist sentiments in the years after 1765 lent a bitter edge to Bailey’s writing. Yet, the Compendious History was completed before his encounters with the

\(^{65}\) Bailey, Compendious History, ch. xviii, § 5, Bailey Papers, 98-3.

\(^{66}\) To be sure, ideology was only one of many motivations for the actions of Loyalists and Patriots, including personal connections, economic self-interest, geography, or the exigencies of war. See Jasanoff, Liberty’s Exiles, 8-9.
Pownalborough Committee of Correspondence, and as late as April 1774 he reported with gratitude, “Our people have been free from those publick commotions which have lately been so frequent and alarming in other places.”67 The book, then, was written as a historical intervention at a time when it was not at all inevitable how events would unfold. Bailey wrote to persuade would-be readers to abandon American parochialism (but not North American identity altogether), and to value cosmopolitanism and connection to the British Atlantic world.68 His was the Britishness described by historian Michael Eamon: “Being loyal, indeed being British, meant being part of something larger: a subject in a world-wide empire, a member in a most sociable race of people boasting in a rich legacy of literature, political debate, legal precedents, scientific advancements, and folk customs.”69

While Bailey wrote New England’s colonial history as a narrative of numerous incidents of unmitigated disloyalty and narrow self-interest, he did not altogether abandon his affection for America. Bailey expressed his American identity through other writings, especially natural history, the history of the Indigenous inhabitants of North America, and the history of Maine, including his own Kennebec region.70 By focusing on sublime beauty in nature and ancient Indigenous nobility, he could identify a version of America untroubled by disloyalty and intolerance. By writing about the history of the “Eastern Country” of New

67 Bailey to Mr. Weeks, April 16, 1774, Bailey Papers, 95-16.
68 See Potter, Liberty We Seek, 12.
69 Eamon, Imprinting Britain, 19.
70 For an example of his writing on the indigenous history of North America, see Jacob Bailey, “Observations and Conjectures on the Antiquities of America,” Massachusetts Historical Society Collections 4 (1st Series) (1795): 100-05. For context, see Leamon, Reverend Jacob Bailey, 72-6.
England, both separately and as a recurring theme in the *Compendious History*, Bailey de-centered Puritan Boston in his narrative, and reinforced his perspective as an outsider to the New England establishment.

“All learning, politeness, and humanity are almost extinguished”

Bailey was troubled by what he perceived as a radical shift in American public discourse during the Revolution: repudiating a culture of sensibility, refinement, and politeness for the sake of “manly roughness,” plain speaking, and populism. “We are sinking with surprizing rappidity into ignorance and barbarity, our conversation, our writings, and intercourse with each other are strongly tinctured with the roughness and severity of the times.” Revolutionaries felt they were embracing a style of language that—in its directness and common sense—was more suited to North American conditions. Bailey disagreed. He believed that civil society was only possible when learning and refinement flourished, when individuals increased their capacity for fellow-feeling, and when oaths were held sacred. While later Revolutionary leaders adapted the language of sensibility to cultivate the virtue of the young republic, in the 1770s Loyalists like Bailey employed sentimental discourse to critique the Revolution and to urge Americans to retain the Enlightenment’s commitment to universal benevolence, cosmopolitanism, and civil society. Bailey worried that by abandoning sensibility, Americans were
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72 Knott, *Sensibility and the American Revolution*, ch. 5. For similar loyalist critiques made during the early phases of the revolution, see Potter, *Liberty We Seek*, 25-36; and Gould, *Writing the Rebellion*, 14-5.
not only cutting themselves off from European learning, but were also eroding the ability to speak to one another with civility.\textsuperscript{73}

Bailey was worried that refinement of language and manners had been replaced by roughness. He lamented that, “all learning, politeness, and humanity are almost extinguished, and nothing remains but a savage roughness of expression and a ferocity of manners truly shocking to those who have any gentle sensations or softness in their natures.”\textsuperscript{74} Whereas polish or refinement was achieved by polite social interaction, roughness resulted from remaining isolated or apart.\textsuperscript{75} Likewise Bailey was concerned that what tied people together—their humanity and their innate capacity for feeling—was being extinguished by strong demarcations of difference. When he considered the literature and print culture of the Revolutionary era, Bailey saw a similar roughness: “Our compositions are no longer debated and enervated by polished sentences and fine turned periods, but are dignified with a manly roughness which strikes the ear like the grating of rusty iron.”\textsuperscript{76} Sensibility was a capacity that had to be cultivated, but rough, unfeeling social interaction could only introduce “insensibility of heart”—diminishing the possibility of fellow-feeling and civic discourse in American society.\textsuperscript{77}

\textsuperscript{73} Robert Calhoon remarks that rhetoric and coercive methods revolutionaries employed had a variety of effects, one of which was the “breakdown of cohesion.” See Calhoon, \textit{Loyalists in Revolutionary America}, 326-39.
\textsuperscript{74} Bailey to Mrs. ___, Nov. 24, 1778 (letterbook copy), Bailey Papers, 91-21. For critiques of American rebelliousness found in the Loyalist press which echo Bailey’s concerns, see MacKinnon and Calhoon, “Character and Coherence.”
\textsuperscript{75} Knott, \textit{Sensibility and the American Revolution}, 43.
\textsuperscript{76} Bailey to unnamed correspondent, Dec. 1, 1778 (letterbook copy), Bailey Papers, 91-21.
\textsuperscript{77} Bailey to Mrs. Domett, Dec. 2, 1778 (letterbook copy), Bailey Papers, 91-21.
Bailey was particularly worried about use of the language of “liberty” to describe the Revolution. Mocking the rhetoric of the revolutionaries, Bailey wrote:

I write this epistle from the glorious land of liberty, from the free and independent states of America! Free from all the troublesome restraints of religion, goodness, and humanity, and independent of everything truly great, generous, and worthy. ... We disdain from the bottom of our souls to be governed by the tyranny of law, equity, and reason! We entertain more dignified sentiments and have placed ourselves under the dominion of violence, rapine, and folly!

From Bailey's perspective, Americans were not so much free as cut off, and not so much liberated as dominated by far worse tyrants. He asserted that some restraints were, in fact, salutary and were not opposed to liberty. Religion, reason, law, and human benevolence were only restraints in the sense that they curbed the worst excesses of social life and the most troublesome passions of the individual. Bailey perceived that revolutionaries were self-consciously adopting a style of rhetoric and a way of using words opposed to British and European culture. He sarcastically wrote, “We scorn as infinitely beneath our dignity, the gentleness, patience, and humanity of the Britons. We pride ourselves in being unfeeling, inflexible, and obstinate Americans.” Rather than the “effeminate” ways of a dying empire, Americans adopted a “manly roughness” “more properly adapted to a race of Heros.” Bailey’s assessment, however, was that they had merely exchanged “health, elegance, and plenty” for “barbarity, ignorance, and brutality.”

Bailey was particularly concerned with what he saw as “a disregard for the most solemn oaths.” And more than any other factor, Bailey’s principled loyalty to his oath to the King contributed to his ordeal and he honoured it at great cost. In a
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78 Bailey to unnamed correspondent, Dec. 1, 1778 (letterbook copy), Bailey Papers, 91-21.  
79 Bailey to Mrs. ___, Nov. 24, 1778 (letterbook copy), Bailey Papers, 91-21.
1778 letter, he explained his convictions about oaths, sensibility, and society. He wrote that his views on the connection between oaths and society were based on an extensive personal study “long before the commencement of the revolution.” He condensed that historical examination by noting a nearly universal “sacred regard for oaths,” and argued that, “whoever attempts to lessen their obligations is an enemy to the welfare and security of civil society.”

Bailey was keenly aware that not a few Loyalists—including some of his Anglican ministerial colleagues—had found a way to justify the exchange of their British for an American oath of allegiance, while others simply took the oath as a wartime survival strategy, rather than out of any heartfelt allegiance. The underlying assumption of such oath-taking was that it was an external matter, unconnected to one’s interior convictions. Bailey was worried about just such a disconnection. He wrote, that “if [one] is induced to offend against conscience [by taking an imposed, unfelt oath], he must become ... hardened against future conviction.” By submitting to an enforced oath, “people will lose their reverence for oaths in general.” The reverence for oaths—and for other kinds of words—was, for Bailey, the basis of the social ties that bound people into a virtuous society. Once the principle of avoiding sacrifice for one’s oath is introduced, Bailey contended it was a slippery slope toward the cheapening of all oaths, words, and commitments: “they will regard them as matters of trifling importance, and in the conclusion the peace and foundation of society will be greatly weakened, if not wholly destroyed.” By disconnecting words from feeling, Bailey contended, or by imposing oaths without
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80 Bailey to Mr. Domett, Aug. 26, 1778 (letterbook copy), Bailey Papers, 91-21.
regard for personal allegiance, governments invited trouble. He asked, "Will men who have been compelled to take this oath become more friendly? Will they consider it as binding?" There was no such guarantee. To ensure that oaths were expressions of conviction, and that they carried a strong sense of obligation, Bailey concluded that, “oaths ought to be voluntary.”

As he did in his manuscript history of New England, Bailey critiqued the tendency of (some) Americans to be separate and independent, rather than connected—an inclination expressed in the revolutionary discourse of “liberty.” On the one hand, Americans were cutting themselves off from the transatlantic culture of sensibility and politeness by which much of colonial society had become more refined. They were choosing populism over the moderate Enlightenment’s cosmopolitanism. On the other hand, Americans were self-consciously adopting ways of speech that Bailey believed would undermine civic discourse, social harmony, and the negotiation of political differences present in culturally diverse democracies. Ironically, Loyalists like Bailey would have been far more at home in the republic during the 1790s, when revolutionary leaders began to employ (or recovered) the language of sensibility to encourage national fellow-feeling and republican virtue. During the 1770s, though, Bailey employed the language of sensibility to critique American isolationism and the breakdown of civil discourse.

---

81 Bailey to Mr. Domett, Aug. 26, 1778 (letterbook copy), Bailey Papers, 91-21.
"Spiriting up the people": Emotions and conspiracy in the Revolution

Bailey saw the American Revolution as a conspiracy—a scheme designed to manipulate the passions of the American people and the affections of the British Parliament. This surprising viewpoint is reflected in A Letter to a Friend on the Present Situation of our Publick Affairs, a manuscript he wrote sometime during the course of the War of Independence, and which apparently remained unpublished.82

It is a remarkable document. There is, of course, the prurient pleasure of discovering the identity of Bailey’s alleged conspirators and the details of the scheme he perceived. Perhaps more to the point of this study, the letter proposes an account of the role of political enthusiasm in the Revolution. It also reveals an aspect of Bailey’s political affections articulated nowhere else so clearly. Janice Potter argues that many Loyalist writers similarly explained the Revolution with reference to the passions of the people—“easily swayed and vulnerable to appeals to their passions or baser instincts, were duped by a crafty and unscrupulous cabal.”83 Bailey’s account is even more emotionally complex, involving British as well as American actors, and the affections of the members of Parliament, as well as the rank and file.

The conspiracy in brief: “some of our most zealous sons are directed in their motions by the ministry.”84 The conspirators: “F___k_n,” “A_ms,” and “H___k,” and
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82 Bailey, A Letter to a Friend on the Present Situation of our Publick Affairs, [n.d.], Bailey Papers, 98-10. Internal evidence suggests that it was written after the outbreak of hostilities, but before an American victory seemed possible, let alone inevitable. The final two pages of the extant version appear to be rough notes, not yet copied into a notebook in a neater hand.

83 Potter, Liberty We Seek, 45. On conspiracy theories as a common feature of Loyalist and Patriot explanations of their times, see Potter, Liberty We Seek, 17-25 and Bailyn, Ideological Origins, 144-59.

84 Bailey, Letter to a Friend, 32.
a tyrannical faction of the British ministry. Bailey proposed that the Revolution was plotted in Whitehall as a pretense for decisive military action against the American colonies, and the further reduction of their liberties, if not their enslavement. The leaders of the so-called “sons of liberty,” chief among them Benjamin Franklin, John Adams, and John Hancock, agreed to be the “tools” of the ministry in return for indemnity from prosecution and, of course, considerable personal wealth. The role of the New England “junto” was to kindle “the flames of sedition and rebellion thro’ the province,” to encourage acts of resistance that were intended to “estrange the affections of the parliament from the colonies.”

For proof of the conspiracy, Bailey pointed to the plainly inadequate response of the British administration to early American rebelliousness, such as the destruction of the tea in Boston Harbour. The Port Bill, he wrote, was never intended to bring the colonists to submission, but only to provoke them to further insurrection. Likewise, the legislation that removed the provincial charter was a half-measure that intentionally did not prevent town meetings—venues that allowed the “seducers” to animate the people to “tumult, mischief, and sedition.” Most importantly, Bailey contended that no group as shrewd as these men would dare push the colonies into so mismatched a war, against so vastly superior an
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86 Bailey, *Letter to a Friend*, 8, 7. Hancock and Bailey were at Harvard at the same time, graduating in 1754 and 1755, respectively, and Adams was in the same class as Bailey. He viewed Franklin (the “phylosophical Hero”) with particular vehemence. For Bailey’s poetry on conspiracies involving some of these figures, see Leamon, *Reverend Jacob Bailey*, 180-2. Elsewhere Bailey wrote, “In my opinion ... neither Adams nor Franklin were ever republican in principle ... their ambition conducted them to lay the foundation of a mighty empire independent of Britain and to erect a monarchy in the new world ... to manage according to their pleasure;” Bailey to Mr. Brown, Feb. 21, 1781 (letterbook copy), Bailey Papers, 94-8.
army, and so contrary to common sense, without some ulterior motivation.\textsuperscript{88} He urged his readers to inquire further, before it was too late:

I must now, Sir, express my humble and most importunate wishes that the eyes of my countrymen may be opened to discern that eminent danger which threatens them with speedy destruction, let them be persuaded to exert their native good sense and penetration to reflect a little upon the transactions of the present day, and seriously examine whether these very flaming patriots to whose guidance they have resigned their judgments, their consciences, and their safety, may not possibly in concert with a wicked and tyrannical ministry be engaged to compleat their ruin.\textsuperscript{89}

Poignantly, Bailey wrote at a moment during the conflict when American victory still seemed unlikely, and the damage wrought by manipulated passions could still be undone.

In laying bare the mechanics of his conspiracy theory, Bailey made several comments on the role of political emotions in the Revolution. He contended that in the “cause of freedom,” like any other political goal, it was best not to place one’s confidence in the “most noisy, precipitous, and furious” methods, but rather in “firmness with moderation, steadiness with secrecy, and humanity with earnest persuasion.” He explained that the latter approach “engages both the reason and the affections.” Relying on fury and impulsive action, on the other hand, “either conduces to excite a sudden tempest of passion without any lasting effect, or to estrange the hearts and inclinations of most of the people from a cause that requires such perpetual bluster and commotion to maintain it.”\textsuperscript{90} It was Bailey’s view that the Revolution was sustained not because ordinary people had been truly, rationally

\textsuperscript{88} Bailey, \textit{Letter to a Friend}, 25.
\textsuperscript{89} Bailey, \textit{Letter to a Friend}, 33.
\textsuperscript{90} Bailey, \textit{Letter to a Friend}, 4; emphasis added.
convinced that the “cause of liberty” required rebellion against Britain, but because their initial outrage at the so-called Intolerable Acts was constantly fanned into passionate fury by an unrelenting barrage of inflammatory rhetoric and mob tactics. Let the people cool their passions long enough to reconsider, however, and he believed they would choose a different course.\textsuperscript{91}

Like many observers then and since, Bailey was astonished at how suddenly and thoroughly revolutionary sentiments spread through the colonies. He pointed to such factors as the influence of the Continental Congress, the activism of local committees of correspondence, and the “misrepresentations of facts” in print. Yet Bailey also suggested emotions played a role, magnifying the effects of other causes:

It was really astonishing to observe the rapid progress of the contagion, the passion for freedom, spread from town to town, from city to city, from province to province till the whole continent was kindled in flame and combustion. Enthusiasm in politicks, as well as religion, catches like gun powder and like a torrent of lightning rushing from the clouds, [it] dazzles, confounds, and consumes with irresistible force.\textsuperscript{92}

As he often did with religious enthusiasm, Bailey argued that political wildfire can be ignited and fanned into fury, but it cannot be controlled. He believed that, under the influence of such strong passions, people were susceptible to manipulation by self-interested individuals. But it was impossible to predict the result of such a conflagration.

It is interesting to compare Bailey’s analysis to more recent studies of the emotional revolution that enabled the political revolution. There are many points of agreement. Nicole Eustace, for example, argues, as Bailey did (though without the

\textsuperscript{91} See Potter, \textit{Liberty We Seek}, 45-6.
\textsuperscript{92} Bailey, \textit{Letter to a Friend}, 13.
element of conspiracy) that revolutionary leaders knowingly embraced the rougher passions, since “they found that they could not advance in the cause of revolution without the aid of that immoderate emotion they had so recently eschewed.”

Bailey spoke of “spiriting up the people,” and Eustace “the notion of spirit” to describe the intentional strategy of firing the emotions of the people. However, while Eustace argues that strong passion was, to a degree, combined with classical virtue, Bailey insisted that it was a cynical strategy designed to unleash destructive, rather than noble, forces. A key aspect of Eustace’s assessment of Patriot emotions was that, “They thus began seeking ways to combine the civility and respectability attributed to refined feelings with the force and might believed to stem from popular passions.”

Bailey believed his experience as a Loyalist belied such a view. He argued that revolutionary passions overwhelmed civic affections, making neighbours insensible to the suffering they were inflicting upon one another. Perhaps speaking of his own experience with mobs and the Committee of Correspondence in Maine, Bailey wrote:

> In these dreadful moments of assault and ravage nothing could soften or divert the inexorable spirit. The assailants divested themselves of every thing noble generous and good, disregarded all the tender offices of friendship and benevolence, banished every sentiment of tenderness from their bosoms.

Bailey did not for a moment doubt that emotions were central in the unification of formerly disparate colonists, or that firing the passions was crucial in the spread of revolutionary sentiments. But, he asked, at what cost? What kind of society was
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created as a result? “Can we expect that harmony should prevail?” Will neighbours be willing to “unite their affections to those persons who offer such violence to their native freedom?”

Finally, *A Letter to a Friend* offers a surprising glimpse at the kind of revolution against Britain that Bailey—the Loyalist—could have supported. As he wrote, Bailey believed that America faced “impending ruin” before Britain’s superior military might. And yet he offered a counterfactual possibility—an approach to revolution that he believed would have been successful, “if these men had entertained a serious intention of expelling the British forces.” Bailey’s revolution would have employed cool cunning instead of so much furious passion. He would have made extensive preparations (which he does not detail) “with the profoundest stillness and concealment,” lulling the British army into inattention. Then, he said, “with these precautions our countrymen might have performed wonders and by an unexpected and fortunate blow, have so intimidated the administration as to have delivered themselves and posterity from European slavery.” Bailey even went so far as to describe that scenario as a “pleasing and patriotic idea.” In other words, Bailey agreed with the revolutionaries that a tyrannical, heavy-handed British administration (if not the King himself) was in a position to subject Americans to “slavery.”

Bailey would have supported some version of passive or even active resistance to British authority. Almost unthinkably, Bailey the Loyalist would have

---

cheered as “pleasing and patriotic” the striking of an “unexpected and fortunate blow” against Britain. All of this would have been conceivable—if the revolution had appealed to both the passions and the reason of the people, if it had not trampled their affections and virtues. Bailey so often criticized the unfolding of the American Revolution that it has been possible to overlook his very real worries about British policy, and his deep emotional identification with America. His unwillingness to countenance the roughness of revolutionary passions has made it possible to miss his American sympathies, and the weakening of his British affections.

**Conclusion**

The writings of Jacob Bailey reveal, as it were, two possible histories of emotion in British America. On the one hand was the emotional history that might have been, a positive vision for the British and cosmopolitan identity of the American colonies. Granted, what Bailey stood for is often overawed by the vociferousness of his polemical rhetoric, but the negatives can be developed into a positive snapshot of his views. He envisioned an American future in which the colonies continued their refinement and became more integrated into British and European culture. North American identity, however, was not swallowed up in this scenario; Bailey hoped for a genuine exchange, in which the ancient dignity of America’s Indigenous people, the sublime beauty of the New World’s pristine landscapes, and the strength of character cultivated by labouring to settle the frontier, were all unique contributions that his country of birth could offer to
transatlantic culture. Reasoned emotions—sentiments—were the glue that made it possible for people of diverse backgrounds and across vast distances to be knit together into a refined British American civilization. Bailey’s was a cosmopolitan version of loyalism. He understood America’s connection to the British Empire in expansive terms; more than nationalism per se, loyalism was the vehicle for participating in a refined, sentimental culture.

However, as he did in the Compendious History, Bailey often expressed this cosmopolitan loyalism in a negative mode, criticizing what he perceived as American parochialism and separatism. He narrated, that is, another history of New England: a long history of American self-interest and recalcitrance before legitimate authority, a deeply-ingrained tendency that cut off the colonies from a world of cultural exchange and refinement. In this account, Puritanism’s long-faced solemnity and the Great Awakening’s enthusiasm seemed likely to overthrow more polite expressions of Christianity. It was a critique that only intensified as the imperial crisis unfolded. Bailey saw the culture of sentiment overwhelmed by the rough manners and violent passions of revolutionary agitators. He worried that violent actions and words would render colonists insensible to the very sympathies and affections that had made civil society possible. One need not agree with Bailey’s strident critiques to find him a perceptive analyst of the role that emotion played in the American Revolution. He understood, as historians of emotion now find, that sympathy could facilitate transatlantic connections, and that passion could motivate disruptive change in political systems.
Bailey’s loyalism was undoubtedly changed by the American Revolution, but it was grounded in a long history of intellectual coherence and emotional resonance that preceded that climactic event. The question for Bailey, taken up in the next chapter, was whether that cosmopolitan version of loyalism and his hope for a transatlantic culture of sympathy could survive the violence and polarization of the Revolution.
“Not from any remainders of affection”:
The disaffection of Jacob Bailey’s loyalty

How is it possible for me to follow your advice respecting politicks, when I have continually before me such shocking and affecting examples of the folly, wickedness, and cruelty of British and congressional government. A man who can behold such objects as present themselves to my view without emotion must divest himself both of religion and human nature.¹

- Jacob Bailey to Thomas Brown, May 10, 1783

The previous chapter began with a dramatized revolutionary Committee of Correspondence charging Parson Teachum, Jacob Bailey’s alter ego, with “having an undue attachment to Great Britain, and of being disaffected to the noble struggles of America for freedom.”² It is tempting to take the Committee at its word, characterizing the emotions of Loyalists as primarily “British”—portraying them as unreconstructed anglophiles or “Augustan Tories.”³ And yet Bailey’s emotions were unsettled by the actions of both the “British and congressional government.” Though Bailey certainly nursed bitter resentment against the American rebels, his emotional connection to Britain also changed. It was not as if one aspect of his British-

¹ Bailey to Thomas Brown, May 10, 1783 (letterbook copy), Bailey Papers, 94-19.
² Bailey, “The Humors of the Committee, or, Majesty of the Mob,” undated stage script, Bailey Papers, 98-16, p. 9; emphasis added.
American identity suffered while the other remained constant—both underwent significant transformation during and after the Revolutionary War. His writings express feelings of anger, disillusionment, humiliation, and grief—directed toward the nation that had once been the object of his devotion and for which he had suffered. In short, Bailey became profoundly disaffected with Britain.

And yet Bailey persisted in his loyalism. Disillusioned though he was, Bailey did not abandon his British allegiance. He did, however, have to ground that loyalism in something other than feelings: “If we continue our loyalty after such obvious and striking demonstrations of partiality, it must be from principles of conscience and not from any remainders of affection.” This chapter, then, traces Bailey’s disaffection with Britain and the reconfiguration of his loyalism.

The dislocating experience of being a refugee was central to Bailey’s political disaffection, but it was not the only contributing factor. Even before his exile, he and other Loyalists were humiliated and disheartened by British overtures of reconciliation made to the American rebels beginning in 1778. In the spring of 1779,
Bailey and his family sought refuge in Nova Scotia. After some months in Halifax, Bailey accepted the position as the SPG missionary at Cornwallis Township. He was soon disabused of his hope that the province would be a haven of loyalism. Instead, he found the former New England residents sympathetic to the revolution; their hostility seemed to extend, rather than relieve, his Loyalist ordeal. Bailey remained at Cornwallis until 1782, when he moved to Annapolis Royal to minister to a growing Loyalist community. During the course of the War of Independence, Bailey witnessed successive waves of Loyalist refugees arriving in the province. Their desperate circumstances elicited Bailey’s deep sympathy, even as he became disillusioned by the “unfeeling” British policy toward the Loyalists. As the terms of the Treaty of Paris (1783) became known, Bailey was incensed at the “inhumanity” of his nation’s betrayal of her most loyal subjects. And yet in the years following the revolution, Bailey remained committed to royal authority and the liberties of the British constitution, even if he expressed his loyalty with a more critical accent.

Bailey’s writing in Nova Scotia was replete with complex emotions. He articulated the emotional experience of political exile—his own and that of other refugees—in hundreds of pages of letters and diaries. Whereas Bailey’s New England writing was predominantly historical, in Nova Scotia he turned to satirical poetry in a Hudibrastic style that combined ludicrous humour and devastating critique of popular religion and political enthusiasm. Bailey also contended with other Loyalists about the role that passions should play in their wartime writing.
The beginning of disaffection

The experience of dislocation within the British Empire began while Bailey was still living in New England—before his physical exile—in response to the 1778 peace commission led by the Earl of Carlisle. The commissioners offered terms of peace and a form of American self-rule to the Continental Congress; meeting with no success with that body, they had their *Manifesto and Proclamation* published and sent to each of the rebelling colonies. Bailey felt sharp betrayal at the possibility of a pardon for the revolutionaries. He wrote, “Nothing could occasion greater surprise and anxiety to the friends of government, than the sudden alteration in the language and operations of the British court.”

The offer of peace, wrote Bailey, was profoundly disorienting to Loyalists. Of their emotional upheaval he wrote to a correspondent, “We recollected our former connection with blushes of confusion, and were almost ashamed of our steadfast adherence to an authority which had neither spirit enough to punish its enemies, nor gratitude sufficient to encourage its friends.” He also began to worry that the friends of Britain would be abandoned: “instead of receiving any countenance, protection, and reward for our firmness and sufferings, we were now exposed as consigned victims.”

Bailey rehearsed some of the ordeals he and other Loyalists faced for their attachment to Britain, their suffering devotion seemingly belittled by the peace
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offers: “We had long been suffering every indignity for our loyalty and attachment, from the sons of hostility and vengeance, daily exposed to the unexampled turbulence of their rage, and the bitter inflictions of their malice—our houses plundered, our fortunes ruined, our families undone, our freedom invaded, our consciences forced.” Loyalists endured such suffering “rather than renounce their principles,” and also because they expected Britain’s powerful, decisive military response. Instead, they learned about Britain’s “most abject and humiliating” peace proposals. He summed up his strong emotional reaction to the offer of pardon: “Every person who possessed any sentiments of duty towards his majesty or felt any affection for Great Britain was seized with a mixture of astonishment and indignation.” He continued, “If we continue our loyalty after such obvious and striking demonstrations of partiality, it must be from principles of conscience and not from any remainders of affection.” Bailey’s comment provides an important insight into the nature of his loyalism, the composition of which eludes simple or static definition. His loyalty seems to have been a complex and changing amalgam, including British patriotism, cosmopolitan refinement, personal connections, and ideological convictions. Though it was never merely an affectionate or sentimental attachment, it was still a disorienting experience for Bailey to remake his loyalism without “any remainders of affection.”

“*No refugee can be happy*”

As Bailey and his Kennebec companions crossed from American to British territory, in June 1779, Bailey confessed to his diary, “It occasioned an abundance of
regret and chagrin when we found ourselves departing from our native country to seek a refuge in a foreign region.”¹⁹ They were among at least 60,000 Loyalists who were eventually cast into the British world by the War of Independence.¹⁰ As an early refugee with the support of the SPG, Bailey’s experience was not necessarily typical of varied refugee circumstances. Nevertheless, as Bailey recorded his passage from Pownalborough, Maine, to Halifax, he attempted to generalize from his own emotional reactions to write sympathetically about a common set of refugee experiences and feelings.

Though Bailey identified closely with Britain—culturally, intellectually, religiously, politically—he was a lifelong New Englander. For almost two decades he had been in the Kennebec region, serving its people, studying its ancient history, and observing his natural surroundings. Bailey sought permission to leave the region for British territory only when it became painfully clear that the local Committee of Correspondence was intent on making his life and work there untenable. Departing by schooner in late May 1779, Bailey’s account of their “expulsion” filled several notebooks, capturing the pathos of a journey that was simultaneously into freedom and into exile. He began his account with the question, “Must we after all the trouble, harassments, and cruel persecution we have endured for the cause of truth and virtue, must we leave these pleasing scenes of nature, these friendly shades, these
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rising plants, these opening flowers, these trees swelling with fruit, and yonder winding river?"\textsuperscript{11}

Despite their sorrow at leaving and the worries of sea travel, the voyage was also a tremendous relief after years of poverty and political persecution. Of their feelings as their vessel came within “the long wished for” sight of Cape Sable, on Nova Scotia’s southern coast, Bailey wrote, “It gave us immense pleasure to behold a country under the dominion of our lawful prince, and where the tyranny of republican villains had not yet extended.”\textsuperscript{12} As they sailed into Halifax Harbour, and saw the naval ships “with the Britanic colours flying,” they were inspired “with the most pleasing sensations.” Bailey expressed his gratitude that his family had been conducted “to this retreat of freedom and security from the rage of tyranny and the cruelty of oppression.”\textsuperscript{13}

Bailey and the other Kennebec refugees arrived in Halifax with little more than the tattered clothes on their backs. When they set out from Maine, Bailey noted forlornly, “we carried our beds and the shattered remains of our fortune, the whole not worth 40 dollars.”\textsuperscript{14} Stepping onto the Halifax dockside, Bailey said that their “uncouth habits and uncouth appearance” attracted such looks of concern from the gathering crowd that Bailey felt compelled to address them, saying, “‘Gentleman, we are a company of fugitives from Kennebec in New England, driven by famine and persecution to take refuge among you, and therefore I must intreat your candour

\textsuperscript{11} Bailey, Journal, June 7, 1779, Bailey Papers, 95-20.
\textsuperscript{12} Bailey, Journal, June 19, 1779, Bailey Papers, 95-22.
\textsuperscript{13} Bailey, Journal, June 21, 1779, Bailey Papers, 95-23.
\textsuperscript{14} Bailey, Journal, June 8, 1779, Bailey Papers, 95-20.
and compassion to excuse the meanness and singularity of our dress.””¹⁵ When a loaf of bread was set before the travellers at a friend’s table, Bailey’s young son, Charley, had to ask what it was, since “the poor little fellow had never seen or tasted any bread made of flour”—one measure of the deprivations in Maine in the years before their eventual exile.¹⁶

From his own experience, Bailey reflected on the plight of a refugee in the early modern Atlantic world, including the emotional dimensions of that experience.¹⁷ First, he said that refugees could expect an uncertain reception. He thought that refugees were likely to be treated by strangers with “suspicion and jealousy.”¹⁸ In wartime, refugees often disembarked from their ships with immediate physical needs, unknown political views, and potential diseases. As a refugee himself, Bailey felt that he could expect hostility or suspicion from local inhabitants whether or not he received government aid. On the one hand, “should the government to which they repair afford them any assistance or support, they immediately become objects of hatred and indignation, for the natives consider them as invaders of their own proper rights”—competitors for jobs, scarce resources, or emoluments. On the other hand, Bailey wrote, refugees who did not obtain official attention could also be resented:

If—as commonly happens—they are wholly neglected by government, they quickly become the most insignificant wretches in nature. They

are everywhere treated with indignity ... tho’ people at first, from that compassion and benevolence which is natural to the human heart, may console and relieve them, yet the hand of charity will soon be closed, and men will always have contempt for a fellow creature who depends upon their bounty for assistance.¹⁹

Bailey believed that the condition of refugees stretched the capacity of people to respond with sympathy and compassion for others. His Enlightenment optimism in the benevolence of human affections had its limits; when the need was too great, people became insensible. Mass dislocations of peoples created a humanitarian crisis to which only governments could respond. He would soon complain that nations, as well as individuals, could be unfeeling toward the plight of refugees.

While there are moments when Bailey’s journal from Kennebec to Cornwallis reads like a travel account, with attention to his natural surroundings, he wrote that there is little pleasure in refugee’s journey “when they are expelled by faction or legal authority.” He admitted that exiles “repair to the place of our banishment, however delightful and advantageous, with reluctance and aversion.”²⁰ Bailey also noted the emotional effect of not knowing whether their exile would be temporary or permanent: “What rendered our situation still more distressing was the uncertainty of our return to our country, our friends, and habitation.”²¹ Indeed, until the conclusion of the war, Bailey, like other Loyalists, retained the hope that British victory would enable their safe return and the resumption of their former lives. This hope (however faint it became) made it difficult for Loyalist refugees to

wholeheartedly identify with their new communities, and eventually the dashing of that hope compounded their bitterness.

Ultimately, it was the dependence of refugees on others that rendered their situation so fraught. “On the whole,” wrote Bailey, “I am convinced that no refugee can be happy, unless he is able to support himself by his own fortune, or some employment independent both of the government and the people.”22 Yet such self-sufficiency was difficult to attain. Having escaped the difficulties of war, Loyalists in Nova Scotia were soon mired in practical problems such as insufficient provisions, troubled land surveys, mediocre agricultural land, competition for scarce resources, and an unsatisfactory British claims process.

“Who can behold such objects ... without emotion?”

Bailey's disaffection with Britain was also caused by his sympathetic, empathic, response to the conditions of Loyalist refugees. The arrival of Bailey and the other Pownalborough exiles was followed by waves of other Loyalist refugees, particularly at the end of the War of Independence. In all, 20,000 Loyalists would make their way to Nova Scotia, many of whom were driven from the uncertainties of war to the deprivations of refugee camps.23

---

In a striking inversion of the devotion to monarchy that characterized Bailey's earlier loyalism, Bailey expressed mocking bitterness toward a King whose tenderness toward his enemies only contributed to the suffering of loyal subjects. Shortly after arriving at his new missionary assignment in Cornwallis, Nova Scotia, Bailey sent a satirical poem of 120 lines to his brother-in-law, wishing that it would “be the humble means of reducing you to a little good humour.” Safely framed as a tale of a “famous king / who liv'd and reign'd in days of yore / Thousands of years ago and more,” the poem was a thinly-veiled description of what Bailey viewed as George III’s unjust responses to the American rebels and loyalists. The poem’s humorous style did little to disguise Bailey’s rancor and disaffection. Of the King’s reluctance to punish his enemies, he wrote, “He can no injury resent / and hates the work of punishment / Hath rather ruin half the nation / than give a rascal flagellation.” Or again, the King did, “in his humble meekness choose / to lick the hand which gives abuse.” The poem also captures the disorienting sense of abandonment by Britain experienced by Loyalists; having suffered so much for their King, they found his silence perhaps more painful than their losses at the hands of American revolutionaries.

But [those] who from virtuous inclination treat him with love and veneration, who labor with incessant pain his cause and empire to maintain,
who with an honest fervor rose
  to stem the malice of his foes,
who still remain with equal zeal
  to seek his honor and his weal,
who leave their children, friends, and wives
  and in his service spend their lives
these by their sovereign are neglected,
basely insulted and rejected.

He disregards their plaintive prayers,
  nor salves nor relieves their fears,
sees them without the least concern,
pursued with hostile rage and scorn
sees them, for [their] truth and loyalty,
in dungeons doomed to rot and die,
or else expel'd [from] their cheerful homes,
in foreign lands condemn'd to roam,
exposed to causeless infamy
and grapes [?] of pinching poverty,
where men employ their utmost power
them to keep under and devour.

It was painful, contended Bailey, for the Loyalists who had treated the King “with
love and veneration... his cause and empire to maintain,” to be so “neglected /
basely insulted and rejected” by that same sovereign. Bailey leveled the devastating
criticism that the King acted unsympathetically toward his loyal subjects in
America—“without the least concern.” If he saw them at all, he watched unmoved as
they were pursued, jailed, exiled, and impoverished. Bailey was moved to pity and
compassion by the desperate conditions of Loyalist refugees arriving in Nova Scotia,
and was angered by what he saw as Britain’s insensibility and inhumanity toward
them.

The Refugees in this province are under the influence of melancholy
and dejection. The inflexible obstinacy of the rebel powers, the
dilatory conduct of the British forces, and the ungenerous treatment

25 Compare Bailey’s rancor with the affection toward George III that many elite Loyalists in
Upper Canada retained; Errington, *The Lion, the Eagle, and Upper Canada*, 23-7.
they meet with in the regions of New Scotland, have broken the spirits of several worthy persons.26

As Bailey intimated, when American Loyalists found their place of refuge bore a troubling resemblance to the republican communities from which they had escaped, their Loyalist ordeal was extended.

He had occasion to cross the Bay of Fundy to meet some of the refugees arriving at Saint John sometime in 1783, and described how their pathetic condition influenced his own feelings and the affections of the refugees themselves.27 He admitted that it was “impossible to describe the hurry, bustle, and confusion that now prevailed at St. Johns or to communicate the feelings and agitations of mind.” He recounted the people’s profound disorientation on disembarking at an “unhospitable and wilderness shore” in the middle of a downpour of rain, without shelter from “the horrors of a cold and stormy climate,” and lacking the reassuring presence of “friendly authority” to relieve their insecurities. As he walked among the refugees, offering what small comfort and assistance he could, Bailey asked about their individual circumstances. He heard the story of a wife whose husband died as the ship departed York, and whose son died as the vessel arrived in Saint John. A once-wealthy woman, now impoverished, claimed that rebels had plundered her house without cause. An orphaned boy described how his magistrate father was killed, how his mother had “died with a broken heart,” and how he was separated from his only brother. “I am left alone in the desolate and horrid country without a

26 Bailey to Mr. Domet, Nov. 6, 1780 (letterbook copy), Bailey Papers, 91-27.
27 Bailey to an unnamed correspondent [undated], Bailey Papers, 95-27/27a. The undated five-page letter was microfilmed between the journal entries for August 16 and August 13, 1779 (also out of order). I have not yet been able to compare the microfilms with the original documents.
single friend,” he concluded. Everywhere children were shivering in their tattered, inadequate clothing. Bailey attempted to articulate the profound emotional impact of observing the condition of the refugees:

The various objects which engaged my attention and the different scenes which arose excited a thousand contending sensations in my breast, at this general and cursory view: anger and meekness, indignation and pity, grief and joy, rage and tenderness, esteem and contempt, anguish and laughter, alternately filled and agitated my mind.

As he listened to wives reproach their husbands for joining the “faithless Britons,” just as much as they blamed the Continental Congress, and as he heard others “in the extreme bitterness of their spirits” cursing the British crown, Bailey reflected upon what such experiences must mean for their (and his) loyalties. In Bailey’s estimation, the exiles before him were the “unhappy outcasts of Europe and America.” He was hard pressed to see that this group owed affection to any country:

Should they be directed in the sentiments, by the dictates of reason, the precepts of christianity, and the feeling of human nature, they cannot regard the continent of their ancestors with affection, but must view every European nation, in its political capacity, with disgust and abhorrence, must they not despise the solemn justice of Spain, the boasted politeness of France, the pretended purity of Holland, the extolled humanity of Britain.

Britain’s culture of sentiment had once been what attracted Bailey’s political affections. Before the Revolutionary War, he had participated in a transatlantic culture of sympathy and cosmopolitan sensibility that helped him feel connected to Britain (and Europe) from his location in provincial America. On the strand at Saint John, surrounded by desperate refugees, the same notions of sentiment and feeling, as well as reason and faith, stood in judgment of the very nations that had once seemed the epitome of polite culture. By disregarding the very people who had
exhibited sacrificial loyalty, Bailey charged, European nations forfeited their claims to politeness, justice, or purity, and Britain made a mockery of her self-portrayal as an empire of benevolent humanitarianism. In other words, the feelings and sentiments that had once given shape to his loyalty now deepened his disaffection from Britain. Bailey contrasted his own sympathy and distress over the condition of other Loyalist refugees with Britain’s unfeeling, insensible reaction; he claimed that anyone “who can behold such objects as present themselves to my view without emotion must divest himself both of religion and human nature.”

The poetics of disaffection

Bailey was a poet before his revolutionary experience. But as a Loyalist refugee in Nova Scotia, Bailey began to write poetry in a genre that reflected his sense of disaffection and dislocation: Hudibrastic verse satire, a style that employed absurdity to expose enthusiasm in religion or politics. While his Compendious History of New England was certainly written in a minor key, sharply critical of what he perceived as the region’s propensity to religious enthusiasm and political self-interest, Bailey nevertheless intended it to be printed for a general audience, hoping that it would persuade readers to adopt more cosmopolitan sentiments. In style and content—and even in its more restricted manuscript circulation—Bailey’s satirical poetry, by contrast, seemed to reflect his chastened confidence about writing for a single Anglo-American public. He used passion to fortify an emotional community of Loyalists, rather than the broad society of sentiment to which he had formerly

28 Bailey to Mr. Brown, May 10, 1783 (letterbook copy), Bailey Papers, 94-19.
aspired. Bailey’s satire embodies many of the features of “Loyalist poetics” identified by Philip Gould: “its separation of virtue from politics, its uncertain view of the elasticity of language ... it does not address a disinterested public sphere nor does it attempt to connect with an abstract public through eloquent performance.”

Rather than careful reasoning or polite wit, his satire used mockery, stark accusations, and even ribald humour to skewer American revolutionaries and to hearten the community of Loyalist refugees.

Bailey’s narrative verse imitated the style of Samuel Butler’s Hudibras, a satirical portrayal of the topsy-turvy world of the seventeenth-century English Civil War. Butler’s long poem (published in three parts, 1662, 1663, 1677) was a burlesque epic featuring the Quixotic mock hero, Sir Hudibras. The humorous inversions and exaggerations of the poem censured the religious and political dissenters whose rebellion led to regicide and the overturning of English society:

When civil Fury first grew high,
And men fell out they knew not why;
When hard words, Jealousies, and Fears,
Set Folks together by the ears,
And made them fight, like mad or drunk,
For Dame Religion, as for Punk.

---

29 Gould, Writing the Rebellion, 5; see 13: “This increasing penchant for ridicule and raillery restructures the relation to one’s audience, narrowing its scope ... and simultaneously losing its faith in the efficacy of rational persuasion.”


32 Wilders, ed., Hudibras, 1; emphasis in original.
Written during the early years of the Restoration of the monarchy, *Hudibras* argued that the fragile order of English society was not yet sufficiently safeguarded. The poem asserts the fundamental untrustworthiness and disloyalty of dissenters.\(^{33}\) Monarchy, in Butler’s view, was the only rational check against the chaos of popular opinion; he believed that the alternative was the world portrayed by *Hudibras*, “a world of madness and mayhem, in which charlatans and knaves are unrestrained and authority is unasserted.”\(^{34}\)

*Hudibras* satirized the seventeenth-century Civil War, but more than a few eighteenth-century readers and imitators saw the poem as a tract for their own unsettling times. Both Loyalist and Patriot poets employed Hudibrastic verse style and themes to comment on the American Revolution; one scholar counted as many as seventy-seven poems, mostly unpublished, in the period from 1765-1783.\(^{35}\) Bailey was not the only poet of Loyalist satire in the British Maritime provinces; Jonathan Odell (1737-1818)—whom one scholar described as “perhaps the best satirist of the American Loyalists and among the best poets of the American Revolution”—took refuge in New Brunswick.\(^{36}\) Unlike Bailey, however, Odell’s satire


\(^{36}\) Gould, *Writing the Rebellion*, 3.
largely ceased after leaving New York; by contrast, exile seemed to be the
environment that incubated Bailey’s barbed verse.\textsuperscript{37}

Bailey was introduced to \textit{Hudibras} in 1779 by fellow Loyalist, Jeremiah Dummer Rogers.\textsuperscript{38} Bailey wrote to Rogers, “I have been reading Hudibrass with a profusion of pleasure and perceive that it perfectly agrees with Lord Clarendon’s account of the grand rebellion in England.”\textsuperscript{39} In the months after his introduction to \textit{Hudibras}, Bailey continued to look for parallels between the two revolutions, ordering an unabridged copy of Lord Clarendon’s \textit{The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England} (1702-1704).\textsuperscript{40} Like so many other readers, Bailey saw the similarities between the English Civil War and the American War of Independence: “I perceive a striking resemblance between the characters and proceedings in that time of confusion and those of the present day.” If the seventeenth-century revolution’s anthem was “The world turned upside down,” Bailey experienced the eighteenth-century revolution as similarly disorienting; in one of his Hudibrastic poems, he declared, “the world is overthrown / And all its structure tumbl’d


\textsuperscript{39} Bailey to Mr. Rogers, 1779 (no specified date) (letterbook copy), Bailey Papers, 91-23.

\textsuperscript{40} Bailey to Mr. Clerk, Nov. 28, 1780 (letterbook copy), Bailey Papers, 91-27.
Bailey asserted that both revolutions were characterized by “hypocrisy, lying, imposition, and disregard for oaths and the most sacred engagements, and the same contempt for authority and all established principles, and lastly the disposition for violence, rapine, plunder, and cruelty.”

Hudibrastic poetry allowed Bailey to depict revolutionary leaders or New Light preachers as mock heroes, exaggerating their language to “expos[e] the vulgar, self-interested motives lying behind [their] grand pretensions.” To one correspondent, he explained why he portrayed “the insurrections and Heroes of the present day” with such an impolite, impassioned form of poetry:

If it should be deficient in point of elegance and politeness, you must remember that it aims at the manner of Hudibrass, and that licentiousness and rebellion supported by a solemn pretense to religion, are not very delicate subjects, and besides, it may be proper to expose hypocrisy and lewdness when united in the most odious colours.

In other words, the Revolution’s violence had already shattered the possibility that elegant rhetoric could sustain civil society, or that polite discourse could harmonize differences of opinion in the Anglo-American body politic. Passion had already overwhelmed reason. All that remained was to expose the rhetoric of “liberty” for what Bailey thought it really was. Though Bailey freely admitted there was an

---


42 Gould, Writing the Rebellion, 84. Joseph Addison argued, “Where the low Character is to be raised the Heroic is the proper Measure, but when an Hero is to be pulled down and degraded, it is done best in Doggerel;” Spectator 249, 15 December 1711, in The Spectator, ed. D. F. Bond, 3 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965), 2:468; as quoted in Richard, Mock-Heroic, 8.

43 Bailey to Mrs. Domet, Nov. 8, 1780 (letterbook copy), Bailey Papers, 91-27. Elsewhere he wrote that with such poetry, “my design is to expose republican and leveling principles;” Bailey to Mr. Rogers, Nov. 4, 1780 (letterbook copy), Bailey Papers, 91-27.
element of private revenge in the acerbic humour of his satire, he believed it could still be “attended with public utility.” Yet its utility was to expose brokenness, rather than to mend.

Bailey employed his satirical poetry to expose what he perceived as the volatile mix of republican sympathy and religious hypocrisy in Nova Scotia’s Planter townships. While he had hoped to find relief in the province from his revolutionary ordeal, the hostile reception he received among former New Englanders in Cornwallis Township only extended it. As he told fellow Loyalist Samuel Peters, “I was quickly after my arrival surprized to find myself surrounded with Whigs, Independents, Anabaptists, newlights, and rebels.” In strident language, Bailey described the Nova Scotian sympathizers of the American rebellion with shades of the regicide of the English Civil War: “I am perswaded that the number of King Killers are in proportion ten times greater here than in the dominions of Congress.” And just as Butler in *Hudibras* warned that religious dissenters undermined the liberties of England’s monarchical constitution, Bailey asserted that the Congregationalism of the former New Englanders was subversive to British loyalty. He claimed that it was only the presence in nearby Halifax of the British Navy that restrained the “saints of the high and mighty congress” from more

---

44 Bailey to Samuel Peters, Nov. 26, 1780 (letterbook copy), Bailey Papers, 91-27. Davies suggests, “For Bailey, writing poetry and prose was a form of consolation, a way of re-articulating his moral vision in the face of folly and insanity;” *Studies in Maritime Literary History*, 31.

45 Bailey to Samuel Peters, May 4, 1780, Peters Papers, Hawks Collection, Archives of the Episcopal Church, Austin, TX, Vol. 1, no. 44. I am grateful to Katherine Carté Engel, Southern Methodist University, for sharing her research related to Jacob Bailey from this collection. The letterbook copy of this letter (without the enclosed poem) is found at May 2, 1780, Bailey Papers, 94-5.

publicly enacting their “rebellion and treason.” As it is, he said, “they are unhappily constrained to fast, pray, mutter, growl, murmur, plot, conspire, and execute in secret chambers and cabals against the tyrannical dominion of Britain.”

Along with these reflections, Bailey sent Peters a Hudibrastic paraphrase of “that whiggish maxim, ‘the voice of the people is the voice of God’”—a motto that, to Bailey’s view, was a rhetorical dressing gown over uglier truths. He worried that popular sovereignty, whether political or religious, very often slid into enthusiasm and social violence, and that “the people” were susceptible to the designs of self-interested populist leaders.

As for Religion, he could mix
And blend it well with politicks,
For ’twas his favorite opinion
In Mobs were seated all dominion.
All power and might he understood,
rose from the Sovran [sovereign] multitude,
that right and wrong, that good and will
were nothing but the rabble’s will.
Tho’ they renounce the truth for fiction
In nonsense, trust, and contradiction.
And tho’ they change ten times a day
As fear or interest leads the way
And what the next revolt and treason
Yet we such doctrine must receive
And with a pious grin believe.

In ev’ry thing the people’s choice
Is truly God Almighty’s voice,
’Tis all divine which they’ve aver’d
How ever foolish or absurd.
If in a tumult they decree
That men from all restraints are free,
At Liberty to cut our throats
’Tis sanctified by major votes.
To bathe the sword in kindred blood,
When it promotes the public good.
That is, when men of factious nature
Aim with Ambition to greater
Should they in mighty congress plod
To set up H—ck [Hancock] for a god.
A god in earnest he must be,
With all the forms of deity.

The high, the low, the rich, and poor
Must quake and tremble at his power,
And who denies him adoration
is Sentenced straightway to damnation
Yea they have power to godify
an onion, turnip or a fly
And some have even understood
To consecrate a pole of wood.
Then force their neighbours great and small
Before it on their knees to fall
Since from the people only springs
the right of making gods and kings
Whoe’re derives authority
From any sovran [sovereign] powers on high
Is at the best a wicked dreamer
A stupid Tory and blasphemer.

From this we see ’tis demonstration
There’s no supreme in the creation
Except that mighty pow’r the People,
That weathercock, which rides the Steeple,
that noisy and licentious rabble
Which storms ev’n heaven itself with gabble,
Should these give sanction to a Lie
’Tis plain that heav’n must Satisfy.

In this poem and elsewhere, Bailey rejected the notion that the War of
Independence was motivated by religion. Comparing it to the Puritan roots of the
English Civil War, Bailey claimed that American revolutionary leaders in New
England did not even bother with a “pretense of religion,” discerning that “the
predominant passion of the age and country was not for religion.”47 With a degree of
cynicism, however, Bailey claimed that the revolutionary “hero” of his poem could
use religion: “he could mix /and blend it well with politicks,” to provide a holy

47 Bailey to Mr. Rogers, 1779 (no specific date; letterbook copy), Bailey Papers, 91-23.
veneer over mob violence. For Bailey, when the people were “sovran” there could be no religious or political truth, for the passion of the mob always overwhelmed its reason, and enthusiasm always trumped loyalty. “The People,” he poignantly wrote, were “that weathercock which rides the Steeple.”

In another Hudibrastic poem, Bailey contended that the Puritan leaders of the English Civil War used religion to stir up the passions of the population:

Our fathers by this instrument
Caus’d all the nation to ferment.
...
On words alone they lay the stress
Religion, Liberty, we find
Will work like magic on the mind,
And when their sounds are oft repeated
The multitudes are warm’d and heated.
...
For passion reason will deceive
And make us things absurd believe.

Enthusiasm in religion, Bailey believed, slipped easily into enthusiasm in politics.

In Nova Scotia, then, Bailey embraced a poetics of disaffection. In Hudibrastic verse Bailey discovered the English Civil War as an interpretive framework for understanding the enthusiasms of the American Revolution. With the form’s exaggerated language he sought to expose and provoke with passion, rather than to convince with wit and reason. Only occasionally publishing his satirical poems in newspapers, Bailey primarily circulated them in manuscript among a circle of fellow Loyalist refugees—expressing and shaping a circumscribed emotional community, rather than a larger public. As Philip Gould observes, “one of the great ironies of

---

48 For the ambiguity in many Loyalists’ perceptions of the people—sometimes rational, sometimes inflamed with passion (and therefore easily manipulated)—see Potter, Liberty We Seek, 45-6.
49 Bailey to Samuel Peters, Nov. 26, 1780 (letterbook copy), Bailey Papers, 91-27.
Loyalist writing is that it often exacerbates the very sense of isolation it is trying to overcome." Nevertheless, he envisioned other pieces of writing as passionate interventions in Nova Scotia’s print culture.

“If zeal is a virtue, this is a proper time to exert it”

Bailey may have become increasingly disaffected with Britain, but as the Revolutionary War continued to rage, he began to insist that loyalty demanded passion. Nova Scotians, he asserted, were entirely too sympathetic to the republican rebels, and sadly not compassionate enough toward the Loyalist refugees in their midst. Changing hearts would require passionate writing—not merely polite reason. When Bailey discovered that not all Loyalists felt the same emotional urgency, his loyalmism was further disaffected. Bailey’s reflections on the necessity of a mode of writing that appealed to political passions were occasioned by his interactions with John Howe (1754-1835), a fellow Loyalist refugee and printer resettled in Halifax.

Bailey initiated a correspondence with Howe in December 1780, saying that he understood from mutual acquaintances that Howe was a printer, “expelled from the metropolis of sedition, on account of your integrity,” and wrote to him as a “brother exile.” Knowing that Howe would be seeking a means to support himself,

---

50 Gould, Writing the Rebellion, 170.
52 Bailey to John How[e], Dec. 31, 1780 (letterbook copy), Bailey Papers, 94-6.
Bailey wanted to suggest a “scheme” for Howe’s “honour and emolument.” He said that the province needed a skilled printer, and complained of the “deficiencies and blunders” in the work produced by Anthony Henry—“ignorance and errors ... so numerous as to discourage any persons of leisure and genius from contributing to the information [and] entertainment of the public.” The arrival of Loyalists in the province marked an expanding and more discerning readership, and the time was ripe for a printer of quality to produce a new periodical paper.

But it was not only the quality of typesetting and style that motivated Bailey’s proposal. He felt that the province needed a loyal counterpart to Henry’s *Halifax Gazette*, one that was less sympathetic to the American cause. As a Loyalist refugee, Howe could surely be expected to provide a voice for the “friends of government.” Bailey outlined the editorial stance that he had in mind:

I should always be open to the distresses and complaints of the refugee. I have no design of dictating either to you or the public, yet from an honest attachment to the fortunes of my loyal brethren, I am induced to suggest the propriety of beginning every number, either with an essay relative to the times or some historical anecdote which may tend to display the malignity of rebellion.

Bailey offered that he would be willing to furnish Howe with pieces from his “considerable collection of materials” on the revolution, as long as he could do so

---

“upon condition of inviolable secrecy with pieces of this nature.” He concluded the letter by expressing his willingness to help procure subscribers for such a periodical, and observed, “should it be printed in quarto it would make a decent volume at the close of the year.” Having appealed to their common experience of suffering as Loyalist refugees, Bailey hoped that Howe would inject a passionately loyal voice into the print culture of a province that harboured too much republican sympathy.

Whether or not Bailey’s proposal had any influence, Howe did indeed begin publishing The Halifax Journal in December 1780. Two months later, Bailey wrote to frequent Halifax correspondent Thomas Brown (who also knew Howe) about the tone that the publisher was setting for the Journal, and his reaction to pieces Bailey had submitted. He observed that Howe was “a sagacious, prudent, and cautious man.”54 Perhaps too cautious. Bailey was willing to concede that at least one of his pieces was too aggressive, at least at the outset, and that he “too abruptly discovered [i.e. expressed] a design of attacking the impregnable fortress of rebellion.” But attack he must, if Nova Scotians were to be convinced of the terrors of a revolution with which too many of them sympathized.

While Howe was attempting to “avoid political disputes” and take a non-partisan approach in contentious times, Bailey felt the stakes were too high. “That the horrid cause of rebellion should not be exposed because it has some advocates in Accadia ... is a doctrine to which I can by no means subscribe.” Bailey admitted that he was disappointed by Howe’s response. He had hoped that since Howe was,

---

54 Bailey to Thomas Brown, March 7, 1781 (letterbook copy), Bailey Papers, 94-8.
like him, a Loyalist refugee, he “would have opened his press to the distresses of his brethren,” given voice to “the children of expulsion and contempt.” But Howe and Bailey disagreed about how to change hearts and minds.

Howe remarked to Bailey that, “the way to a man’s conscience is not by irritating his passions.” Like many other Anglo-American readers of the polite publications inspired by The Spectator, Howe thought that “wit and humour” could be skillfully deployed to prick the conscience without recourse to less rational passions. Bailey, on the other hand, asserted that persons whose emotions were inured by the violence of the revolution demanded something stronger than such a “casual” attack:

Those miserable vices which have strongly fortified the heart against gentler impressions and hardened the soul with the deepest malignity must be stormed with thunder bolts and when the passions of the guilty are aroused into a tempest without an opportunity of revenge, when the tumult begins a little to subside, he is open to conviction, reflection rushes in, conscience is alarmed, and shame and remorse unite to produce a reformation.

One could be forgiven for thinking Bailey sounded something like the New Light preachers he frequently disparaged: storming the heart with thunder to arouse a sense of guilt, awaiting the moment of conviction, alarming the conscience, with repentance leading to reformation. Evangelicals and moral philosophers alike shared the belief that the passions could be deployed for moral ends.

Bailey contended that there were times—such as his own—when loyalty demanded zeal. Writing to Thomas Brown about Howe and the directors of his press, he claimed, “Their moderation in the affairs of government, at such a season as the present, is as inconsistent with true loyalty as indifference in matters of
religion is with real piety.” While moderate emotions may be preferable during seasons of peace and when reasoned debate is possible, such a stance is unsuitable for the violence and polarization of rebellion. Moderation, in such circumstances, could even be considered a vice. On the other hand, Bailey wrote, “If zeal is a virtue, this is a proper time to exert it.” Silence, moderation, and calm suggest that one cannot truly apprehend the horror of rebellion nor have sufficient sympathy for suffering. To his brother-in-law, also a Loyalist refugee, Bailey wrote, “We imagined that [Howe] would have attacked rebellion with that honest zeal which ought to distinguish a person in his situation.”

The rage of revolution removed the possibility of moderation. Bailey argued, “In such seasons, no medium will be allowed by either party between loyalty and rebellion.” Revolution polarized what had been a more complex spectrum of allegiances and affections; there remained only the stark binary of loyalty or rebellion. Figures such as Howe, though, were “trimmers,” attempting to plot a course between the two choices—trying for personal or commercial reasons to avoid affronting either party. Bailey skewered this position in a satirical poem sent to Dummer Rogers, inspired by “the extreme caution of our printers, who it seems refuse to insert anything which tends to expose the guilt and madness of rebellion.” The poem begins:

Men often play in politicks

---

55 Bailey to Thomas Brown, April 1, 1781 (letterbook copy), Bailey Papers, 94-9.
56 Bailey to Mr. Weeks, April 2, 1781 (letterbook copy), Bailey Papers, 94-9.
57 Bailey to Mr. Weeks, April 2, 1781 (letterbook copy), Bailey Papers, 94-9.
Like subtle Fox, their cunning tricks
And when they see all in commotion,
Like noisy waves in stormy ocean,
They wisely aim in soft repose
To keep Dear Self secure from blows.
Careless of Prince or country's glory,
They nicely trim twixt whig and tory,
And gravely think that honesty
Is out of date in policy.

He continues the tale of a “new fangled nation,” in which a “man of wondrous moderation” was compared with those who suffered on behalf of their nation’s “law’s” and “freedom’s cause.” While they endured “madness, rage, and foam,” the moderate man was at home in “indolence and ease / like mouse in belly of cheese.”

Indeed, this contrast between the suffering Loyalist and the self-interested moderate was at the heart of Bailey's quarrel with Howe and other so-called Loyalists:

Nor love nor homage did express
In word or deed towards King or Congress
Resolved to sleep in a whole skin,
Whilst others trug’d thro’ thick and thin.

Despite his intention to remain aloof from the conflict, the subject of the poem was molested by the Committee of Correspondence as disaffected because of his evasions, and was likewise mistrusted by the British. His “trimming” came at the cost of his integrity, and for all that turned out not to be a safe strategy during the conflict.

As Thomas Vincent observes, Bailey's perspective is somewhat problematic. The poem plainly criticizes the “trimmer” for attempting to appease both parties, suggesting that such a balancing act would eventually be revealed as

dangerous and untenable. Yet the poem also attacks the unfeeling committee for forcing such a choice upon an innocent citizen. The two-pronged attacks of the poem’s satire creates an ambiguous moral message: it is not possible to remain neutral during times of rebellion, but this is itself a form of violence, rather than a basic political good. Or to pose the problem a different way: in the poem, Bailey ends up insisting on the same political polarization as the rebel Committee, when he in fact experienced this forced choice as coercive.

As they continued their correspondence, Bailey continued to press Howe on the question of appropriate emotions in the face of the rebellion and the condition of the refugees. In a letter of September 1781, Bailey dwelt on the theme of honesty in emotional expression. He did not mean, as in modern usage, that one should be transparent about one’s feelings. Instead, Bailey argued that emotions should function like a moral compass, giving an accurate reading of the morality of civil society. Describing what he perceived as the injustices and cruelties of the American rebellion, he wrote, “Such scenes of wickedness and impiety cannot be regarded with *indifference* by an honest man, nor be properly described without some degree of *spirit* and *indignation*.”

To respond unfeelingly—with anything less than “spirit and indignation”—would demonstrate a lack of moral understanding.

To be sure, admitted Bailey, “candor and moderation is required towards all who differ from us in mere opinion.” But the actions of revolution went beyond intellectual debate: “when actions are openly avowed, defended, and perpetrated
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60 Bailey to John How[e], Sept. 1, 1781 (letterbook copy), Bailey Papers, 94-12; emphasis added.
which disgrace humanity, every honest man should be alarmed and be at liberty to
express his resentment, under the control, however, of decency and prudence.”

Passion should be used in public writing, argued Bailey, to evoke the right
public sentiments, whether outrage or sympathy. Certain genres or styles of writing
conveyed such emotions more effectively. The pieces that Bailey submitted to
Howe’s *Halifax Journal* were short historical anecdotes, personal narratives, and
satirical poetry. Of the latter, Bailey noted, “it may be proper to employ the force of
ridicule and the most animated description in order to expose their vices to publick
abhorrence.”

Although Bailey lamented what he perceived as the irrationality of the
American rebellion, he believed that the intentional use of passion was necessary in
public writing to overcome the strong prejudices or complaisant indifference of too
many Nova Scotia readers. His goal in such feeling prose and poetry, he wrote to
Howe, was “to elucidate the folly, the madness, the iniquity and impiety of this
rebellion,” and to “excite the compassion of conscientious loyalists towards to the
unhappy victims of political rage.” Though his intent was not to “kindle the
resentment of the disaffected by any unseasonable severity,” he would rather err on
the side of loyal zeal than over-cautious moderation.

Howe remained skeptical about Bailey’s case for the effectiveness of
passionate writing in winning over those “disaffected with government.” It appears
(from Bailey’s side of the correspondence) that Howe replied with counter examples
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61 Bailey to John How[e], Sept. 1, 1781 (letterbook copy), Bailey Papers, 94-12
62 Bailey to John How[e], Sept. 1, 1781 (letterbook copy), Bailey Papers, 94-12
63 Perhaps, Bailey concluded the letter to Howe by requesting him to send a copy of a book
from Loyalist newspapers in New York and Newport. Despite Bailey’s argument that “nothing but the rod of severity can correct [the American rebels’] native stubbornness or work any conviction on their minds,” even the strongest writing did not appear to have convinced them to return to loyalty.64

Bailey insisted, however, that bold, zealous political writing did have an effect on other groups. “Tho’ they had no proper effect upon the determined rebels, yet they gave amazing spirit and courage to the loyal party, confirmed the wavering, and ... greatly revived our desponding hearts, and abundantly fortified us against the attacks of persecution.” Bailey was convinced that Loyalists still in the American colonies, as well as those refugees in Nova Scotia, would be heartened by writing that confirmed their costly loyalty and expressed solidarity with them. He reckoned that the “timidity” of the British government and recent successes by the rebels rendered such passionate loyal print even more necessary.

In his exchange with Howe, Bailey outlined his justification for adopting the style of writing—more passionate and immoderate than polite—that the revolution demanded of Loyalists. He hoped that emotional depictions of the violence of revolutionaries or heart-rending tales of refugees’ losses would evoke a response from unfeeling hearts: to stir the indifferent, to shame the rebels, to induce sympathy for the refugees. His own ordeal appears to have shaken his confidence that reasoned, polite discourse could overcome disagreement and address a single public. In revolutionary times, it appears that only passion could have an effect.

64 Bailey to John Howe, Dec. 17, 1781 (letterbook copy), Bailey Papers, 94-13.
Howe’s reticence to forsake moderation, even though a Loyalist refugee himself, contributed to Bailey’s Loyalist disaffection.

“It is difficult to love and esteem those who have no regard for ... the situation of their steadfast adherents”

The Treaty of Paris of 1783 stripped Bailey’s loyalism of any remaining affection. The terms of peace recognized the independence of the United States, but only managed to “recommend” the restitution and mild treatment of loyal British subjects.65 To one correspondent, Bailey gave full vent to his anger and disappointment:

It is impossible to form expressions strong enough in condemning the peace. Neither can a parallel be found to the folly, meanness, injustice, and inhumanity of the British court in deserting her best friends, and delivering her warmest friends to destruct[ion] and ruin. We may still be loyal from principles or conscience, but it is difficult to love and esteem those who have no regard for their own honor nor the situation of their steadfast adherents.66

Even as he voiced these bitter reflections on the former object of his affections, Bailey reaffirmed that he intended to persevere in his loyalty. Having been bled of love, however, Bailey’s loyalty would be “from principles or conscience.”

Bailey remained committed to royal authority and to Britain’s constitutional liberties, even if he regarded recent actions as a betrayal of those ideals. In addition to his ideological commitments, Bailey was able to maintain this dichotomy because he ascribed the British betrayal to specific individuals. He believed the American conflict was driven by corrupt officials in the British ministry (and their American

66 Bailey to I. Jones, July 2, 1783 (letterbook copy), Bailey Papers, 94-20.
co-conspirators). He wrote, “It is not my intention to reproach the nation, since I am convinced that a most wicked and daring faction have directed our public affairs.”

As he did from the earliest overtures of reconciliation, Bailey laid much of the blame at the feet of George III. In a poem sent to Charles Inglis, then at London, Bailey poured out frustration that bordered on treason, impugning the Crown with vacillation, oppression of its subjects, and passivity unbefitting a monarch:

When I survey the refugees,
Camped under tents and spreading trees;
Along the fields and pastures spread
Without a house to screen their head
From the dire peltings and alarms
Of northeast winds and thunder storms;
From clime to clime obliged to stray
As freakish Britain leads the way;
Sometimes as friends and sons caressed
And them with every ill opprest;
The butt, the scorn, the insult made
Of those to whom they lent their aid;

When I those wretched wights behold
It brings to mind the Saints of old:
Forced o’er hills and dales to [trudge]
And forced in caves and dens to lodge.

But this difference we may see
Between a Saint and a refugee:
The first acknowledges the Lord,
The other bows to George the Third;
The former is Heaven’s immortal king,
The last, a supple passive thing.

While in principle, Britain’s constitutional monarchy should have offered stability and refuge for its subjects, Loyalist refugees were in the most unstable, insecure of
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67 Bailey to Mr. Rogers, July 1, 1783 (letterbook copy), Bailey Papers, 94-20.
circumstances—exposed to the elements in refugee camps. And while they had escaped the “freakish resolutions” of revolutionary mobs, they were hardly better off being led by “freakish Britain.” Most damningly, Bailey charged the King with passively bending before the Americans, rather than exercising the kind of strength and resolution becoming a ruler. Little remained of the warm affection Bailey once had for the King, the admiration with which he regarded the metropolis, or the pride he felt from his connection to the benevolent Empire.

Britain’s wartime mismanagements and Loyalist betrayals, as he saw them, corroded Bailey’s political affections. Instead of turning to republicanism, however, Bailey reconfigured his loyalty on the basis of political ideology and personal integrity—royal authority and fidelity to oaths still mattered to social cohesion, even if British leaders had failed to live up to the promise of the British constitution. Robert Calhoon has perceptively observed that some Loyalists were able to channel their disillusionment and their self-understanding as “victims of both American aggression and British incompetence” into something constructive—“a tough, realistic, and implacable determination to surmount the difficulties of rebuilding their lives and constructing a new political social order in British North America.”

---

“The enjoyment of legal happiness”

Bailey’s personal feelings about loyalism and enthusiasm were intimately connected to institutional structures. His ordeal in Maine was largely due to the local revolutionary Committee of Correspondence, which Bailey described as an “unfeeling committee.” Despite Bailey’s disaffection with Britain, he remained committed to the British Constitution as the most likely support for “the enjoyment of legal happiness.” Perhaps not every political institution was so “unfeeling.” This lingering political belief was demonstrated in Bailey’s written representation to the Nova Scotia House of Assembly about the controversial outcome of the 1785 provincial election.70

In communities like Bailey’s Annapolis Royal, the election of 1785 laid bare the fault lines between Loyalists and previous settlers.71 The factions in the county were represented in the election by pre-Loyalist Alexander Howe and Loyalist David Seabury (and running mate Thomas Barclay).72 The residents of the county—“with

70 Bailey, Representation to the Nova Scotia Assembly about the 1785 election, 1786, Bailey Papers, 98-7. On the controversial election, see Barry M. Moody, A History of Annapolis Royal, vol. 2 (Halifax, NS: Nimbus, 2014), 94-6. This was not the only contested election in British North America in which Loyalists featured prominently; see Bell, Loyalist Rebellion in New Brunswick; and Condon, Loyalist Dream for New Brunswick, 152-72. For comparisons with Upper Canada, see Errington, The Lion, the Eagle, and Upper Canada, especially her comments on the challenges of translating British constitutional principles into a North American setting (esp. 191); and Jeffrey L. McNairn, The Capacity to Judge: Public Opinion and Deliberative Democracy in Upper Canada, 1791-1854 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000).


prudence, coolness, and impartiality,” in Bailey’s words—elected Seabury by a significant majority. Howe contested the election, alleging the partiality and undue influence of the Sheriff, a Loyalist. The legislative committee annulled the election result on the basis of only Howe’s depositions. Bailey considered the new election not only an egregious breach of custom and rights, but also a “cruel imposition by reason of the severe weather at this season of the year.” Despite the difficulties to travel caused by the “deepness of the snow and the vast collections of ice in our rivers,” the residents returned another majority for Seabury. Bailey’s written representation to the Assembly may have been occasioned by a further appeal by Howe.73

What most incensed Bailey about the contest over the results of the elections was that the Loyalist supporters of Seabury were denied their opportunity to be heard by the Provincial Assembly. The basis for his representation was not the relative merits of Seabury or Howe, or even the minutiae of the election process. Instead, Bailey made his case on the basis of “the constitution of the British Empire,” and “our established rights.” By refusing to grant Seabury and the electors of the county the opportunity to submit their petitions, they were being denied a fundamental constitutional privilege. “Is it not,” Bailey asked, “the custom of all polished nations, and the boasted privilege, the glory of Britons, not to be condemned till after a candid and impartial hearing before their judges and accusers, and is not this custom founded in reason, nature, and religion”? However

73 Though he does not mention it in the document, Bailey and Annapolis County Loyalists would have a further disappointment in the matter, when the Assembly also overturned the results and declared Howe duly elected.
disaffected with Britain he may have been, Bailey did not hesitate to charge the Assembly, “You have ... deprived us of our right as British freeholders.” However bruised his faith in British polity, it remained central to his political convictions, and the basis on which he and other Loyalists would attempt to build their future.

Loyalists, claimed Bailey, had a particular stake in whether the Assembly safeguarded British liberties or if it exhibited the kind of arbitrary government they had just escaped. Would the provincial government maintain the constitutional structures that made it possible to enjoy “legal happiness, freedom, and tranquility”? He asked:

If our lawful protectors and guardians neglect to hear our just complaints, if those whom the constitution has appointed to be the supporters of freedom commence Tyrants and have recourse to partial and arbitrary measures, and treat their constituents as the worst of criminals, to whom shall we apply for redress. Where shall we, who have already fled from the horrors of democratic oppression and tyranny to the dominions of Britain for the enjoyment of legal happiness, freedom, and tranquility—where shall we, disappointed, chagrined, insulted and abused, find another retreat, in which we can enjoy the benign influence of royal authority under the best of sovereigns without feeling the malignant strokes of popular decision, or rather, Aristocratic Despotism?

Bailey equated the “enjoyment of legal happiness” with enjoyment of “the benign influence of royal authority.” But is it not remarkable that only two years after calling the King a “supple passive thing,” Bailey here described him as “the best of sovereigns”? Perhaps the political emotions are not so contradictory as first appears. As this quotation suggests, Bailey had not lost the vivid sense of the refugee experience. His rights as a British subject, he had learned, must be asserted, rather than assumed. At the same time, however, Bailey maintained that this Sovereign was infinitely safer than “popular decision” or “Aristocratic Despotism.” Bailey
maintained his loyalty to “royal authority” in the face of the conspiracies of “the mighty” and the enthusiastic “madness of the people.”

Conclusion

Historian Dror Wahrman has contended that the American Revolution unsettled the political identities of many Americans and Britons. However, Keith Mason adds that Loyalists complicate that thesis. “In the case of the Loyalists,” Mason suggests, “the conflict itself actually hardened their sense of identity. It was the subsequent experience of exile that destabilized it.”

Attending to Bailey’s political emotions during his revolutionary ordeal and exile illustrates just this process of hardening and then destabilization, followed in his case by the reconstitution of his loyalism on different emotional footing. Bailey was harried and beleaguered by the efforts of the Pownalborough committee to police his political affections, but throughout that experience he remained remarkably committed to his loyalty and his oaths. It was actually the British response to the revolution and to its loyal refugees, as he saw things, which destabilized Bailey’s sense of political identity, and which provoked his disaffection. He expressed that disaffection and uncertain identity through the barbed verses of Hudibrastic poetry, written more to commiserate with other disillusioned refugees than it was to address the kind of diverse, sympathetic British American public he had once envisioned. Bailey’s correspondence with printer John Howe reveals that he was less optimistic than

---

before about the power of reason to persuade, and was more willing to employ passion and zeal in his writing, to awaken those who had become insensible to the injustices of British policy.

And yet Bailey did maintain his loyalism despite this disaffection; by reflecting on just this agonizing experience, he clarified what perhaps should have been evident all along: that loyalism, at least for Bailey and others like him, was always about more than an anglophile’s fondness for Britain’s culture or King, and about more than reactionary conservatism. As he demonstrated in his representation to the Nova Scotia legislature about the disputed provincial election of 1785, Bailey’s loyalism had intellectual content: a firm commitment to British constitutionalism and its moderation of the political passions of the moment.
“A good Degree of Affection in Things of Religion becomes us”: Henry Alline, Jonathan Scott, and the Long Argument

Consider these statements about the place of emotions in religion, both of them made by evangelical preachers in Nova Scotia in 1783-84:

“I would be very far from speaking against the Exercise of natural Affection and Passions in Things of Religion. ... I think that a good Degree of Affection in Things of Religion becomes us; seeing the Things of Religion are of the greatest Importance.”

“But O how apt are young Christians to be led stray, being so fond of everything that has a zeal... I heard men exhort that had nothing of the Spirit of Christ, but many of the Christians thought them certainly right, because they seemed to have a great zeal. ... I believe if they have the spirit of God, [it] brings meekness, love and humility with the zeal.”

One of these was written by Henry Alline (1748-1784), a tanner and farmer turned charismatic New Light itinerant who, from his base in Cornwallis Township, sparked a populist religious movement throughout the settlements clustered around the Bay of Fundy and along the St. John River. Alline was charged by contemporary critics with fomenting enthusiasm, and for spreading a heterodox message confused by “reveries of mysticism.”¹ The other was penned by Jonathan Scott (1744-1819), a

fisherman turned Congregational minister who became Alline’s leading critic, and who was sought as a moderating influence by Nova Scotia churches riven by the emotions stirred by the evangelist’s ministry. Scott published a point-by-point rebuttal of Alline’s theology, a message he claimed was “in direct Opposition to Reason, and the Sentiments of sober and considerate People.”

With those general positions sketched, it may be surprising to discover that the first statement, urging “the Exercise of natural Affection and Passions in Things of Religion,” was made by Scott, while the judicious remark that true zeal must be accompanied by “meekness, love, and humility,” was offered by Alline. Scott’s religion, that is, was not so “rational” as to be unfeeling, and Alline’s ministry encompassed emotional moderation, as well as rapture. This chapter provides the context for those isolated remarks, arguing that the debate between Alline and Scott cannot be reduced to the “religion of the heart” versus “rational Christianity.”

---


3 Scott, Brief View, 262; and James Beverley and Barry Moody, eds., The Journal of Henry Alline (Hantsport, NS: Lancelot Press, 1982), 216.
To be sure, the differences between the two Nova Scotia authors on the role of emotions were substantial. Scott charged Henry Alline with “imprudent Zeal and wild Enthusiasm.”\(^4\) Having spent time in Cornwallis Township near the beginning of Alline’s preaching ministry, and later witnessing the effects of Alline’s itinerancy in his own Yarmouth church, Scott complained that Alline’s writing, as well as his preaching, was intended to inflame the natural passions rather than to cultivate godly affections. Of Alline’s treatise Two Mites, Scott exclaimed, “The whole Book is interspersed with Poetry, calculated to excite and raise the Passions of the Reader, especially the young, ignorant, and inconsiderate, who are influenced more by the Sound and Gingle of Words, than by solid Sentences, and rational and scriptural Ideas of divine and eternal Things.”\(^5\) Perhaps most painfully, when Scott was forced to resign as minister of the Yarmouth Congregational church, he blamed Alline and other New Light itinerants for sowing the unsocial passions that led to the “Disaffection and Disunion in Sentiment” within his congregation. Scott and Alline would appear to belong to two very different emotional communities.

And yet Alline and Scott had more in common than this rhetoric might suggest. Theirs was not really a New Light—Old Light debate, or another instance of emotional versus rational religion. The two ministers, for example, shared a commitment to evangelical revivalism. When Scott underwent his own conversion in 1766, he was willing to embrace the label “New-Light” when his acquaintances
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\(^5\) Scott, *Brief View*, 168; see 204, where Scott makes a similar charge about the Anti-Traditionist.
mocked him for his newfound religious seriousness.\(^6\) Despite his opposition to the Allinite revivals, when he removed from Nova Scotia to Maine, Scott himself acquired a reputation as a New Light and a revivalist.\(^7\)

In other words, the disagreement between Alline and Scott can be seen as, among other things, one iteration of a long-running tension within Anglo-American Protestantism—and even within the evangelical movement—between individualistic and communitarian impulses. As Stephen Foster has persuasively argued, what gave Puritanism its vitality was a “long argument” between the laity’s concern for purity and the magistrates’ emphasis on order.\(^8\) While the former tended toward insularity and separation, the latter embraced comprehensiveness and was willing to utilize civil power for religious ends. In language that is manifestly relevant to the debates about the passions of revival in Nova Scotia, Foster contended that, “The Puritans formed a vision of some combination of order imposed from above and enthusiasm elicited from below.”\(^9\) As historians of Puritan New England have demonstrated, the tenuous balance between these concerns was irrevocably unsettled by the breakdown (or in the case of new settlements, like Nova Scotia, the absence) of the traditional town-church synthesis.\(^10\) Scott and

---


\(^9\) Foster, *Long Argument*, 9; emphasis added.

Alline represented the continuation of this tension within evangelicalism in the Age of Revolutions—how to maintain an emphasis on personal religious experience without abandoning a comprehensive social vision. Both writers emphasized conversion-centred piety, but they differed on how to coordinate that personal emphasis with more communal concerns. To maintain the purity of personal experience (if not doctrine), Alline was willing to jettison all “externals,” while Scott considered covenant bonds the very sinews of religion and society.\footnote{University Press, 2014); Jaffee, People of the Wachusett; and Mancke, Fault Lines of Empire. In his influential analysis of nineteenth-century Ontario Protestantism, William Westfall argues that the cultures of “order” and “experience” were messier on the ground than their ideal types might suggest. He highlights the exchanges that took place particularly in frontier settings; Westfall, Two Worlds, 45-9. Nathan Hatch has influentially argued that late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century populist religious movements such as Freewill Baptists, Methodists, and Mormons represented the “democratization of American Christianity.” Hatch cites Henry Alline numerous times as an exemplar of this strain of individualistic religion; Nathan O. Hatch, The Democratization of American Christianity (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989). Patricia Bonomi similarly posits that the Great Awakening birthed a “new spirit of defiant individualism” in American culture; Patricia U. Bonomi, Under the Cope of Heaven: Religion, Society, and Politics in Colonial America (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 158. More recently, Jonathan Den Hartog has proposed that evangelicals, such as John Jay and Elias Boudinot, who had been active in Federalist politics, transferred their hopes for social reform and republican virtue from party politics to centralized voluntary evangelical associations, such as the American Bible Society. For Den Hartog, this represents the “federalization of American Christianity.” Jonathan Den Hartog, Patriotism & Piety: Federalist Politics and Religious Struggle in the New American Nation (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2015). Seeing both of these tendencies in the British North American context, absent the specific party affiliations of the United States, suggests that there were individualistic and communitarian tendencies within the evangelical movement itself as it attempted to adjust to the emergence of voluntarism and democratic impulses, and the weakening of various forms of religious establishment. On how Congregational ministers in New England maintained and adapted a strong social vision in the post-Revolutionary period, despite the cultural shift to liberal individualism, see Grasso, A Speaking Aristocracy; and Jonathan D. Sassi, A Republic of Righteousness: The Public Christianity of the Post-Revolutionary New England Clergy (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001). For a persuasive argument about how the social vision of Puritanism was eroded by the Great Awakening, among other factors, see Mark A. Noll, America’s God: From Jonathan Edwards to Abraham Lincoln (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), esp. 3-30.}
At about the same time that North America’s political elites were attempting to mediate between liberal individualism and republican “common good” in public life, the New Light heirs of the Great Awakening explored various ways of balancing “heart religion” and social order.\textsuperscript{12} As Ruth Bloch has argued, evangelical religion and sentimental culture, spheres less rarified than political or economic discourse, could be mediating spaces between individualistic and communitarian impulses. “The individualism of evangelical religion and sentimental literature,” Bloch writes, “upheld the freedom of individual choice, but the choices described within these religious and sentimental frameworks were not those of individual autonomy but of identification with the communal groups of the church and family.”\textsuperscript{13} Although the emotional preaching of evangelicals was focused on individual conversion, the religious affections they cultivated—from humility to love—were embodied in social settings. And while evangelicals agitated for individual religious choice, they tended to separate into alternative church communities, rather than remain isolated


\textsuperscript{13} Bloch, “Religion, Literary Sentimentalism,” 328.
agents. Emotions were not only the instruments of individual self-assertion or self-expression; individuals cultivated specific feelings in and for communal contexts.

The contrast between Alline’s individualistic piety and, say, Charles Inglis’s established Christianity could not be clearer. But comparing Alline and Scott introduces shades of grey. For despite their real differences, their common convictions about religion and emotion make their disagreement part of an ongoing tension within the larger emotional community formed by the heirs of the Great Awakening. Gordon Stewart and George Rawlyk once described Alline’s theology, in part, as a “tortuous attempt” to reconcile the “communal religious traditions of the New England way with [William] Law’s emphasis on the individuality of the Christian experience.” Alline’s proposed reconciliation may indeed have been idiosyncratic, but the tension itself was apparent in the evangelical tradition writ large. And the attempt to bridge communitarian and individualistic (and liberal and republican) ideas was just as tortuous and fraught throughout the Revolutionary Atlantic. What follows is a discussion of the role of emotion in their theological writings, especially Alline’s Two Mites on Some of the Most Important and Much Disputed Points of Divinity (1781), and Scott’s lengthy published rebuttal, A Brief View of the Religious Tenets and Sentiments Lately Published (1784). Particular
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attention is given to the way that each of them used affections to mediate individual and communal tendencies—how they attempted to avoid the opposite ditches of unsocial enthusiasm and unfeeling formalism.

The print exchange between Alline and Scott was also an instance of how local communities and middling religious leaders negotiated longstanding transatlantic debates about emotions, self-fashioning, and communities. If their literary productions set them apart from most other New Lights in their communities and gave them a measure of regional influence, still their humble origins (a tanner and a fisherman) and lack of formal education locate them at the margins of Anglo-American learned culture. Their close contemporary John Payzant offered a pretty accurate assessment of their formal qualifications, when he observed, “It was evident, that Mr. A[lline] was as well educated as Mr. S[cott], for Mr. S[cott] was but a fisher-man-and had taking up Preaching without acadamical aducation.”16 Both authors wrote with the religious concerns of their own region in mind, but did so by adapting the discourses of, and participating in, transatlantic conversations about religious and political emotions. That two largely self-educated Nova Scotian ministers attempted such ambitious, if not always successful, forays into this transatlantic conversation demonstrates how pressing emotions—and ideas about them—were to communities and ordinary people throughout the Enlightenment Atlantic.

“There is not one Spark of true Religion in all the Externals”: Alline’s individualistic piety

Beyond the observation that his New Light message was crackling with “highly charged emotionalism,” how did emotions actually figure into Alline’s theological framework? It turns out that he addressed a range of issues related to the affections, beyond the intensity of experience. Was human nature endowed with a capacity for certain affections and sensibilities? What were the obstacles to cultivating virtuous emotions, and how could they be overcome? How could enthusiasm be avoided without losing sight of affect in the religious life? And how did (or should) private feelings reverberate through society? With these and other themes, Alline was addressing many of the same questions as philosophers such as Shaftesbury and Hume, or theologians such as Wesley and Edwards. And if some of his proposals were less coherent or more esoteric than theirs, still his work represents a British North American and evangelical intervention into those transatlantic conversations.

Alline asked why it was that even among putatively religious people, the “Externals of Religion and Ceremonies” were regarded as essential to faith while, on the other hand, “the Power of Godliness, and the Internals of his Kingdom are either treated as Enthusiasm, or matters of no Importance”? Such was Alline’s focus on individual conversion and felt religious experience that his writings expressed
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17 Armstrong, *Great Awakening*, 82.
19 Alline, *Two Mites*, 200; emphasis added.
ambivalence—and sometimes outright hostility—toward the communal church practices most associated with public morality and social order. “There is not one Spark of true Religion in all the Externals,” he averred, “since all Religion is a Work of the Holy Spirit on the inner Man.” This interior, affective perspective was woven through his theological writings. Feelings were central to Alline’s anti-Calvinistic account of free will and human agency. He described a more feeling God and asserted that happiness in salvation could only be rooted in felt consent. Alline portrayed human salvation as, in part, an awakening from unfeeling insensitivity. Conversion, in his writings, was narrated as an exchange of one set of feelings and desires for another. This experiential piety became, in Alline’s message, a principle of critique, challenging the authority of unfeeling ministers, and dissolving traditional covenants to form congregations of more personal bonds.

“They could be happy no other way”: Feelings and agency

Alline proposed a more feeling alternative to the Calvinism of his New England background. From the divine side of the equation, Alline’s God was motivated by love rather than (as he characterized Calvinism) by wrath or indifference. Human beings were created to find their true happiness by connection to that God, but such a love was only meaningful if rendered willingly, out of felt consent. Rather than an arbitrary choice of some for salvation, others for damnation, humanity was universally “endowed with such capacity and placed in such a Station,
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20 Alline, Two Mites, 128.
21 See S. D. Clark, Church and Sect in Canada (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1948), which analyzed the Alline revivals in terms of “order” and “separation.”
as to render [them] capable of acting as a free Agent.” Alline’s anti-Calvinism has been cited as an instance of the populist resistance to elite intellectualism and clerical authority, and it was surely that. It is difficult to hear his admonition, “Consent, Consent O Sinner!” and not think of the democratization of public discourse in the Revolutionary Atlantic. Yet Alline’s theology may also be seen as part of a more general tendency to moderate Calvinism and to make greater accommodation for individual human agency, even among those theologians who retained Calvinism. George Whitefield, for example, upheld Calvinism over against John Wesley’s Arminianism, but Whitefield, as much as anyone, emphasized the capacity of his hearers to respond feelingly to the gospel message. For Alline to emphasize happiness, love, and felt experience was a way of indicating that it really was the individual expressing their agency in receiving God’s universal offer of salvation.

Even God, in Alline’s theology, acts out of a depth of feeling. Loving benevolence, rather than reason or justice, is the motivation for God to act in creation or salvation. “For the very Nature of the Divine Being,” wrote Alline, “is to
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22 Alline, Two Mites, 2-3.
24 Alline, Two Mites, 106. On the democratization of public discourse in New England, see Grasso, A Speaking Aristocracy.
25 Kevin Flatt proposes that Alline’s anti-Calvinism had roots in his own conversion and spiritual experience, as much as from other theological influences; “Theological Innovation from Spiritual Experience: Henry Alline’s Anti-Calvinism in Late Eighteenth-Century Nova Scotia and New England,” Journal of Religious History 33, no. 3 (2009): 285-300.
flow in Love and Goodness to all his Creatures.” Alline portrayed a deeply feeling God, contrasting sharply with the cool detachment of the Calvinist deity, who acted by rational necessity from eternal decrees. That is not to say that Alline perceived God to act on impulsive feelings or irrational passions, changeably moved by the actions of his creation; no, God was the ultimate free agent. God, who was “happy in and of himself,” sought to share this happiness with humanity. “The great Design of Heaven,” he declared, “was to make His Creatures happy.” Alline rejected the belief that God’s judgment of sinful humanity was rooted in feelings of anger or wrath, for “such is the nature of the Divine Being, as can never be roiled, incensed, or stirred up to thirst for Revenge.” Penitent sinners, then, did not need to fear the changeable feelings of an arbitrary deity, nor rouse an indifferent God. Rather, Alline’s God was happy by nature, with a steadily loving disposition toward humanity.

Alline asserted that love must arise from consent. Over against the Calvinist emphasis on God’s priority in predestining individuals to salvation or damnation, Alline claimed that love could not be compelled; it must be felt to be authentic. Quoting Edward Young’s “Night Thoughts,” Alline wrote, “Heav’n wills our Happiness, allows our Doom, / Invites us ardently, but not compels.” Portraying humanity’s original innocence as represented by Adam in Eden, Alline asserted that
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27 Alline, Two Mites, 46; see idem, Thanksgiving Sermon, 8.
28 See Alline, Two Mites, 16.
29 Alline, Anti-Traditionist, 15. See idem, Thanksgiving Sermon, 7.
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Adam was "yet a free Agent capable of sinning ... but by no Means compelled ... For if he had been so, he could never have been happy."\textsuperscript{33}

\textit{Restoring sensibility}

For Alline, the common difficulties of arousing the right feelings or regulating unruly passions were indicative of a fundamental problem in fallen human nature, and so he described salvation as an awakening from insensitivity. Though he believed that humans enjoyed free agency in their state of innocence, Alline contended that original sin impaired human moral capabilities. He argued that in their sinful condition, individuals are in a “state of insensitivity,” a kind of spiritual numbness or slumber in which they are unable to enjoy communion with God, their true source of happiness, nor can they feel proper sorrow for their condition.\textsuperscript{34} Humans, that is, are working with a restricted set of moral affections and cannot cultivate the higher emotions unaided. This differed, of course, from more optimistic Enlightenment assumptions about the natural human capacity to cultivate benevolent affections.

The question, then, was how such an impaired faculty would be restored by grace. In one of his more innovative proposals, Alline wrote that the incarnation of Christ—God stooping to become a human being—restored the human capacity to sense one’s condition apart from God and to respond to the gospel message. Humanity is “held up in that Capacity of consenting ... by the Spirit of an Incarnate

\textsuperscript{33} Alline, \textit{Two Mites}, 4.
\textsuperscript{34} Alline, \textit{Two Mites}, 70-4, 81.
The incarnation, that is, gave to all people, on a probationary basis, the power to consent freely to the offer of salvation. Alline did not say that all people have such a moral capacity by nature (what he described as the Arminian position). Nor did he propose (as did Calvinist thinkers such as Jonathan Edwards) that God elected to give some people a spiritual sense of divine things. Rather, Alline proposed a universal but God-given capacity to respond freely and feelingly to God’s overtures of love in salvation:

Thus, my dear Reader, you are to consider yourself ... neither elected nor reprobated, but with electing LOVE all around you, and a reprobating Power within you, and with a Conscience capable not of growing a Christian by Degrees, as some vainly imagine, but of hearing the Voice of Redemption, and consenting to the offer when made you by the great Restorer of Mankind.

Or in phrasing used throughout his writings, he wrote that, “REDEEMING LOVE knocks at the Door of every Individual,” and each person has been given the ability to respond freely to this invitation. Alline, that is, approached the eighteenth-century preoccupation with cultivating virtuous affections and sentiments as a theological problem, and sought to sketch out a solution that mediated between grace and human agency.

Conversion: “The Exchange of an Object of Delight”
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36 Alline, Two Mites, 115-120.
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38 Alline, Two Mites, 89-90.
Alline narrated conversion, in part, as a transformation of the emotions, as “the Exchange of an Object of Delight” for another.³⁹ A convert traded a set of worldly passions and delights for new desires and affections. Alline contrasted this focus on an inward change with the adoption of external religious habits or with intellectual assent to specific doctrines. He said that a person may be “rationally convinced of many important Points ... may join with some Church ... attend the House of Worship once or twice a Week, ... are very liberal to the Poor, spend once or twice a Day some Time in private Devotion, seem to be zealous in Prayer ... may appear great advocates for Morality.” And yet, claimed Alline, “all this may be without a Divine Change in the Heart.”⁴⁰ The central turning of conversion took place in the affective, rather than the intellectual or moral, aspects of life. A focus on conversion was one of the most characteristic emphases of the evangelical movement, given a particularly emotional accent in Alline’s telling.⁴¹ No one can be truly “born again,” he wrote, “if their Hearts and Affections are not redeemed.”⁴²

Feelings also marked the stages of one’s conversion. In the first instance, “the great Work of the Spirit of God is ... to bring the Man to a Sense of his fallen Condition, and the Impossibility of Happiness or Redemption while in Love with the Enjoyments of this fallen World.”⁴³ Once a person has been thus “awakened” from their spiritual indifference, according to Alline, he “not only hears of his being a
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⁴⁰ Alline, *Two Mites*, 109-111.
⁴¹ On the centrality of conversion in evangelicalism, see Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain*, 5-10; and Hindmarsh, *Evangelical Conversion Narrative*.
⁴² Alline, *Two Mites*, 129-130.
⁴³ Alline, *Two Mites*, 121.
Sinner, but *feels it* in his own Soul." However, feelings could be deceptive, so a potential convert must not settle for "agreeable Frames" that too quickly relieved the discomfiting experience of feeling one’s own sin and helplessness. Alline also warned that a person seeking salvation might even experience some "Transports" or feelings of religious ecstasy, but still be misled, for people may have their natural passions or their "animal Spirits" animated in some settings. How, then, is a sincere seeker to know if the feelings they experience are truly indicative of conversion, rather than some facsimile? Rather than any one experience or feeling, Alline counseled his readers that a "divine change of heart" would be accompanied by a more thoroughgoing set of new dispositions and changed emotions:

They will find the Burden of their Sin gone, with their Affections taken off of this World, and set on Things above, with their Hearts oftentimes drawn out after Christ, under a feeling Sense of the Worth of his Redeeming Love; at the same Time, with a Sense of their own Vileness, and the Vanity of all Things here below, together with the Worth and Sweetness of heavenly Things, and the Amiableness of the Divine Being, they find an increasing Thirst after more Liberty from Sin and Darkness, and a continual panting after the Enjoyment of God, and a Likeness to the meek and lowly Saviour; for their Hearts, which before were set on Things below, are now set on Thing[s] above.

Conversion, that is, entailed a renovation of one’s emotional life: new pleasures, new aspirations, and new dispositions.

To help readers assess whether such a conversion of feeling has taken place in their own hearts, he posed the question, “Where do you get your greatest Happiness, and enjoy the sweetest Moments, not only at some particular Time and
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44 Alline, *Two Mites*, 124; emphasis added.
45 Alline, *Two Mites*, 125-6.
Place, but Days and Hours, Weeks and Years...?" Is it, he asked, “the Things of Time and Sense,” or is it “in the Enjoyment of CHRIST, the Vitals of Religion, and a feeling sense of DIVINE THINGS between God and your own Soul?”48 Although Alline often drew attention to the heights of religious experience, he insisted that the evidence of true redemption was not “Fancies, Dreams, or Visions” or the ecstasies of the moment, but rather a change of desires through the course of one’s life. This is worth lingering over a moment, because New Lights were known for the rapturous emotionalism of their meetings, as Methodists were shortly thereafter to be known for the raucous spirituality of camp meetings. Alline, however, assigned great importance to emotional experiences and the cultivation of affections that were more personal and that were evident over time, a theme explored in the next chapter. The evangelical message urged women and men, in the words of Phyllis Mack, to “shape their own subjectivity, not in a single cathartic moment at a revival meeting, but over a lifetime.”49

To focus his message on the conversion of the heart, Alline sought to pare religious practice of what he perceived as distracting encumbrances. Even more than the seductions of the world, Alline preached against the spiritual dangers of “faithless Prayers, Spiritless Duties, and Christless Christianity.”50 Alline recognized how radical his critique was: “You may think perhaps that I am oversetting all Religion by speaking so much against your Prayers: but let me tell you, that you will
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48 Alline, Two Mites, 131-2. See also, Anti-Traditionist, 42-3.
49 Mack, Heart Religion, 7.
50 Alline, A Sermon Preached at Port Medway, 11.
never know or enjoy one Spark of True Religion until all those recommending prayers are overset.”\textsuperscript{51}

\textit{Clerical authority: “A feeling Sense of the Love of God”}

For Alline, as for other early evangelicals, personal conversion became a principle of critique, a means for lay people to evaluate and even resist clerical authority. Traditional clerical qualifications, such as education and ordination, were relativized by the evangelical criterion: did the minister have “a feeling Sense of the Love of God”?\textsuperscript{52} “A Man may get his Head full of the Letter of the Word,” wrote Alline, “and his Heart never touched with the Spirit of the Word.”\textsuperscript{53} As Nancy Christie has observed, religious practice in North America was remade during the long eighteenth century as, among other changes, cultural authority was redefined “in terms of emotional persuasion and dramatic presentation” rather than traditional markers of learning or respectability.\textsuperscript{54} Characteristic of this aspect of the Great Awakening was Gilbert Tennent’s sermon, \textit{The Dangers of an Unconverted Ministry} (1741).\textsuperscript{55} Alline was no less provocative in Nova Scotia, when he asked, “Whether or not it is absolutely necessary for a Man to be a Converted Man to be qualified for the Work of the Ministry;” he forcefully answered in the affirmative.\textsuperscript{56} He challenged the province’s ministers, “whether or not you have been

\textsuperscript{51} Alline, \textit{A Sermon Preached at Port Medway}, 13.
\textsuperscript{52} Alline, \textit{Two Mites}, 182.
\textsuperscript{53} Alline, \textit{Two Mites}, 161.
\textsuperscript{54} Christie, “In These Times of Democratic Rage,” 28; Grasso, \textit{A Speaking Aristocracy}.
\textsuperscript{56} Alline, \textit{Two Mites}, 158.
experimentally acquainted with those Truths in your own Souls." He boldly charged that “the greatest Part” of Christian ministers were unconverted, did not display authentic religious affections, and were unqualified for their position. Alline took his subjective critique of clerical authority to its logical conclusion, urging his hearers to separate from churches and congregations that did not give evidence of experimental piety and felt knowledge of the gospel they preached.

“A cheerful Conformity to the Externals of Religion”

Alline most often portrayed the religion of the heart as inimical to churchly or social “externals”—superficial distractions to the more necessary transformation of the affections. That Alline was self-consciously positioning his individualistic New Light message in opposition to the communitarian structures of New England Puritanism was nowhere more apparent than in his comments about church covenants. In the “New England Way,” local churches were formed as voluntary covenants among individuals who were able to narrate an experience of personal conversion. The ideal proved difficult to sustain after the first generation of idealistic Puritan settlers, as new migrants and young children began to change the
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spiritual complexion of New England communities. While church and town were a seamless unity for full members, it was not immediately clear how those who had not yet experienced (or who were indifferent to) a Puritan conversion related to those linked community institutions. How could the Puritan ideal of a reformed church and society be sought if some residents remained outside the church? A solution adopted by many churches, the so-called Half-Way Covenant, granted some of the privileges of church membership to those who had not (yet) been accepted on the basis of their personal conversion.\(^\text{61}\) The Half-Way Covenant can be seen as a compromise on the side of individual piety in order to secure communal morality and order.

Alline asserted that too often, following this pattern, individuals were admitted to church communion without giving any evidence of a “saving Change” in their hearts, to the detriment of genuine religion. He excoriated the Half-Way Covenant, mockingly asking, “Where, or what Place it is half way to?” He bluntly avowed, “It cannot be half way to Heaven.”\(^\text{62}\) His attack on such churches as being held together by so many “Paper Covenants” is perhaps the clearest indication that Alline had a radically different social vision than the Puritanism out of which he emerged—determinedly individualistic, rather than communitarian.\(^\text{63}\) To focus on
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\(^\text{62}\) Alline, *Two Mites*, 237.

\(^\text{63}\) For “Paper Covenants,” see Alline, *Two Mites*, 233, 237. Jonathan Edwards also rejected the Half-Way Covenant, insisting that true religion must involve the affections, rather than merely outward morality. For a brief discussion, see George M. Marsden, *Jonathan Edwards: A Life* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), 353-6. It could be argued that both Alline
sincere heart-felt piety and the individual's covenant with the local church, Alline was willing to surrender a more comprehensive understanding of the covenant as providing a “canopy” over church and society.64

By focusing on individualistic piety, Alline mainly communicated ambivalence about the communitarian and social dimensions of Christianity. He observed that a basic religious sensibility might motivate some people to avoid egregious social vices and to “practice some external [religious] performances.” He acknowledged that when people change their outward moral behaviour, “it may be better for civil Society.” But, Alline continued, “all that can be said of the Change (respecting their own State) is, that they have exchanged from the open profane to the Moralist, and from one Part of the Devil’s Kingdom to another.”65 “True religion,” for Alline, was defined by a change of the heart, and only incidentally with reference to virtue in civil society.

Yet occasionally Alline articulated an implicit assumption that personal piety would lead to godly sociability, that being heavenly minded, as it were, could produce some earthly good. Alline remarked that, “this internal Work of the Spirit of God will reflect a cheerful Conformity to the Externals of Religion.”66 This was a rare acknowledgement that cultivating the emotions could bridge the inner life and social ethics. Although Alline discouraged reliance on external authorities and boundaries, he was optimistic about the ability of individuals (aided by grace) to
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65 Alline, *Two Mites*, ii-iii.
66 Alline, *Two Mites*, 128; see also, 333.
regulate their social behaviour by “internal constraints on the self.” Regulating emotions was, in fact, a way of regulating society. Later evangelicals, such as Edward Manning, developed this tendency much further than Alline’s implicit assumptions, finding in voluntary associations a way to combine individual piety and social reform.

“Disaffection and disunion in sentiment”: Emotions and social order

Jonathan Scott was Henry Alline’s most vociferous critic. He charged that Alline’s singular accent on individualism in religion had serious disruptive social consequences, and he claimed that the passions of New Light spirituality overwhelmed the cultivation of more orderly affections. As one of the few remaining Congregational ministers in Nova Scotia during the American Revolution, Scott (who was settled in Jebogue, Yarmouth) complied with a request from the Cornwallis Congregational church, then without a minister, to spend three months in the township to quell the clamour caused by Alline’s preaching. Before the Revolution was over, the wildfire of New Light revival was also kindled in Jebogue, and Scott witnessed a series of divisions within his congregation that eventually led to his resignation. In 1784, Scott published A Brief View of the Religious Tenets and
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Sentiments Lately Published and Spread in the Province of Nova-Scotia, a lengthy rebuttal to the theology and methods of Alline and the New Lights. He could hardly have been more censorious of Alline’s treatise, condemning its anti-Calvinism, and disavowing Alline’s esoteric views on the spiritual, rather than corporeal, nature of the original creation. Alline’s thought lacked coherence, he claimed, and threatened to bring that same chaos to the church:

This Book, entitled Two Mites ... abounds greatly with bold, barefaced Assertions, and mysterious, uncouth and unintelligible Sentences, which it is not at all likely that the Author understands himself; and the Sentiments and Sentences are, in a great many instances, inconsistent, and in direct Opposition to each other, so as mutually to overthrow and destroy each other, as also all true Religion and Godliness.

For Scott, the unruly argument was of a piece with the havoc that Alline’s preaching wreaked in church and society, stirring up dangerous passions more than godly affections.

The affections were central to Scott’s long polemic against Alline. His goal, he said, was to help readers “in forming just Ideas concerning the religious Affections and Exercises, and the Appearances of Religion which [Alline] has been instrumental in exciting and promoting among People in this Province.” What did Alline’s publications say about the affections, how did he employ the passions in his poetic style of writing, and what kinds of emotions did his ministry produce in Nova Scotia communities? Such questions, wrote Scott, get to the “Bottom and Foundation of the religion of our Author.” To be sure, Scott’s analysis portrayed significant differences
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in the emotional styles of the two ministers. Yet Scott by no means disavowed the importance of the affections in religious life. Despite their many substantive disagreements and conflicting emphases, Scott and Alline did share important commitments about the affections and often employed similar vocabulary. The point is not that Scott and Alline were made from the same mold, or to suggest that Scott was simply a misunderstood revivalist, but rather that polemical rhetoric obscured their common convictions about the role of affections, and the contested meaning of emotions within evangelicalism. The terms of their internecine debate as conflicted heirs of the Great Awakening were different from the more familiar opposition between evangelicals and upholders of more “rational” or polite forms of Christianity. Although he contended that Alline’s ministry was characterized by a “Spirit of wild Enthusiasm,” Scott also maintained the centrality of emotions to religious life. In fact, he insisted, “I would be very far from speaking against the Exercise of natural Affection and Passions in Things of Religion. ... And I think that a good Degree of Affection in Things of Religion becomes us; seeing the Things of Religion are of the greatest Importance.” Writing in a polemical mode, Scott, of course, emphasized (and sometimes exaggerated) the differences between their views on the “root” and “fruit” of religious affections.

“Right Affections in Things of Religion,” wrote Scott, “have Truth for their Foundation”—that is, “the Doctrines and Instructions of the holy Scriptures.” Like other eighteenth-century writers on emotions, he understood affections to have

72 Scott, Brief View, 257.
73 Scott, Brief View, 262.
74 Scott, Brief View, 253.
75 Scott, Brief View, 250.
cognitive content, rather than seeing feelings and reason in opposition. For evangelical writers, this meant cultivating certain feelings in response to a particular set of theological ideas, such as awe before God’s holiness, sorrow at human sin, or gratitude for salvation. Scott condemned the tendency, which he observed among some New Lights, to oppose experiential piety and biblicism. Some, he said, “have cried up Christ, and the Spirit, and spiritual Experiences, while they have run down and cast Contempt on the Written Word of God, calling it only Paper and Ink, a dead Letter.” Those that downplayed the Bible as the source of religious affections tended to rely on more subjective experiences or idiosyncratic readings of scripture texts (decontextualized from larger theological narratives)—“sudden impressions” and “Visions and Revelations of Things.”

As Scott discussed the effect of conversion on the affections, he emphasized the sanctification of emotions more than the intensity of feelings. It was not enough simply to demonstrate “the greatest shews of Zeal,” or that one’s emotions were “excited and raised to a high Degree.” Not every religious feeling, after all, was necessarily an indication of divine activity. “The Affections and good Frames that many People have,” contended Scott, might be “nothing but the Workings of natural
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Passions, or animal Nature excited and stirred up." Grounding one’s sense of assurance in the presence of heightened feelings or on moments of religious ecstasy might be misplaced confidence. Rather than occasional impressions, then, Scott described a suite of changed emotions as the fruit of conversion:

- delightful Views of the glorious Excellency of God and Jesus Christ;
- Love to God for what he is in himself; universal Love to Mankind; a broken Spirit and constant mourning for Sin; Humbleness of Mind, Meekness, preferring others before Self; Patience under Trials and Losses; Abstractedness from the World, and Affections set on Things above.

Despite Scott’s portrayal of the sheer emotionalism of New Light spirituality, however, Alline had offered a similar catalogue of changed dispositions as the evidence of a transformed heart.

Scott, as well as Alline, sought revival and raised religious affections. Surveying the religious condition of Nova Scotia, he asserted that, “There is a great Need of Reformation.” But he sought a more moderate approach than what he observed in Alline and the New Lights, one that did not set affections at odds with scripture or reason, and did not overturn order in church and society: “The Truths of divine Revelation, the Order of the Gospel, and the Laws of Nature and Reason of which God is the Author, does not stand so much in the Way as that they must all be violated and destroyed to make Way for a divine Work of the Spirit of God.”

Despite his strictures against Alline, Scott was no “Old Light” in the mold of
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Charles Chauncy of Boston. In fact, Scott drew much of his thinking about emotions from the writings of Chauncy’s sometime opponent, the pro-revival theologian of the Great Awakening, Jonathan Edwards. Scott acknowledged his admiration for Edwards, whose *Treatise on the Religious Affections* he regarded as “one of the best Books on *experimental Religion*, except the Bible, that I have ever met with,” exhibiting Edwards’ genius and “great Acquaintance with *vital Religion* and true *Godliness.*” Like Edwards, Scott sought to “distinguish between true and false Religion, between saving Affections and Experience, and those manifold fair Shews and glittering Experiences by which they are counterfeited.” Neither felt it was adequate to condone or to condemn all feelings. The contention between Scott and Alline, then, demonstrates two different approaches to emotions among the supporters of evangelical revivals.

Despite their overlapping, if distinct, beliefs about revival and affections, however, the breach between their respective followers was significant. Alline’s preaching, Scott charged, was fomenting “Schism and Separation, Rents and Divisions” among Nova Scotia churches. Despite, or perhaps because of, their focus on the religion of the heart rather than “externals,” Nova Scotia New Lights were disrupting familiar religious structures and local churches. Citing examples from around the province, Scott claimed that, “there is scarce a Church or religious
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Community that I can hear of in this Province, but what our Author has broke in upon, and drawn off a Party from it by some Means or other."\textsuperscript{88} Most bitterly, Scott recounted the divisions that he experienced in Yarmouth and that he witnessed in Cornwallis. The pattern, he said, was that soon after Alline or his fellow itinerants preached in an area, those that embraced New Light sentiments charged the settled minister with being unconverted or of preaching merely external religion, and began to separate from their congregations. New Lights, he said, “are flying in Haste, from their Covenants, Promises, Brethren, Friends, from God’s House, Worship, Order, and Ordinances.”\textsuperscript{89} Scott saw the breaking of covenantal ties as an indication that these could not be godly affections.

Scott was particularly attuned to the social consequences of Alline’s reorientation of religion around individual piety. New Light divisiveness was unraveling the covenants that held church and community together. Scott alleged that Alline had “done what was in his Power to break the Union and Relation that subsist among sober People, which is founded on solemn Covenant.”\textsuperscript{90} Alline’s itinerancy was breaking down the ties that held together local communities, and the affectionate bonds between churches and ministers. When an embattled Scott finally requested a dismissal from the Jebogue church, he stated that Alline’s New Light message had made them “a divided People in Things of Religion,” alienated from one

\textsuperscript{88} Scott, \textit{Brief View}, 219.
\textsuperscript{89} Scott, \textit{Brief View}, 144.
\textsuperscript{90} Scott, \textit{Brief View}, 247. For the covenant signed by the members of Scott’s own church at Jebogue, Yarmouth, Nova Scotia, see Stewart, ed., \textit{Documents}, 42-3.
another by a “Disaffection and Disunion in Sentiment and Practice.” 91 Scott also worried that the divisions and separations he saw “in Church and Society, and in Families” had troubling implications for the whole social order, and not only in the religious sphere. 92 The covenant, as was discussed above, represented the Puritan vision of a cohesive social and religious community. With the transplanting of New Englanders to Nova Scotia, with its frontier conditions, religious pluralism (relatively speaking), and centralized (rather than township) governance, it remained an open question how—or even whether—that kind of covenant community could be sustained. 93 So when Alline eschewed such social relations as so many “Paper covenants,” and when “All Covenants, Vows, Promises, and Engagements, are trampled upon as the Dirt and Mire [and are] treated with open Contempt,” Scott feared that an already-fragile form of community was in danger of fragmentation. 94 Scott’s despairing question expressed the challenge that individualism posed to Anglo-American society: “If Men’s own Covenant Engagements … will not bind and hold them … I know not what will.” 95 By focusing

91 Jonathan Scott, Letter to the Church and Society of Jeboege in Yarmouth, in Stewart, ed., Documents, 179. On the controversy over itinerancy in the Great Awakening, see Hall, Contested Boundaries. Hall rightly connects itinerancy with voluntarism; preachers appealed to the emotions of colonists during an era of expanding consumer culture; see page 5. For the English context, see Deryck W. Lovegrove, Established Church, Sectarian People: Itinerancy and the Transformation of English Dissent, 1780-1830 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004); and for itinerancy and the spiritual geography of northern New England, see Balik, Rally the Scattered Believers.

92 Scott, Brief View, 238.

93 Mancke, Fault Lines of Empire, 109-37; Balik, Rally the Scattered Believers.

94 Scott, Brief View, 249.

95 Scott, Brief View, 242.
on individual and affective piety, were evangelicals like Alline jeopardizing the very communal structures that nurtured that piety?96

**Conclusion**

There were both centripetal and centrifugal forces within the evangelical tradition. Just as those in political and economic spheres experienced the pull toward either liberal individualism or a communitarian approach to society, so the religious emphasis on personal experience strained the bonds of communities and made it difficult to sustain a comprehensive social vision. As the conflict between Alline and Scott suggests, religious emotions were one important site where this ongoing tension within evangelicalism was negotiated. Emotions were central to Henry Alline’s individualistic New Light message, from his proposals for happy consent in salvation to the description of salvation as awakening from insensibility. Feeling also became a principle of critique, as he condemned the “externals” of unfelt religious practices and warned hearers away from unfeeling ministers. Jonathan Scott rarely admitted it, but he and Alline could agree that the transformation of one’s emotions was the most important evidence of conversion. But Scott insisted that Alline and the New Lights focused too much on sudden emotional impressions and fleeting ecstatic experiences (which may, in the end, be nothing more than natural passions), instead of the steady transformation of one’s dispositions and affections. Scott also worried that Alline and his followers were too careless of the social affections and covenants that knit together church and society,
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fraying the bonds of the emotional community of which they both, despite their differences, were a part. The charge of “enthusiasm” polemically linked what Scott perceived as extreme individualism with its ripple effects in society.

Nova Scotians, like others in the Enlightenment Atlantic, wrestled with the meaning of sentiments and affections, and wondered how self-fashioning and community-building could be reconciled. Alline and Scott, two self-educated ministers from different points along the evangelical spectrum, contributed to these transatlantic conversations, and adapted them to their local circumstances. Without claiming that they belong on the same shelf as Hume or Edwards, they were, as J. M. Bumsted said of Alline, “attempting to come to grips with the important intellectual and philosophical issues of [their] time,” which certainly included the role of emotions in self and society. Ordinary people and middling leaders also had a stake, and a say, in the outcome of these debates.
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Unfeeling Enthusiasts:  
Nova Scotia New Lights and the Problem of Emotions

Freely I hear the Son of God,  
For wretched sinners spilt his blood;  
But I no Christ can feel or see,  
For other sinners or for me.

In midnight darkness here I dwell,  
While other souls of glory tell;  
They say they feast on joys above,  
But I’m a stranger to their love.¹

Feelings were not just a preoccupation of Nova Scotia New Lights. They were a problem. While contemporary critics satirized their sensational excesses or fretted about rampant and unreasonable passion, New Lights themselves sang about their unfeeling hearts. Theirs was the problem, not of too much emotion, but of not enough, and of not the right kind. It was a deficiency they experienced at every stage of the spiritual life: newly awakened outsiders wondered if they would always be strangers to the pleasures of salvation; recent converts wanted to feel less “self” and more grace; and longtime pilgrims distrusted the authenticity of old sensations. It is not a little jarring to consider congregations of so-called enthusiasts, supposedly

imagining themselves to be "the particular favourites of the divinity," singing lines as insensate as "I no Christ can feel or see."²

Jonathan Scott, of course, attacked Henry Alline for the "imprudent Zeal and wild Enthusiasm and Imagination, which manifestly runs through all his Religion."³ Though controversial under Alline’s leadership, Nova Scotia’s New Lights were even more likely to be charged as enthusiasts in the decade after his death, when a younger cadre of itinerant preachers led the congregations in a more emotionally demonstrative and perhaps antinomian direction. So concerned about this local movement was Bishop Charles Inglis that in 1791 his charge to the clergy was on the evils of enthusiasm. He contended that the province’s New Lights were disseminating "wild notions, to the injury of society and rational piety."⁴ Historians, too, have taken note of the emotional dimension of the New Light revivals. Maurice Armstrong described the New Light message as “a gospel which warmed men’s hearts and stirred their deepest emotions ... the contagion which the excitement of the revival produced among an isolated and emotionally-starved people."⁵ George Rawlyk emphasized their “exaggerated emphasis both on the emotions and on all sensory perceptions.”⁶

² The description of enthusiasts as “favourites of the divinity” was Joseph Priestly’s (1772), as quoted in Jan Goldstein, “Enthusiasm or Imagination? Eighteenth-century Smear Words in Comparative National Context,” in Klein and La Vopa, eds., Enthusiasm and Enlightenment in Europe, 33.
³ Scott, Brief View, 211.
⁵ Armstrong, Great Awakening in Nova Scotia, 67.
⁶ Rawlyk, Canada Fire, 3.
Yet the witness of the New Lights themselves—both ordinary people and their leaders—was that the right emotions were elusive. It turns out that the ecstasy of the moment had a long backstory. New Lights cultivated “spontaneous” feelings by intentional habits, repeated failures, and a community of concern. Even for so-called enthusiasts, emotions were what historian William Reddy has described as a “domain of effort.” As Rawlyk acknowledged, New Lights “sought the mountain peak of religious ecstasy but naively underestimated how difficult it would be for them to remain there.”

New Lights, that is, valued a constellation of particular emotions and they taught one another how to acquire and express those feelings. Generalizations about the emotionalism of the movement obscure a more complicated emotional community. As Phyllis Mack says about another evangelical community:

Far from exhibiting mindless enthusiasm or an inchoate desire for contact with the supernatural, many people actually had trouble generating those emotions. Indeed, the most cursory reading of unpublished sources shows not the unthinking hysteria of people’s emotional outbursts, but the conscious effort that often preceded and reinforced them.

Examining the emotional aspirations of this community, then, sheds much-needed light on the New Light revivals “as an emotional experience.” Doing so also begins to map the emotional terrain of the daily, lived experience of evangelicals, for whom

---

8 Rawlyk, *Ravished by the Spirit*, 77.
9 Mack, *Heart Religion*, 6. The assertion of David Lovejoy, that the Great Awakening was little more than “a mindless play upon the emotions of its victims” simply cannot be sustained by the evidence of agency and self-fashioning exercised by ordinary evangelicals in precisely the emotional dimension of their lives. See Lovejoy, *Enthusiasm*, 196.
conversion or ecstatic raptures were only occasional heights.\textsuperscript{11} Religious affections were just as much a concern for New Lights when they walked through the arid plains or dark valleys.

This chapter traces the problem of emotions in New Light writings and identifies some of the religious feelings that together marked them as an emotional community. It begins with an examination of the role of emotions in Alline’s journal, arguing that a focus on “rapture” misses the emotional aspirations and transformations that shaped his spiritual narrative. The religious affections—or their absence—were also a prominent theme in the extensive body of hymns Alline wrote for New Light worship. The chapter concludes by listening to the way that ordinary New Lights described and cultivated religious feelings in their letters.

“Why is not my whole soul ravished...more?”

A nineteenth-century biographer wrote that Alline was “converted in a rapture; and ever after he sought to live in a rapture; and judged of his religious condition by his enjoyments and raptures. ... He looked mainly to feeling, especially to rapturous feeling.”\textsuperscript{12} Indeed the pivotal moment of Alline’s life was his conversion, which he described in this rapturous language: “My whole soul was filled with love, and ravished with a divine ecstasy beyond any doubts or fears ... I

\textsuperscript{12} John Davis, \textit{The Patriarch of Western Nova Scotia: Life and Times of the Late Rev. Harris Harding, Yarmouth, N.S.} (Charlottetown, PEI: W. H. Bremner, 1866), 178. See Rawlyk, \textit{Canada Fire}, 7. “Rapture,” in this context, refers to a mystical spiritual experience, not the belief (popularized by nineteenth-century Dispensationalists) that Christians alive at the time of the Second Coming would be physically taken by God out of the world before a period of tribulation.
enjoyed a heaven on earth, and it seemed as if I were wrapped up in God.”

Yet single-minded focus on “rapture” obscures a whole spectrum of religious feelings—from distress to happiness to humility—in Alline’s experience and theology. Even more importantly, such emotional heights were not merely the gift of a moment—they required steady effort and cultivation, and even so, were often Alline’s aspiration rather than his daily reality. To be sure, being “wrapped up in God” was the *sine qua non* of New Light spirituality, but this state of selfless ecstasy was achieved only occasionally and then after considerable attention to one’s inner life. Alline’s journal records the winding road to rapture, and then the daily process of emotional self-fashioning that prepared him for those ecstatic moments. Even for Nova Scotia’s “mystic,” rapture was as much longed-for as enjoyed. In addition, behind the public exuberance of New Light meetings was the more private and daily experience of emotional self-fashioning. Beyond rapture, Alline’s journal also described the *other* affections valued in the emotional community of New Lights: certain assurance of their salvation, this-worldly happiness, and self-surrendering humility.

Emotions structured Alline’s conversion narrative. His was an experience, not only of new doctrinal beliefs, but new feelings. Alline described his conversion

---

14 Rawlyk proposed that Alline’s journal, which circulated in manuscript among New Lights before it was published, was embraced by ordinary Nova Scotians because they could relate to it: “If the Falmouth farmer-tanner could experience the intense spiritual ecstasy and also the certainty of the New Light—New Birth, then they could do so too;” *Canada Fire*, 6.
15 Alline’s “journal” as published (including both the manuscript Chipman transcription and the 1806 printed version) is a hybrid document. It begins with an autobiographical memoir of his early life, conversion in 1775, and first year of preaching. From Sept. 1777 to December 1780, there are dated entries that summarize Alline’s activities and reflections
as a long journey through distress and despair to the joyful moment when
redeeming love broke through. Like John Bunyan’s Pilgrim, Alline was long stuck in
the “slough of despond” before arriving at the desired country. In his memoir, Alline
recalled that as a child in Newport, Rhode Island, a thunderstorm had “awakened”
him to the danger of suddenly dying and being sent to hell.  
He turned with greater
attention to his prayers, catechism, and devotional reading. Rather than comfort,
however, Alline’s “awakening” unsettled him. Page after page of his early memoir is
dominated by emotives registering distress: unhappiness, fear, despair, alarm,

---

for various periods of time, from a few days to several months. On Jan. 1, 1781, Alline wrote,
“This year I intend, if God permit, to pen down the travels of my soul every day, which in the
time past I have not done.” Alline continued regular entries in that near-daily format until
Nov. 17, 1783, when he stopped because of sickness. An account of his last months and
deathbed experience was added to the document by his host, Rev. David McClure of
Newburyport, Massachusetts. Alline wrote at least some of his journal in shorthand; this
manuscript is not known to be extant, though a small sample of his shorthand appears to
have remained in the family. Despite numerous small differences, the Chipman
transcription and published Life and Diary seem to be derived from the same translation of
that shorthand (also not known to be extant). Notwithstanding the stylistic differences
between the memoir and journal portions, the entire document has been edited and
intentionally narrated, some of it after considerable reflection. See Beverley and Moody,
“Introduction,” Journal of Henry Alline, 23-5; David G. Bell, “All Things New: The
Transformation of Maritime Baptist Historiography,” Nova Scotia Historical Review 4, no. 2
(1984), 78; idem, Henry Alline and Maritime Religion, 10; Edward Manning Saunders, History
of the Baptists of the Maritime Provinces (Halifax: John Burgoyne, 1902), plate opposite page
31. On reading Alline’s Life and Journal as an autobiographical text, examining questions of
form, history and fiction, and persona, see Gwendolyn Davies, “Persona in Planter Journals,”
in They Planted Well, 210-17; and Jamie S. Scott, “Travels of My Soul”: Henry Alline’s
autobiography in general, see James Olney, ed., Autobiography: Essays Theoretical and
Critical (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980); Philippe Lejeune, Jeremy D. Popkin,
spiritual autobiography, see Hindmarsh, Evangelical Conversion Narrative; Andrew
Cembers, “Reading, the Godly, and Self-Writing in England, Circa 1580–1720,” Journal of
Autobiography: Planter Religion in the Next Generation,” in Henderson and Robicheau, eds.,

---

misery. “Oh the distressing days and unhappy nights, that I have waded through!” he wrote. “Nothing but darkness, nothing but distress and slavish fear.” He was distressed as he examined his interior life, despaired as he studied and attempted to understand the mysteries of salvation, and was fearful and burdened with guilt when diverted by worldly pursuits.

Despair, however, did serve a purpose in the journey toward conversion. Alline hoped that the despair would win him some divine sympathy; he admitted that he “would sometimes think that my prayers and tears would prevail with God, and sometimes that my being so engaged, so affected, and so humble, would affect God, and cause him to pity me, and be willing to convert me.”

Could the penitent’s pathos change God’s own feelings? As Alline came to understand it, despair did have a salutary, preparatory purpose, but it was not to appease God. Rather, it was meant to teach the would-be convert not to rely on more comforting religious feelings. He explained that an “awakened” person may readily cling to what contemporaries called “agreeable frames”—pleasing spiritual sensations or feelings of comfort—or they may feel their “passions moved,” and hope they were closer to conversion.

Such feelings, warned Alline, provided only false confidence, a diversion from the divine source of salvation. He asserted that “their joys” were merely their “animal spirits [being] elevated with a prospect of happiness, when the inmost soul is never touched or redeemed.”

The distressing period of preparation, then, is to wean one

---

18 Alline, Journal, 34.
19 Alline, Journal, 56.
20 Alline, Journal, 60.
21 Alline, Journal, 102; emphasis added.
off of the allure of self-confidence and to teach one to recognize superficially comforting emotions. Despairing of self-effort, the seeker, like Alline, could finally throw herself on God’s mercy.

Alline narrated his conversion as an emotional hinge—a striking before-and-after moment. The climax occurred in March of 1775 when, in anguish, he opened an old Bible to passages in the Book of Psalms that seemed to describe, on the one hand, his sense of sinfulness and brokenness, and on the other, articulated a plea for God to pull him out of his despair.22 He recalled, “O help me, help me, cried I, thou Redeemer of souls, and save me or I am gone for ever.” His prayer that night, he said, was “the last word I ever mentioned in my distress (for the change was instantaneous).”23 Indeed, Alline’s emotional vocabulary changed immediately, at least in his retelling. The distress had done its work of preparation, and it rarely occurred again.24 He wrote of that change:

Redeeming love broke into my soul ... with such power, that my whole soul seemed melted down with love, the burden of guilt and condemnation was gone, darkness was expelled, my heart humbled and filled with gratitude, and my will turned of choice after the infinite God.25

Conversion, for Alline, was an entire and almost instantaneous exchange of affections. Instead of feeling guilty and troubled, he registered new emotions: love, selfless adoration, humility, and gratitude. From a subjective point of view, this change of feelings served to certify the authenticity of the conversion.26 These were

22 Psalms 38 and 40; Alline, Journal, 61.
24 See Alline, Journal, 90.
precisely the religious feelings that he had for months despaired of ever
experiencing, so their presence indicated to Alline that some spiritual change had
occurred. In a similar vein, after being so long preoccupied with self-examination
and the deficiencies of his own heart, he now found that he was less self-focused as
his affections turned outward and heavenward:

Attracted by the love and beauty I saw in [God’s] divine perfections,
my whole soul was inexpressibly ravished with the blessed
Redeemer; not with what I expected to enjoy after death or in heaven,
but with what I now enjoyed in my soul: for my whole soul seemed
filled with the divine being.

He was, he continued, “ravished with a divine ecstasy” and “it seemed as if I were
wrapped up in God.”

He recounted other moments of ecstasy over the next several
years. Sometimes he alluded to a “blessed visit to my soul.” As an itinerant
preacher, Alline’s spiritual union sometimes occurred in the saddle: “Riding from
place to place I was blessed with a sense of God’s love to the world. My soul enjoyed
happy hours with God.” Of one occasion in the pulpit, he wrote, “when speaking to
the christians, my whole soul was so ravished with the love of Jesus, that I could
scarcely speak; yea, my heart seemed melted with love.”
The intensity and
immediacy of his feelings in such moments of divine contemplation appeared to
overwhelm his self: “Sometimes I had such a sense of his goodness ... Yea,
sometimes I almost wish to be dissolved.”

---

27 Alline, Journal, 63.
28 Alline, Journal, 140.
29 Alline, Journal, 147.
30 Alline, Journal, 179.
31 Alline, Journal, 135.
And yet rapture usually eluded Alline. Despite the centrality of his rapturous conversion to his spiritual memoir, and despite his constant longing for that same intensity of emotion, his feelings often fell short of such heights. In verse, he expressed that aspiration: “I long to walk and live so near to God; / As always taste the sweetness of his word.” But he then responded in prose, “O when I speak of those solemn and soul transporting truths, why is not my whole soul ravished with sacred joy and humbled at my Saviour’s feet more than I am?”

On another occasion, he wrote that although he “enjoyed something of God this day,” “yet I am so far from such a realizing sense of things as I think I ought to have, and my soul aspires after, that methinks I know nothing.” He complained, “I have seen such a disproportion ... between what I profess to believe and what I feel,” and he exclaimed in frustration, “O this unfeeling heart of mine; why does it not melt?”

In other words, Alline often found himself unmoved and unfeeling. He aspired to those moments of unselfconscious surrender to divine presence, but these did not come as easily or often as he hoped. Alline regularly noted how difficult it was to maintain a feeling sense of divine things, to linger in those times of enjoyment, or to stay happy. He confessed that his feelings were, “sometimes up, then down.”

In the life of the quintessential New Light, the absence of intense religious feelings was as noteworthy as their presence.

How did Alline explain his difficulty of maintaining a feeling heart?

Embodiment was one problem. An important strain in Alline’s thought was the
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32 Alline, *Journal*, 113; emphasis added.
34 Alline, *Journal*, 133; see 118, 161.
35 Alline, *Journal*, 152.
opposition of the spiritual and the corporeal. The spirit was imprisoned in the body, seeking heavenly liberation: “All things that were corporeal seem a clog...a strong chain...I seem as a wild bird in a cage.”36 He aspired to enjoy constant communion with God, but confessed that he continued to struggle with more worldly passions: “If it was not for pride and unbelief, my soul would rejoice continually: but O I shall never get rid of all those chains, until I leave this mortal world.”37 Alline’s language, of course, tended to minimize the extent to which his own religious emotions were embodied—expressed in tears, cries, laughter, and gestures. From his perspective, the physical was a limitation, and he anticipated the heavenly experience of “unmingled joys.”38 Alline also suggested that “zealous disputes about non-essentials” tended to dampen religious affections. He contended that “the life of religion” was “the love of God in their souls,” while discoursing about questions such as the proper methods or subjects of baptism tended to preoccupy Christians when “religion grows cold.”39 He praised one nearby church for seeming to enjoy “so much of the vitals of religion and presence of God, as to lift them up above all sectarian zeal.”40 Others failed to cultivate a ravishing sense of God’s presence because their ministers told them not to expect it. Alline claimed that, “a number of anti-christian ministers are labouring night and day to prove that a feeling knowledge of redemption in the soul is not to be attained, and that all such pretensions are a vain

37 Alline, Journal, 112; emphasis in original.
imagination and a delusion." The expectation that Christian converts should usually and immediately feel an assurance of their salvation was one of the central emotional dimensions of the Great Awakening, setting early evangelicalism apart from Puritanism. Yet some ministers hesitated to ascribe such significance to subjective feelings, considering assurance a more elusive prize.

It was not only the intensity of feeling that mattered to Alline, but rather the day-to-day cultivation of specific affections, including happiness, love, and humility. Attending to the particular meanings that Alline invested in each of these terms, rather than assuming unchanging definitions, illuminates some of the values of the New Lights as an emotional community. Perhaps the most prominent of those emotions are happiness and pleasure. On almost every page of Alline’s journal (after his conversion) are references to enjoyment and happiness:

“Christ is...the source of happiness...the joy of my life.”

“I enjoyed something of God this day.”

As I was riding through the woods, my soul enjoyed that which the world cannot give nor take away.”

“[I] enjoyed some happy hours in my own soul.”

“I enjoyed some happy moments this day while travelling.”

“O the happiness of living near the Lord Jesus Christ!”

---

41 Alline, Journal, 121.
42 Bebbington, Evangelicalism in Modern Britain, 42-50.
43 Alline, Journal, 29.
45 Alline, Journal, 149.
46 Alline, Journal, 111.
47 Alline, Journal, 189.
As innocuous as these references may seem to modern readers, Alline’s emphasis on present happiness and enjoyment is noteworthy. Echoing a sentiment famously expressed in the American Declaration of Independence, Alline took it as a given that humanity was “of an aspiring Nature and must always be in Pursuit of Happiness.”\(^4^9\) In this emphasis, Alline reflected the Enlightenment’s optimistic belief that pleasure could be found in this and not only in a future heavenly life. His was not a deferred happiness, but could be a quotidian pleasure: “It was a heaven whenever or wherever I enjoyed my God.”\(^5^0\) Though religious writers such as Alline differed from some Enlightenment philosophers by maintaining the necessity of divine grace in human happiness, they participated in a fundamental shift in expectations, “presenting happiness as something to which all human beings could aspire in this life.”\(^5^1\)

Another specific emotion that Alline sought to cultivate was humility: “O for humility, humility.”\(^5^2\) Alline often linked his desire for humility with the image of sitting “at the feet of Jesus,” a posture of learning and surrender; “O that I had an humble place near his blessed feet to be swallowed up in God.”\(^5^3\) Humility sits uneasily in Enlightenment accounts of self-fashioning, in which assertions of agency

---

\(^4^9\) Alline, *Two Mites*, 81; “happiness” appears as early as the first sentence of that book.

\(^5^0\) Alline, *Journal*, 192.


\(^5^2\) Alline, *Journal*, 148, 140.

\(^5^3\) Alline, *Journal*, 113.
and individual choices predominate. Cultivating humility and other forms of self-denial or self-surrender (themes taken up below in New Light hymns), seems the opposite of such assertiveness. Yet as historian Phyllis Mack has observed, evangelicals did indeed aspire to feelings that seemed to surrender, as well as to fashion, the self. She proposes that historians recover “a conception of agency in which autonomy is less important than self-transcendence and in which the energy to act in the world is generated and sustained by a prior act of personal surrender.”

Alline’s desire, “O that I was more humble!” then, represented his aspiration to fashion a self that was not self-centred.

In addition to any single feeling, Alline framed the process of sanctification as a fundamental reorientation of the heart: what the Christian loved and hated, what they were attracted to or recoiled from, how their passions were inclined. He described this continuing conversion of feelings in this way:

He that has the turn, that is after God’s own heart, is also humble, and longs greatly to be free from sin, yea, from all sin whatever, and to be made perfectly holy: while those of the other turn do not wholly hate

---


55 Alline, Journal, 140.
sin. O happy, happy souls, whose treasure is above; their love and holiness centre there, constrained by the ties of love.56

Such a radical emotional transformation was one of the most convincing kinds of evidence that redemption had touched the inner person. Notice, too, that longing for a change of heart—and not only its perfection—was, for Alline, a sign of grace. The steady drumbeat of emotional aspiration in Alline's journal—the desire for more love, more humility, more enjoyment, more happiness—was itself an indication of a transformed heart.

Alline's journal not only recorded his other attempts at emotional self-fashioning, but was also itself a medium to shape his religious affections. The habit of reporting his feelings was another means of paying attention to them. Of one such experience he wrote in his journal, “Employed some time in writing this day; and blessed hours, I have often, being thus employed, enjoyed, when I could feel what I wrote, and feast my soul on the glorious plan of life.”57 Writing his experiences (or the feelings to which he aspired) could change or intensify those feelings. Alline used his journal “to pen down the travels of my soul,” but he did not only climb the heights of ecstasy—he also sojourned in the valleys of despair and across the unfeeling plain. Though he certainly sought moments of spiritual rapture, he also sought to cultivate a range of religious affections, and regarded his daily emotional transformation as evidence of conversion and sanctification.

57 Alline, Journal, 157; see 128.
“O let me feel thy love divine”: Alline’s hymns as emotional texts

The hymns of Henry Alline were the texts by which Nova Scotia New Lights weekly proclaimed not only their faith, but also the religious emotions that they valued most. Literary scholar Thomas Vincent called attention to Alline’s ability as a hymn writer to “communicate the emotional reality of religious experience ... within the range of the sentiments and affections of ordinary [people].” When a young Edward Manning was struggling in 1791 with the problem of his own unfeeling heart prior to his conversion, a neighbour gave him some lines from a hymn by “Dear Mr. Alline.” Those verses, which began, “O Hardened, Hardened heart of mine,” Manning later recalled, “Set forth my condition as it really was.” As this example suggests, Alline’s hymns did not only focus on the relief of conversion or the glories of heaven; like his journal, the hymns, too, reflected the difficulties of shaping one’s emotional life. Examining his large collection of hymns reveals some
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58 Alline first published a selection of twenty hymns in 1782 at Halifax, though no copies are known to be extant. This edition was reprinted as Hymns and Spiritual Songs (Windsor, VT: Alden Spooner, 1796). For a recent reprint of this edition, see Henry Alline, Hymns and Spiritual Songs, ed. J. M. Bumsted (Sackville, NB: Ralph Pickard Bell Library, 1987). The much longer volume with the same title (from which this study quotes) was published in four editions: Boston, 1786; Dover, NH, 1795 and 1797; Storington-Port, CT, 1802. For the bibliographic history, see Thomas B. Vincent, “Some Bibliographical Notes on Henry Alline’s Hymns and Spiritual Songs,” Canadian Notes and Queries 12 (Nov. 1973), 12-3. Many of the hymns are reprinted in George A. Rawlyk, ed., The New Light Letters and Spiritual Songs, 1778-1793 (Hantsport, NS: Lancelot Press, 1983). On the widespread use of Alline’s hymns, into the twentieth century among Freewill Baptists, see Frederick C. Burnett, “Henry Alline’s ‘Articles & Covenant of a Gospel Church,’” Nova Scotia Historical Review 4, no. 2 (1984), 18; and Bell, Henry Alline and Maritime Religion, 3. For examples of later eighteenth- and nineteenth-century use of Alline’s hymns, see Edward Manning, “Reminiscences,” undated manuscript [pre-1846], Edward Manning Collection, Esther Clark Wright Archives, Acadia University, Wolfville, NS, 1846.001/3/1, page 8; and Charles Knowles, A Brief Sketch of the Life of Mrs. Ann Knowles, Who Departed This Life August 13, 1845 (Boston: Howe’s Sheet Anchor Press, 1846), 17. Also see Thomas B. Vincent, “Henry Alline: Problems of Approach and Reading the Hymns as Poetry,” in They Planted Well, 201-210.


60 Manning, “Reminiscences,” 8.
of the dominant themes in the emotional style of Nova Scotia New Lights: the problem of the unfeeling heart, the goal of selfless affections, feelings as evidence of spiritual transformation, and the present enjoyment of religious happiness.

Hymns played an important role in shaping the affective spirituality of dissenting Protestant and evangelical churches.\textsuperscript{61} As Alline asserted in the preface to his hymnal, singing could be useful to raise religious affections: “the heart may be alarmed, and stirred up to action, by local objects or vocal sounds.”\textsuperscript{62} He suggested that hymns were “far more likely to stir up and engage the heart (especially souls enlightened and groaning for liberty) when they express the state, groans, and desires of their own souls.” For that reason, Alline wrote hymns that were, he believed, “adapted to almost every capacity, station of life, or frame of mind.”\textsuperscript{63} His large collection of hymns was organized into five books, each of which reflected such a stage in the spiritual life, from awakening to conversion to the trials of the Christian to heavenly joys. Laid out in this way, the hymns can be read as a guide to fashioning the affections through each of those stages of the religious life.


\textsuperscript{62} Henry Alline, \textit{Hymns and Spiritual Songs}, 3\textsuperscript{rd} ed. (Dover, NH: Samuel Bragg, Jr., 1797), iii.

\textsuperscript{63} Alline, \textit{Hymns and Spiritual Songs}, iv.
The problem of the unfeeling heart

Other souls his love have felt,
Will it not my hardness melt?  

The conversion of a person’s emotions, according to New Lights, began with a growing awareness that the unconverted heart has a limited range and capacity—there are many feelings that one simply cannot experience. Many of the hymns in the first part of Alline’s hymnbook, written in the “language of the awakened sinner,” reflect this experience of being caught between knowing and feeling the message of salvation. Awakened sinners, who are just becoming “sensible” of their spiritual condition, begin, paradoxically, to feel sharply their lack of feeling, or, as many of these hymns put it, the “hardness” of their heart. Having cast off spiritual indifference or the enjoyment of “sensual joys,” the awakened person experienced the frustration of lingering sin and habitual stubbornness: “O what a harden’d wretch am I! / Will nothing melt my hardened mind? / ... my heart’s so hard in sin / I neither feel, nor melt nor move.” The inability to feel, or to be moved or “melted” was an epistemological, as well as soteriological concern; that is, unfelt knowledge was only partial or merely intellectual, in the same way that one can only know that honey is sweet by tasting it. The hymn, entitled, “A sinner convinced of a hard heart,” drew together many of these themes:

1 Was e’er a wretch so hard as I

---

64 Alline, Hymns and Spiritual Songs, 57 (Hymn 1.72); emphasis added.
65 Alline, Hymns and Spiritual Songs, Book 1, page 1.
66 For other examples, see Alline, Hymns and Spiritual Songs, 14, 19, 28, 53. For this theme in early British Protestantism, see Ryrie, Being Protestant, 20-6.
67 Alline, Hymns and Spiritual Songs, 28 (Hymn 1.35).
My heart will neither melt nor cry,
I'm griev'd because no more distress'd,
And wonder I so easy rest.

2 My stubborn will, will not relent;
Nor my obdurate heart repent;
O might some pow'r of love divine,
E'er melt this rocky heart of mine!

3 Come mighty God, these foes subdue,
Form my benighted soul anew;
O let me taste the joys above,
And join to sing redeeming love.

4 Give me one spark of heav'nly day,
To scatter all those clouds away;
Nor shall I ever happy be,
Till from these chains I am set free. 68

The hard heart of the awakened sinner was not the result of indifference, but of natural inability. Only “some pow'r of love divine,” wrote Alline, could “melt this rocky heart of mine;” only God could form a “benighted soul anew” so that the awakened sinner acquired a “taste” for heavenly joys. Godly feelings, according to New Lights, did not come naturally or easily to sinful human beings; evangelicals did not share the optimism of sentimentalist moral philosophers who believed it was in human nature to express moral sentiments or benevolent affections. Over against the innate “moral sense” postulated by Shaftesbury and Hutcheson, for example, evangelicals like Alline asserted that unconverted humanity was “insensible” until “awakened” to new senses, new feelings, by grace. Only then might a hard heart be melted.

Desire

68 Alline, Hymns and Spiritual Songs, 36-7 (Hymn 1.46).
O Lord, methinks I feel thy love
And long to love thee more.  

Perhaps the most fundamental emotional transformation for New Lights was the conversion of desire—the reorientation of the heart toward new loves, new pleasures. At the heart of these new desires was the desire for God, a longing expressed in Alline’s hymn, “Desiring Christ above all things”:

1 Methinks I long to see thy face,
     O thou indulgent God,
To taste the sweetness of thy grace,
     and spread thy name abroad.

2 Jesus let thy heav’nly arms,
     Encircle me around,
And lift my heart above the charms,
     Of this enchanted ground.

3 Let lofty themes my soul inspire,
     To soar for joys above;
My heart inflame with the sweet fire
     Of thine immortal love.

4 O let the glories of thy name,
     My life and breath employ,
And ev’ry pow’r of thought inflame
     With pure seraphic joy.

Compared with the “insensibility” of those not yet converted, this song was peppered with the vocabulary of the senses: see, taste, sweetness. The lines convey experience and pleasure, but also a desire for a deeper spiritual communion. For the new convert, desire for God was kindled, rather than satisfied, a theme expressed by Alline’s use of fire imagery: “My heart inflame with the sweet fire / Of thine immortal love,” “ev’ry pow’r of thought inflame,” or, in the words of another song,

---

69 Alline, Hymns and Spiritual Songs, 86 (Hymn 2.22).
70 On the theme of desire, see Ryrie, Being Protestant, ch. 4.
71 Alline, Hymns and Spiritual Songs, 147 (Hymn 2.87).
“O let thy love our souls inflame.”

The prayer to be “inflamed” suggests emotional intensity, but also a willingness for the self to be consumed by the divine Other.

This language of selfless desire is the context for understanding the New Light preoccupation with moments of spiritual communion and ecstasy; rather than a yearning for sensation *per se*, the hymns taught them to aspire for more of God’s presence. As New Lights sought to fashion their emotions, they attempted to do so with less of *self* at the centre of their experience. In the words of the hymn, “Longing to be wholly for God,” they prayed:

I want all self to be subdu’d...
I want my will to be resign’d ...
I want my soul bound up in God.

And in a desire that confounds Enlightenment definitions of self-fashioning, they prayed, “O let me and thy self be one.”

*Feelings and assurance*

When e’er I feel that faith divine
   I climb to realms of bliss;
I feel the blessed Lord is mine,
   And *know* that I am his.

The presence of certain religious feelings provided New Lights with assurance of their salvation; the absence of those emotions provoked uncertainty and doubt. Like other evangelicals, Alline sought to inject an emphasis on personal experience into a religious tradition that he felt had become too reliant on

---

72 Alline, *Hymns and Spiritual Songs*, 138 (Hymn 2.76).
74 Alline, *Hymns and Spiritual Songs*, 158-9 (Hymn 3.3); emphasis added.
“externals” such as outward morality or nominal intellectual assent. The presence—or the intensity or duration—of “felt knowledge” provided the subjective means of convincing oneself and others that an interior change had occurred.75

O might I always feel thy pow'r
Of that eternal life divine!
Then could I say at every hour,
That I was his and he was mine. ...

Long as I felt the heav'nly charms,
And tasted the immortal food,
I would not leave my Saviour's arms,
For countless years of earthly good.76

Not only intensity, but also the consistency of feeling, provided New Lights with the assurance that they had been, as they believed, united with Christ. Another song has them sing, “O let me feel thy love divine ... until I know that thou art mine.”77

Not surprisingly, perhaps, such a subjective form of evidence often proved fleeting. Feelings were notoriously difficult to sustain amidst the changes of daily life. In “The travels of a doubting Christian,” Alline articulates that experience of uncertainty. The song confesses, “Once ... I thought the Lord had set me free, / And all my doubts were over.”78 But that certainty dissolved when the narrator wrestled with competing emotions:

But O! I left my heav'nly friend,
And follow'd false delights;
Soon did my joyful moments end,
In long and tedious nights.

75 Alline, Hymns and Spiritual Songs, 284 (Hymn 4.71).
76 Alline, Hymns and Spiritual Songs, 171-2, Hymn 3.20).
77 Alline, Hymns and Spiritual Songs, 20-1 (Hymn 1.26); emphasis added.
78 Alline, Hymns and Spiritual Songs, 185-6 (Hymn 3.37); see also 234, 236-7, 238-9 (Hymns 4.1, 4.4, 4.7).
While the song’s closing lines expressed some confidence that their desires for God could be renewed, they also retain a degree of ambiguity, stating how dependent New Lights were on feelings for their identity: “Unless I feel that thou art mine, / I cannot think I’m blest.” In another hymn, singers second-guessed those feelings that once seemed to assure them of spiritual security:

1 O that I knew it was the case
My soul was born of God,
And found myself among that race,
Washed in the Saviour’s blood!

2 The time has been, I thought I knew
The bless’d Redeemer’s voice;
I thought I lost my burden too,
And felt my heart rejoice.

3 I thought my will was then resign’d
To the Redeemer’s ways,
And felt my inmost soul inclin’d
To tell the world his grace.

4 But O! too soon the scene was turn’d
I lost that pleasing view;
I lost the sweetness once I found
Lost earthly pleasures too.79

The song is a frank admission of the difficulties of using emotions to ground religious certainty. The loss of feelings was not only troubling in the present moment, but also introduced doubts about previous affections and assurance: “I thought I knew ... I thought I lost my burden ... I thought my will was then resign’d.” The implication is that true feelings were lasting feelings. The emphasis in Alline’s verse was on feelings of intimacy and nearness to God. While New Lights gave considerable thought to maintaining these feelings of spiritual union and assurance,

79 Alline, Hymns and Spiritual Songs, 197-8 (Hymn 3.51); emphasis added.
their sung theology did not obviously teach them how to persevere through changing or absent emotions.

*Feeling heavenly joys on earth*

No distant God I know
Or future heav’n can trust;
I want my heav’n *begun below;*
I want a *present* Christ.\(^{80}\)

New Lights certainly retained a strong preoccupation with the joys of heaven. The last section of Alline’s hymnbook consisted “chiefly of infinite wonders, transporting views and christian triumphs.”\(^{81}\) Heaven, New Lights believed, will be the future realm of unending rapture, unmediated intimacy, and “unmingled joys.”\(^{82}\) Yet New Lights insisted that their happiness was not entirely deferred until the afterlife; they sang about “Heaven on earth.”\(^{83}\) That is, feelings of spiritual communion, delight, and love in the present life were a genuine foretaste of what awaited the resurrected Christian.

1 O for a taste of life divine
To feed this hungry soul of mine!
I want the Son of God to know
And taste of heav’n while here below.

2 If I were sure that I should have
A crown of joy beyond the grave,
yet that alone won’t do for me;
I want while here with God to be.

3 What e’er I do, where e’er I go,

\(^{80}\) Alline, *Hymns and Spiritual Songs*, 318 (Hymn 5.14); emphasis added.
\(^{81}\) Alline, *Hymns and Spiritual Songs*, Book 5, page 309.
\(^{82}\) Alline, *Hymns and Spiritual Songs*, 202 (Hymn 3.55).
\(^{83}\) Alline, *Hymns and Spiritual Songs*, 137 (Hymn 3.39).
I want those joys of heav’n to know ...\textsuperscript{84}

While some contemporaries exchanged the happiness of a future heaven for the “pursuit of happiness” in this life, New Lights did not feel the need to choose. Rather than delayed joy, they believed that the very essence of the Christian life was to experience \textit{in the present} a taste of the delights that awaited them: a “taste of heav’n while here below.” “On earth,” they sang, “my soul enjoys a heav’n.”\textsuperscript{85} By making the feeling experience of God’s presence the essence of both future hope and this-worldly spirituality, Alline could write—in the words of the title of one hymn—

“Heaven not promised, but possessed.” In striking language, New Lights proclaimed:

\begin{quote}
It’s not a heav’n to come
My soul can satisfy;
Nor can I find myself at home
But with my Jesus nigh.

O God thy heavens bow,
These parting walls remove,
Let me begin my glory now,
And \textit{here} enjoy thy love.\textsuperscript{86}
\end{quote}

The hymns of Henry Alline, sung by New Lights in Nova Scotia churches (and beyond), expressed the emotions that were valued in their community. Like his conversion narrative, Alline structured the hymnbook to articulate the emotional transformations of the Christian life—from the hard, unfeeling heart of the awakened sinner, to the convert’s growing desire for God, and to feelings of intimacy that, when present, provided the grounds for their assurance. The

\textsuperscript{84} Alline, \textit{Hymns and Spiritual Songs}, 181-2 (Hymn 3.33).
\textsuperscript{85} Alline, \textit{Hymns and Spiritual Songs}, 333 (Hymn 5.34) and 377 (Hymn 5.89).
\textsuperscript{86} Alline, \textit{Hymns and Spiritual Songs}, 320 (Hymn 5.16); emphasis added.
emotional “transports” that they experienced (or sought) in the present were, for Alline and the New Lights, a taste of heaven on earth.

“I think I feel new desires”: The emotional self-fashioning of ordinary New Lights

“Dear Sister in Christ,” wrote Charlotte Prescott to Sarah Brown on May 23, 1790. “For So I trust ... I may call you; and tho’ we are Strangers in person yet not in heart, but Join’d in the Everlasting Love of Jesus, which I find at times to draw my mind away from all Created Good.” Prescott’s letter is one of several dozen written by Nova Scotia New Lights in in the decade after Alline’s death in 1784, and collected in a manuscript notebook by contemporary (and frequent correspondent) Thomas Bennett. Like Prescott and Brown, the New Light correspondents thought themselves to be joined in heart—an emotional community sharing common experiences and aspirations. Though the circulation of the diary and hymns of Alline was crucial to the creation of a New Light community spread throughout scattered settlements, it is the letters that reveal the sinews of this emotional community as also a textual community. Joseph Dimock wrote to Bennett on one occasion with renewal news, and claimed, “It warms my Heart while I write ... [and] while you read

87 Charlotte Prescott to Sarah Brown, May 23, 1790, in Rawlyk, ed., New Light Letters and Songs, 100. See Rawlyk, Canada Fire, 84-5.
88 Bennett (? – 1800) was a schoolmaster in the Cornwallis area in the 1780s and early 1790s, and then in 1794 moved to Liverpool, where he was a merchant. He was a frequent correspondent and sometime itinerant preacher with the New Lights. Rawlyk, ed., New Light Letters and Songs, 56; and Cuthbertson, ed., Journal of John Payzant, 47. Reprinted in chronological order in Rawlyk, ed., New Light Letters and Songs, the manuscript volume is located at the Esther Clark Wright Archives, Acadia University, Wolfville, Nova Scotia, as the Thomas Bennett accession, “New Light letters and spiritual songs” [179?], 1900.471-BEN/1. Most of the letters appear to be handwritten copies. For provenance, see Rawlyk, ed., New Light Letters and Songs, 69-72.
89 See Rosenwein, Emotional Communities, 25.
your Heart longs to be [here].” Joseph Baily simply confessed in another letter, “I feel as I write.” 90 Beyond this sense of an affectionate connection, the letters, particularly between women, were also the sites of mutual emotional fashioning. 91 The correspondents expressed their aspirations, articulated their shortcomings, and offered advice or encouragement to one another about how to cultivate the emotions valued by the New Light community. These letters are especially valuable because they demonstrate that ordinary participants in evangelical churches, and not only their leaders or well-known authors, wrestled with emotions in their theology and experience. 92

“I don’t know that I ever felt any thing”

Emotions could be a source of profound uncertainty and doubt. Charlotte Lusby, a New Light in Amherst, Nova Scotia, wrote to Thomas Bennett of her struggles to make sense of her religious feelings, and her doubts about whether she

---

92 On ordinary people, as well as elites, reflecting on their emotional experiences, see Mack, Heart Religion; and Taves, Fits, Trances, and Visions, 4. Rawlyk suggests that the similarity between the language and spirituality of ordinary New Lights and their leaders is evidence of the “democratization” of the movement. Rawlyk, Canada Fire, 99-101; and Hatch, Democratization of American Christianity. The agency of lay people in constructing their own religious and emotional identity sometimes dovetailed and sometimes conflicted with the wishes of clerical leaders; see Christie and Gauvreau, Christian Churches and their Peoples, 14. Important works on lay piety include Seeman, Pious Persuasions; and David D. Hall, Worlds of Wonder, Days of Judgment: Popular Religious Belief in Early New England (New York: Knopf, 1989).
had truly been converted.\textsuperscript{93} With a sense of exasperation, she wrote, "I wish I knew what or where I am."\textsuperscript{94} In one letter, she complained of her insensibility and cast doubt upon such religious feelings that she did have:

\begin{quote}
Sr

I take this opportunity to write to you to let you know Something of my Mind. I Can tell you how Stupid I am. It Seems to me that I am more hard and Stupid than ever I was in my life, I dont know that I ever felt any thing of the Love of God in my life. I doubt it greatly Sometimes and do at present. I thought Once and more than once that I felt happy, But I am so Stupid and hard that it Seems I am unmovable. It Seems to Me I have got Secure and Insensible, and In a manner Contented; for I feel Such a Wicked Heart that is almost Reigns Master. You must pray for me when you Can And when you are happy you must write. – I was at Meeting this day And I felt my Heart as hard as a Stone. Could any one feel so that ever was happy Before, for I am so uneven it Seems to me I must be a Stumbling block to poor Sinners. I realy wish Sometimes I was out of their way for I do hurt. Remember me to all the Girls over there. I must Conclude least I weary your patience

I Conclude yrs C.L.\textsuperscript{95}
\end{quote}

Lusby used several terms to describe what she perceived as her inability to feel the kinds of emotions that she associated with a true conversion: stupid, hard, unmovable, insensible. She admitted her frustration, for example, that at a New Light meeting, "I felt my Heart as hard as a Stone"—apparently unmoved by what she observed.


\textsuperscript{94} Charlotte Busby to Thomas Bennett, Nov. 3, 1790, in Rawlyk, ed., \textit{New Light Letters and Songs}, 115.

\textsuperscript{95} Charlotte Busby to Thomas Bennett, n.d. [1790 or 1791?], in Rawlyk, ed., \textit{New Light Letters and Songs}, 116.
Such insensibility made Lusby doubt the authenticity of her past feelings, and therefore of her conversion. She confessed, “I dont know that I ever felt any thing of the Love of God in my life” and “I thought ... that I felt happy.” It could be difficult for New Lights to gauge the sincerity and the meaning of their emotions. Such interpretation, moreover, was not the task of a moment only, since Lusby expected a sense of consistency over time—her current feelings cast doubt on her previous emotional assurances.

Counter-intuitively, at least for modern readers, Lusby identified the feelings of security and contentment as obstacles. Writing disapprovingly, she said, “It Seems to Me I have got Secure and Insensible, and In a manner Contented.” New Lights, it seems, did not want to be relieved of their emotional longings too easily; living with restlessness was preferable to what they felt to be false comfort. As she put it in an earlier letter, “Sometimes I think I am resting Short of Christ, O and unconcerned about my Soul.” Even religious feelings could be problematic. Harris Harding warned another correspondent to be vigilant about a “Natural Passion for Religion”—feelings of relief, contentment, or security that focused too much on self, and not enough on God. Staying “sensible” apparently demanded a certain continuing degree of uncertainty, examining the source and effect of one’s feelings.

Lusby concluded her letter with the worry that her uneven emotional life would prove as confusing to others in the New Light community as it was to her.

96 Emphasis added.
97 Charlotte Busby to Thomas Bennett, Aug. 4, 1790, in Rawlyk, ed., New Light Letters and Songs, 103.
New Lights modeled their feelings and emotional responses on those of others, but as Lusby's example illustrates, interpreting the affections of others was just as subjective and uncertain an endeavour as knowing one's own heart.

“Ravish’d with his Beauty”

The same year that Charlotte Lusby was writing to Thomas Bennett, her sister, Betsy (or Elizabeth) Lusby received a letter from Elizabeth Blair. Conveying the intense emotions of selfless contemplation, the letter read in part:

I have Cause to bless and adore him for what he is in himself—infinitely Holy in all his ways and Righteous in all his Judgements. O go on in the Strength of your Lord and Master, Stand in that Bless’d Cause which is Stronger than Death, for Methinks The happy day hastens when our Souls shall be disentangled from the Clogs of Mortality and we Shall awake in his Likeness And be Satisfied. – O Can it be possible that Worms of the dust will be so ravish’d with his Beauty --- Thou art fair my Love, Thou hast dove’s Eyes. O Soul-Transporting Word, God Man Mediator, “The Bright and Morning Star that leads the way.” Methinks my imprison’d [soul] longs to be gone, But O why Should I think the time long when I feel his Love and will Carry me thro all my Trials, and how fair is my love, my Sister, my Spouse. When I feel his Smiles I Can Say he is my friend in time, and will be thro Eternity; And why Should I be Impatient to be gone for he has promis’d me never to leave me nor forsake me. O that he may Empty me out of Self, for I know this Bless’d Robe of Righteousness will. And that, and that alone will stand when Heaven and Earth shall pass Away.

Compared with the self-conscious uncertainty of Charlotte Busby’s letter, Blair’s heightened language pointed away from herself, contemplating the person and work of Christ, a New Light version of the “Beatific Vision.” She anticipated a future (but

hastening) day when she would be “ravish’d with his Beauty” and finally be satisfied.

For Blair, New Lights were “lovers of Jesus,” and her letter drew from the erotic imagery of the biblical book, Song of Solomon: “Thou art fair, Thou hast dove’s Eyes,” “How fair is my love ... my Spouse.”

Like a lover, Blair’s contemplative preoccupation was with the beauty of her beloved, adoring Christ “for what he is in himself” rather than the benefits she received. Such a ravishing vision would only be realized entirely in a heavenly future. In the meantime, however, Blair’s contemplations on the glory of Christ could be “Soul Transporting” to the exclusion of more mundane concerns.

This “transporting” experience of surrendering oneself to a vision of the glory of Christ was the most desired, if often elusive, stage of New Light spirituality, and was often cultivated—as it was for Blair—by reflecting on the sharp divide between the heavenly and the earthly. Sarah Brown of Newport, Nova Scotia, wrote in ecstasy, “My Tongue fails to Express the Views of Eternal Glory ... O, a field of divine Light transports my Soul to a paradise of Joy and wonder ... O Transporting View ... O Love transporting.” And Elizabeth Prescott simply declared that she “often found [God’s] Love to transport my Soul Beyond itself.”

So God-directed, rather
than self-centred, was this “transporting” experience that Blair declared, “O that he may Empty me out of Self.” Once again, New Lights decisively asserted that the “pursuit of happiness,” that quintessential eighteenth-century preoccupation, could lead away from oneself.

Could such emotional self-surrender be cultivated? To New Light preacher Harris Harding, less control and regulation was required. He advised a Horton correspondent, “When you feel your Soul drawing after [Jesus], dont fear to let it go freely, dont Stand to examin whither it be right; nor yet to Stop here, because you have got as far as ever you did before; but let your mind Soar away to the Blessed Shore.”102 To other New Lights he wrote, “When you feel your minds Soaring away: dont fear to let them go ... O my sisters Launch out into the Great Deep of God’s Nature.”103 Harding appears to have been advocating emotional passivity: encouraging New Lights to simply lean back, as it were, as their mind was carried along in divine contemplation. This kind of yielding advice seems to run counter to much eighteenth-century writing about the affections, which stressed the careful regulation of the passions so that one was not carried away. Harding, by contrast, asserted that too much reasoned examination would prevent the soaring of the soul: “dont Stand to examin whither it be right.” And yet, even these moments of soul-

---


transporting ecstasy required preparation; Harding’s own letter assumed a kind of emotional apprenticeship, instructing fellow converts how to respond common hesitations, and how to overcome self-consciousness.

“All our desires, inclinations and pursuits must be turned on another way”

A letter by New Light Nancy Lawrence described the everyday emotional renovation envisioned by the New Light community. Lawrence was converted to New Light religion while on a visit to Nova Scotia, despite her staunchly anti-revivalist family background, and shortly thereafter married a New Light merchant not far from Cornwallis Township. One of her letters expressed a nuanced understanding of the relationship between natural passions and religious affections. What is required, she wrote, was nothing less than a change of heart, the transformation of nature by grace. While all eighteenth-century writers on the affections were convinced that particular emotions could be cultivated, evangelicals did not share Enlightenment optimism that this was a change automatically within everyone’s reach. Lawrence said that left to ourselves, “we partake of the fallen nature,” in need of being “reinstated in that Image of God which we lost by the fall.”

We must have our nature, our hearts changed by regenerating Grace by the operations of the spirit of God with our Spirits or never enter the Kingdom of Heaven... I dont mean that the animal nature must be changed; but that all our desires, inclinations and pursuits must be turned on another way—or wills & affections renewed, and the chief end and aim of all our actions be to Glorify God and enjoy him, by this change we are brought to delight in holiness and conformity to the will of God and have a foretaste of Heaven while on earth which must be or we never shall behold his face in love in an unregenerate state.

104 For biographical information on Lawrence, see Rawlyk, ed., New Light Letters and Songs, 351-54; and Rawlyk, Canada Fire, 86-90.
Heaven would not be a seat of happiness to us—but the reverse for we would not have all the faculties of our souls engaged and delighted in praising God and beholding the spotless purity and holyness of his nature in admiring the Glorious plan of salvation, the wonders of redeeming love and the riches of free grace.\textsuperscript{105}

The emotional work of conversion, she said, was meant to achieve nothing less than that “all our desires, inclinations and pursuits must be turned on another way.” Rather than simply a display of some feelings at some times, all the affections must be renewed.

Lawrence suggested that a key measure of such a change of affections was what a person most enjoyed. She drew on the language of the 1646-47 Westminster Shorter Catechism’s first statement—“The chief end of man is to glorify God and enjoy him forever”—and used a vocabulary of delight, admiration, and enjoyment. Such a change of affections, wrote Lawrence, was a “foretaste of Heaven while on earth.” It anticipates the more complete transformation of persons when they come face to face with God, since contemplation in this life at least begins to transfigure the heart and will.

Lawrence articulated, in the short compass of this letter, themes that were central to works such as Jonathan Edwards’\textit{s Treatise on the Religious Affections}, especially the idea that renewed affections were recognized by the inclination of the heart, and the emphasis on delight. Lawrence, that is, writes as one familiar with the affective strain of Puritan teaching and the theological works of moderate

\textsuperscript{105} Nancy Lawrence to Sally Bass, Aug. 1789, in Rawlyk, ed., \textit{New Light Letters and Songs}, 276. Lawrence’s letter was not in the Bennett collection, but she was active in the same New Light networks at the same time.
evangelicals, and she did not find their emphases inconsistent with the teachings of the New Light community in Nova Scotia.

Although Lawrence’s was a theologically moderate view of the religious affections, emphasizing a long-term emotional transformation as well as moments of ecstasy, she was conscious that her stress on grace to effect such a change of heart rendered her suspect, even among some religious communities. “I am well aware,” she admitted, “this will be stiled entailusiasm, perhaps hypocrisy or insanity.” While she shared the eighteenth-century’s preoccupation with the affections, Lawrence and other evangelicals did not adopt the Enlightenment’s optimism about unaided human nature, or the individual’s ability to redirect their passions in a new direction.

“I think I feel new Desires”

The cultivation of particular religious emotions was a defining communal activity for Nova Scotia New Lights, one performed by ordinary participants and not only by its ordained leaders. To return to the example of Charlotte Prescott, she gratefully responded to Sarah Brown, with the wish, “D[ea]r Sister, that I may be able to follow the Good advice you give me in your letter.”106 Prescott’s letter picked up on several of the themes identified in other New Light correspondence. New Lights, she stated, were “Join’d in the “Everlasting Love of Jesus, which I find at times to

draw my mind away from all Created Good.” There were moments, that is, when she found herself unselfconsciously contemplating divine love. But like most of the other letter writers, Prescott experienced the transformation of her emotions as a struggle and a field of effort. She continued,

I think I feel new Desires … But 0 I find a Heart that is deceitfull above all things, Desperately wicked, prone to wander from Heavenly friend and often do in by and forbidden paths. Yet like a tender parent does he bring me back and Cause me to Rejoice in his Unchangeable Love which I find to be the Same yesterday, to Day, and for ever.

Her hesitant perception that she felt “new Desires,” points to her understanding, like that of Nancy Lawrence, that conversion included a new inclination of the heart, the renewal of the affections. Unlike divine love, however, she expressed the notion that her own feelings were quite changeable, and therefore required both God’s grace and her own constant attention. She admitted, “tho I Cannot Say my mind is in that happy frame that I have in times past, Yet I know he is faithful who has promis’d never to leave me nor forsake me.” Prescott, that is, aspired to selfless contemplation and steady emotional transformation, but understood this as finally a heavenly goal, realized only partially in this life, and was a struggle best attempted in community.

**Conclusion**

The thoughtful concern with which ordinary New Lights reflected on their emotions, the effort they invested to cultivate specific affections, and the extent to which their homespun advice mirrored themes in more refined sentimental culture, belies the easy polarization historian George Rawlyk expressed in his comment that
“New Light Christianity is a religion of the heart, not the head.”\textsuperscript{107} To be sure, New Lights were particularly concerned about heart-felt faith and aspired to moments of rapture. Yet ordinary New Lights were not unthinking or merely impulsive in the cultivation of their affections. To the contrary, they approached their emotional self-fashioning reflectively and intentionally, if not always with refinement. The writings of theologians and philosophers on affection and sentiment, in turn, had resonance because these were issues that concerned ordinary people in their daily lives.

Paying more detailed attention to the emotional lives of so-called enthusiasts also decenters revivals in historical accounts of evangelical religion. That is not to gainsay the importance of conversions or camp meetings; it is a recognition, rather, that there was a wider spectrum of lived emotional and religious experience apart from those events. And as impulsive as those moments of religious ecstasy may have appeared, even they were usually achieved only when individuals cultivated, worried about, and reflected upon the emotions that helped to define their community.

\footnote{Rawlyk, ed., \textit{New Light Letters and Songs}, 71.}
“I am a lover of peace and order, both in church & state, and firmly opposed to all usurpers & disorganizers in either.” So wrote Stephen Jones, a judge and Congregational layman in Machias, Maine, in an October 1796 letter, in which he charged New Light itinerants from Nova Scotia of being usurpers, overturning that very peace and order.¹ To Edward Manning, his brother James, and fellow preacher James Murphy, he asserted, “I believe that you ... are men of warm imaginations, that your minds have been wrought upon, and that a spirit of enthusiasm has seized you, and that you have worked yourselves up into a religious frenzy.” Jones’s letter described the Nova Scotians with some of the most typical features of early modern “enthusiasm.” He alleged that the New Lights based their preaching on “the extraordinary influences and ministrations of the Spirit,” that they had special access to the mind of God. Jones bluntly pointed to what he thought was the real source of their ministry:

Through an intemperate zeal, you have worked yourselves into a belief that you are the first favourites of Almighty God, and that he does and must work by your instrumentality. ... your extraordinary feelings arise from the force of your own wild imaginations.

¹ Stephen Jones to Edward Manning, Oct. 31, 1796, Edward Manning Collection, Esther Clark Wright Archives, Acadia University, Wolfville, NS. Hereafter, items in this collection will be cited as Manning Collection. For the context, see Mancke, Fault Lines, 116-8; and Bell, ed., Newlight Baptist Journals, 91-2.
Rather than divine inspiration, Jones asserted that the “extraordinary feelings” on which the enthusiasts boldly based their authority arose merely from undisciplined imaginations and unregulated emotions. And like other early modern commentators, he thought their alleged enthusiasm bordered on insanity; Manning and his associates spoke in “a jumble of words, not half articulated, and bellowed out with all the violence of a madman.” The Nova Scotians also presented a populist challenge to the authority of the local minister. Jones contended that Murphy “declared that no minister ever went to heaven who penned his sermons and preached by notes, or that had received a liberal Education,” and that Manning mentioned the incumbent minister in his public prayers, “as an unconverted person.” If only, Jones enjoined, their minds could “be improved by reading and study” and “brought to reason on Divine things,” they would surely discover the disordered passions that actually motivated their actions.

Manning’s letter of response a few days later complicates Jones’s portrayal of him as an enthusiast. On the one hand, Manning clearly expressed an individualistic, highly affective version of Christianity. He said, “I believe that True Religion is in the heart, that it is a divine Principle implanted there By the finger of God”—rhetoric that did position Manning’s evangelical faith as a challenge to forms of religion that he judged to be more concerned with “externals.” And against Jones’s claim that Manning spoke of God in irreverent, overly-familiar terms, Manning countered that personal, experiential piety was essential: “Nor can there be True Religion without a Praying heart.” However, Manning rejected the charge that “it is a great Piece of

2 Manning to Jones, Nov. 11, 1796, “Other documents,” D1846.001/3/7, Manning Collection.
Inthusiasm” for him to be so sure of his calling or to be certain of his salvation. To demonstrate that seeking such emotional assurance was not an innovation or aberration (and perhaps to rebut Jones’ claim that Manning was unencumbered by any learning), he quoted three Calvinist authorities—Puritan John Flavel, the Westminster Confession of Faith, and George Whitefield—to bolster his sentiments (though including Whitefield would not have allayed Jones’s concerns). While he allowed that Murphy may have spoken imprudently, he denied the claim of anti-intellectualism, and wrote in the strongest terms of their esteem for “divines who many Times Preached by Notes, and men who have been Liberally educated.” And though he did not deny that their itinerant preaching fomented separations and divisions in Machias churches, he rejected the charge of enthusiasm and the indictment of their actions as self-interested or for pecuniary gain. Manning still sounded like an enthusiast, at least to listeners like Jones—employing the language of the heart, and relying on an impassioned, extemporaneous, and persuasive preaching style. As an itinerant, he and his New Light associates presented a real challenge to established church authorities and boundaries, preaching an unsettling message of radical interiority. Yet Manning’s willingness to praise learned theologians and to identify with Calvinist writers, and his jealous defense of his reputation and sentiments, suggests that Manning was also more than an enthusiast.

---

As it happens, in 1796 Manning was midway through a striking emotional and religious transformation. Despite his marked differences with Jones, within less than a decade Manning would set aside his populism and antagonism to learned culture, and for the rest of his long life Manning was a prolific reader, established an extensive correspondence network of authors and publishers, and was involved with the founding of two colleges. Notwithstanding the emotional intensity, heterodoxy, and divisiveness of Manning’s early itinerant preaching, he became a firm advocate for orderly worship and orthodox Calvinism, became the Baptist minister for Cornwallis Township, and was instrumental in the emergence of the Baptists of the Maritime provinces as a respectable denomination.

Historian George Rawlyk emphasized the sharp discontinuities in the religious and emotional development of Manning and his former New Light peers:

“Thus, in their search for respectability and order, the Nova Scotia Baptist leadership jettisoned much of the emotionalism and evangelical spirituality which

---

4 On Manning, see Barry M. Moody, “Manning, Edward,” in Dictionary of Canadian Biography (Toronto and Laval: University of Toronto / Université Laval, 1985). Rawlyk, Ravished by the Spirit, 80-103; idem, Canada Fire, 66-8, 77-84; and Goodwin, Into Deep Waters, 98-125.

Julian Gwyn draws upon Manning’s extensive diary for its portrayal of Manning’s social environment in “The King’s County World of the Reverend Edward Manning to 1846,” Journal of the Royal Nova Scotia Historical Society 16 (2013): 1-18. Filiopietistic treatments of Manning include I. E. Bill, Fifty Years with the Baptist Ministers and Churches of the Maritime Provinces of Canada (Saint John, NB: Barnes and Co., 1880), 129-41; and Edward Manning Saunders, History of the Baptists of the Maritime Provinces (Halifax, NS: John Burgoyne, 1902). (Saunders was one of many people named after Manning throughout the Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Maine.) The primary sources for studying Manning’s life and thought are extensive, including a diary from 1807-1846, and approximately 800 letters from correspondents throughout the Maritime provinces and New England. They are located in the Edward Manning Collection of the Esther Clark Wright Archives, Acadia University, Wolfville, Nova Scotia, D1846.001. I am grateful to former University Librarian Sara Lochhead and University Archivist Patricia Townsend for permission to use a complete typed transcript of the Manning diary, created by Freeman Fenerty in consultation with Barry Moody.
was at the heart of Alline's message." Manning's message, Rawlyk claimed, "no longer emphasized—as it had—the central importance of feelings and impressions." To be sure, the Manning of the 1830s is almost unrecognizable from the enthusiast who confronted Jones in the 1790s. And yet, there were important continuities underlying Manning's religious experiences. Daniel Goodwin has persuasively argued, against Rawlyk's declensionist narrative, that Manning and other nineteenth-century Calvinistic Baptists retained a strong emphasis on experiential piety, even as they sought order and built respectable institutions. Nor were they any less feeling.

This chapter will show that feelings and emotions did, in fact, continue to have central importance for Manning, though in a different way. Manning continued to emphasize the religious affections, although—rounding off the rough edges of his earlier enthusiasm—he downplayed the ecstasy of the moment in favour of longer-term emotional habits. He also cultivated new social passions. Sympathy became crucial to Manning, as he imagined his place in expanding emotional communities. Fellow-feeling helped him to identify with a transnational evangelical community, and his tearful, intensely emotional reading demonstrates how evangelicals used sympathy to respond to missionary and imperial expansion. Without surrendering his emphasis on heart religion and experiential piety, Manning cultivated more communal affections.

5 Rawlyk, Ravished by the Spirit, 86.
6 Rawlyk, Ravished by the Spirit, 83. Rawlyk goes further, asserting that for Manning and other former New Lights, their "abandonment of Allinite principles had created a certain emotional emptiness in their religious lives;" Ravished by the Spirit, 118. See Rawlyk, ed., New Light Letters and Songs, 64.
7 Goodwin, Into Deep Waters.
The Making and Remaking of an Enthusiast

Manning narrated his New Light conversion as a prolonged, overwhelming emotional experience. But his experience was also another illustration of how difficult it could be, even for “enthusiasts,” to feel the emotions to which they aspired, and the disconcerting uncertainty about how to read their own affections. Manning, who emigrated with his family from County Monaghan, Ireland, to Nova Scotia in about 1770, was still a boy when Henry Alline began to kindle the province’s New Light revivals. He later recalled Alline comforting him, then aged ten years, on the execution of his father, Peter Manning, for murdering a neighbour. “I well remember his addressing me, though but a child, and the tears dropping from his face upon mine, while he exhorted me to flee from the wrath to come.” Though Alline cast a long shadow over Manning’s life, it was not until after the evangelist’s death that Manning underwent what he described as his conversion. In 1789, when he was 23 years old, a period of “reformation” was sweeping through Falmouth, led by local New Light preachers such as John Payzant. Manning wrote that “at meetings, many times, when poor Souls would cry out under concern for their Souls’ Salvation, my heart would be affected.” Over the next several months, he oscillated

---

8 This account of Manning’s conversion is based primarily on his undated manuscript, “Reminiscences,” Manning Collection, 1846.001/3/1. Quotations in this section are from the “Reminiscences,” unless otherwise noted. See also the historical notes Manning sent to Rhode Island Baptist, David Benedict: Manning, Notes on the History of the Baptist Denomination in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island [18??], 1846.001/3/3; and manuscript fragment of notes on New Lights and religion in Nova Scotia for David Benedict, (“Other documents,” Manning Collection, 1846.001/3/7). Also see Rawlyk, Canada Fire, 77-84.

9 Payzant was, in an ironic twist, the son-in-law of the man killed by Manning’s father.
between awakened affections, periods of “dulness,” and even mocking others under religious conviction.

But then one Sabbath morning Manning was particularly affected by the emotional displays of others in the meeting house—by “tears Rolling down [their] cheeks like rain,” and by sinners “crying for mercy.” “Every Word, Sigh or groan” which was uttered in the congregation,” Manning said, “were as daggers to my Heart, and brought Tears from my Eyes in abundance.” This, he said “was the first time I ever did the like in a public Congregation.” In vivid language, he recalled, “The World wore a different aspect in my view from what ever it did before” and “all my desire now was to be converted.” For several more days, Manning endured many “melancholy moments” and was in an “agony of ... soul.” He reflected that the words of one of Alline’s hymns articulated the emotional dilemma he was in: “O Hardened, Hardened heart of mine.... / The greatest grief that I endure ... Is that I am distressed no more, with this unfeeling mind. / I mourn because I cannot mourn.” More than anything else, Manning agonized about not being able to generate the feelings of sorrowful repentance that he thought should mark a sincere convert. The moment of relief finally arrived at another meeting not long after when, as he later described it, he relinquished the belief that he could save himself, confessing that, “God must do the Work at last.” “That instant I let go my hold,” he wrote, “I felt a Ray of Light Steal into my Soul, And I felt glad” and for about a half an hour he was "lost to the things of Time and Sense.” He said that an “unusual peace Seemed to swallow up My whole Soul with wonder and admiration.”
Despite the intensity of that moment, Manning still doubted his religious feelings. He thought that perhaps he “felt a particular Love to the Christians which I had never felt before,” but then wondered if this was nothing more than “natural affection.” His heart was, he said, “melted with A sense of the Love of God,” but he was inclined to distrust these impressions. Expressing the uncertainty that New Lights could experience as they attempted to interpret their own emotions, he asked whether there was “a possibility of my being converted and not knowing it.” He admitted his confusion about these new sensations to one woman, saying, “I felt strangely and could not tell the meaning of it.” In the end, it was talking to others who had previously experienced conversion, comparing their changes of feelings with his own, that finally allowed Manning to turn from self to God: “This I know: my Soul was wrapt up in God’s Eternal Love. I felt nothing but that Glory.” Manning’s conversion narrative certainly had the ecstatic climax that seemed quintessential of the emotional style of the New Lights. But the emotional tumult of the months leading to that transformation also illustrate how fraught religious feelings were, and how difficult it was for ordinary people to make sense of those feelings, or to generate the affections to which they aspired.

Within a few months of his conversion, Manning had joined a cadre of young New Light itinerants who preached throughout Nova Scotia, New Brunswick’s St. John River valley, and into Maine. For a period of about two years beginning in 1791, Manning was prominent among a group within the New Light community who believed they were privy to a “new dispensation” from the Holy Spirit—the movement that provoked Handley Chipman to write his 1793 essays on emotions,
bodily gestures, and reading feelings as moral evidence (see Chapter 2). According to John Payzant, the minister of the New Light church in Cornwallis, Manning and his brother, James, said in a church meeting that, “all orders were done away, and that the Bible was a dead letter, and they would preach without it.” Manning “in particular, was insinuating these Eronious Sentiments in yong people minds.” Payzant contended that by disavowing religious authority, order, and orthodox doctrine, that the “New Dispensation” party had “cut off the reins of government.” Chipman wrote in 1793, that “Mr. Ed[ward] Manning used frequently to make Such a noise in his Preaching and Praying that perhaps not half his Sentences could be understood. But he Seems to be got over it in some measure.” He may have “got over it,” but Manning’s was not an immediate change. Manning was ordained by the Cornwallis New Light Church in 1795, but despite this apparent nod to order, in 1796 his intensely emotional preaching and lingering elements of his religious populism still elicited the charge of enthusiasm from Stephen Jones of Machias.

In the decade following the 1796 Machias encounter, Manning and many of his New Light peers underwent a series of linked changes in their piety, embracing Baptist ecclesiology, moderate Calvinist theology, a concern with order, and the necessity of a more learned ministry. Manning’s diary, extant for the last half of his life, offers evocative evidence of his prolific reading. Sounding very much like Stephen Jones, Manning came to write that, “Reading and good literature” and

---

10 Journal of John Payzant, 47.
11 Chipman, Essays, i.4. See Goodwin, Into Deep Waters, 102-104, on the experiences that led Manning to distance himself from the New Dispensation movement.
intellectual “improvement” is a “necessary hand-maid” to religion. Manning also participated in an extensive correspondence network throughout New England and the Maritime provinces, contributed regularly to religious periodicals, was involved with the founding of schools that eventually became Colby College, Maine, and Acadia University, Nova Scotia, and acquired a reputation as “a man of abilities and great reading.” The piety he sought to cultivate was, as he once expressed it, “learned, and yet truly evangelical.” Daniel Goodwin argues that Manning “attempted to direct the New Light movement into a more balanced form of evangelicalism where ecstatic religious experience would always be tempered by order.” Manning, it seems, was an enthusiast no more.

The distance Manning traveled from his earlier views might also be measured by his reaction, in the early 1820s, to the writings of Henry Alline and Jonathan Scott, and to the rapturous worship of John Payzan’s New Light congregation. Years after his own change of sentiments Manning reread Scott’s Brief View. His reflections in his diary on that reading express how completely he disavowed his former views: “Have been reading Mr. Scott against Mr. H. Alline. Scott is in the right, and A. of course is in the wrong. Hope they were both good men, tho’ both in some things it is probable were wrong, but I think I could seal Mr. S.’s

---

12 Manning Diary, April 4, 1821, Manning Collection.
13 Manning Diary, June 5, 1823, Manning Collection.
14 Manning Diary, July 10, 1823, Manning Collection. Manning was admiring the evangelicalism of British Baptist theologian and memoirist, John Ryland.
15 Goodwin, Into Deep Waters, 106.
16 On the transformation of Manning and a cadre of ministerial colleagues from New Lights to Baptists, including their emotional moderation, see especially Bell, ed., Newlight Baptist Journals, 2-35; and Goodwin, Into Deep Waters.
sentiments generally with my blood!” The next day he expressed sympathy with
the disruptions that Scott experienced in the face of the New Light revivals. “Spent
this day pretty much in reading Mr. Scott’s publication. Poor man, he had much
affliction on account of Mr. Alline. Mr. A. was verry erronious, but I hope is gone to
rest, but his errors did not die with him. NO, they live to the Sorrow of many, and me
among the rest.” Manning was troubled, rather than heartened, by the persistence
of New Light or Allinite beliefs and practices in the township.

In the early 1790s, John Payzant had attempted to moderate Manning’s
antinomian enthusiasm. But in the early 1820s, it was Manning who found Payzant
suspect. He thought that Payzant interpreted the scriptures too “mystically,” and
that his focus on interiority tended to allow “contempt of the visible ordinances of
the Gospel.” Calling Payzant’s sermon “good generally, though somewhat confused
for so great a man,” he admitted, “I wish for clearer preaching.” In September 1821,
Manning visited Payzant’s Liverpool congregation. Unlike many of his New Light
peers in Nova Scotia, Payzant had not become a Baptist. Manning was discomfited
by the sensory experiences of a once-familiar New Light service, punctuated by
demonstrative gestures and intense emotions. He described sitting in the gallery of
the meetinghouse following the observance of the Lord’s Supper, when a number of

17 Manning Diary, Nov. 27, 1820, Manning Collection.
18 Manning Diary, Nov. 28, 1820, Manning Collection.
19 Moody, "From Itinerant to Pastor." On the persistence of the New Light / Allinite tradition
in the region, see David G. Bell, “The Allinite Tradition and the New Brunswick Free
Christian Baptists, 1830-1875,” in An Abiding Conviction: Maritime Baptists and Their World,
Preachers and the Struggle for the New Brunswick Christian Conference, 1828-38,” in
Revivals, Baptists, and George Rawlyk, 93-112.
20 Manning Diary, Sept. 28, 1820, Manning Collection; see Sept. 29-30.
females “screamed out ... [with] an extravagancy of Voice, and such uncommon
gesticulations, leaving their seats, running round the broad [a]isle, Swinging their
Arms, bowing their heads to the Ground.” Manning commented, “I hope they are
good, but I truly wish they were more orderly.” Indicating how much his emotional
responses had changed from his own New Light days, he confessed, “surely I would
freeze to death before that would warm me;” his affections would be raised, rather,
by “a few words of evangelical Truth,” even if delivered by a child. After two more
days of meetings in the Liverpool area, Manning concluded:

O how much I esteem the Solemn devotions of the truly pious, and
well-informed Christian assemblies I have Seen. I decidedly prefer the
Solemn exercises of the pious in Cornwallis to the uncommon
Vociferations of these Persons in and about Liverpool. They seem to
know no better than that they are never in the liberty of the Gospel
but when they are all agitated and their Voices extended so that you
can hear them for a Mile.

In Manning’s assessment, New Lights continued to equate spiritual liberty with a full
and free expression of emotions, particularly with their voices and bodies. He, on
the other hand, had embraced the more restrained “Solemn devotions.” Despite
Manning’s framing of the difference between the two pieties as “informed” versus
those that “know no better,” both emotional styles entailed intentional cultivation in
the context of their communities, restraint as much as demonstrativeness. That
Manning was repelled by emotional expressions that had once come naturally to
him suggests the extent of the transformation of his habits of feeling.

21 Manning Diary, Sept. 2, 1821, Manning Collection.
22 Manning Diary, Sept. 4, 1821, Manning Collection.
23 See Scheer, “Are Emotions a Kind of Practice.” Manning’s strong reaction to New Light
passions may have had a gendered aspect. He particularly drew attention to the females in
the Liverpool meeting, disturbed by their “screeching” and movement about the aisles of the
“I am happy, happy, happy ... But I do not depend on Raptures”

In leaving behind his enthusiasm, Manning did not disregard emotions altogether. His extensive diary, from 1810-1846, portrays the affective dimension of his religious life to be one of Manning’s greatest preoccupations, and emotional self-fashioning as one of the main purposes in his reading and journaling. To be sure, he sought to rein in and regulate the more enthusiastic passions of his New Light years. Yet emotional experience remained central, even as Manning adopted different theological frameworks for understanding his (and others’) feelings. He still expected occasional moments of spiritual ecstasy, but the emphasis was different:

I am happy, happy, happy, in the blessed Jesus, the God-Man Mediator, God’s Eternal Son, and My Eternal Surety. O, [I] want all to know how much comfort I have and do find in this blessed PLAN. But I do not depend on Raptures, but on Christ, but this trust produces Raptures sometimes, but they are not so much an evidence of Grace as holiness.24

Manning no longer believed, as he had in the 1790s, that religious feelings could be read as certain evidence of one’s salvation. The older Manning regarded changed affections as one aspect of the growth of holy character after salvation. In theological terms, emotions shifted from being a marker of conversion to evidence

meetinghouse. It may be that Manning felt that such prominent displays of one kind of female piety subverted the authority of the predominantly male ministers and deacons. Later the same day, while visiting with a Liverpool family, Manning was put off by the forthright conversation of the woman of the house: “I do not like to have an uninformed Woman take all the talk and so amaizing loquacious, and to be talking all the time when I am endeavouring to impart instruction. Told her so and she was more moderate.” Manning Diary, Sept. 2, 1821, Manning Collection. See Rawlyk, Canada Fire, 129-30. For the role of women in public church life, see Hannah M. Lane, “Women and Public Prayer in the Mid-Nineteenth-Century ’Calvinistic’ Baptist Press of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia,” in Canadian Baptist Women, ed. Sharon M. Bowler (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2016), 3-19; and David G. Bell, “Allowed Irregularities: Women Preachers in the Early 19th-Century Maritimes,” Acadiensis 30, no. 2 (2001): 3-39.

24 Manning Diary, March 23, 1821, Manning Collection.
of sanctification. Manning also came to believe that Christians should expect a variegated emotional life; he did not always expect raptures. In the worlds of author Charles Buck, in a book that Manning read with warm approval in the 1830s, “Let it not be understood, however, that by happy experience I always mean remarkable high emotions, ecstatic pleasures, or ravishing transports.”25 Or, as Manning put it, he could be “happy, happy, happy,” without depending on raptures.

Manning was particularly drawn to authors who also wrestled with the affective dimension of religious life. From a friend in Halifax he borrowed Puritan books such as John Owen’s The Grace and Duty of Being Spiritually Minded (1681) and John Flavel’s Treatise on Keeping the Heart (1691).26 Such reading, he said, “tends to solemnize my mind.”27 He read the affectionate writings of eighteenth-century English dissenters Philip Doddridge and Isaac Watts, including the latter’s The Use and Abuse of the Passions in Religion (1729).28 Manning thought that these

26 For his reading of Owen, see Manning Diary, Jan. 19-20, 1821 and Feb. 15, 1821, and for Flavel, see Manning Diary, April 20, 1821 and April 29, 1843, Manning Collection. John Owen, Phronema Tou Pneumatos; or, the Grace and Duty of Being Spiritually Minded: Declared and Practically Improved (London: J. Murgatroyd, 1798); John Flavel, A Treatise on Keeping the Heart (New Brunswick, NJ: A. Blauvelt, 1801).
27 Manning Diary, Jan. 27, 1821, Manning Collection.
28 For his reading of Doddridge, see, for example, Manning Diary, July 29, 1825; and for Watts, see Manning Diary, April 2, 1821, Manning Collection. Isaac Watts, Discourses of the Love of God and the Use and Abuse of the Passions in Religion ... To Which Is Prefix’d, a Plain and Particular Account of the Natural Passions, with Rules for the Government of Them (London: J. Clark and R. Hett, 1729).
“old puritannical divines” were so valuable because they combined robust Calvinist orthodoxy with a devotional emphasis on the “enjoyment of the comforts of religion.” In Jonathan Edwards’s Treatise on Religious Affections (1746), Manning found the theological framework that made sense of his own religious affections, and the moderate Calvinism he had adopted. As he put it on October 22, 1822, “Reading Edwards on the Affections again. Confirms me more and more in the truth of what I have been endeavouring to exhibit for these many years.”

Edwards formulated his ideas about the religious affections at the intersection of Enlightenment philosophy and controversial religious awakenings. In one direction, Edwards looked toward the Lockean emphasis on sense perception, and then the sentimental responses to Locke by the Third Earle of Shaftesbury and Francis Hutchinson. Edwards maintained their emphasis on the affections, but denied that virtuous feelings could be naturally generated, but must be supplied by grace—a “spiritual sense.”

Looking in another direction (one particularly relevant to Manning and Nova Scotia’s reconstructed New Lights), Edwards’s theology of the affections addressed the controversies provoked by the emotional displays associated with the Great Awakening. Not only did opponents of the revival, such as Boston’s Charles Chauncy, decry the spread of “enthusiasm,” but Edwards himself was horrified by excessive passions or fervor that did not result in

29 Manning Diary, July 29, 1825, Manning Collection.
30 Manning Diary, Oct. 22, 1822, Manning Collection.
lasting transformation of character. Edwards attempted to articulate a theology of
the affections that affirmed their centrality to religious experience, but also
distinguished between “gracious” and “false” affections. Like Manning, Edwards
sought a way to cultivate religious affections without encouraging enthusiasm.

Manning thought that Edwards’s treatise was “verry clear in discriminating
between true and false fear and joy, and that it was a Sifting, Doctrinal, and
Experimental and deep publication.”32 He did worry, though, that it might be
“beyond the capacity of many Zealots for experimental religion.” He did not think
this because of the clarity of the work itself, but rather that those who focused so
much on religious experience would be inured against a book that “goes directly to
condemn their flights.”33 Manning admitted that reading Edwards not only gave him
the intellectual framework he needed, but also affected him personally; his work, he
wrote, “I think has a tendency to make me more devotional.”34

Manning also drew upon the work of Andrew Fuller (1754-1815). The most
influential British Baptist theologian of the late eighteenth century, Fuller
articulated a moderate Calvinism compatible with evangelical revivalism, and which
provided the theological rationale for missionary activism, such as the mission to
India initiated by Fuller’s close friend, William Carey.35 As Daniel Goodwin has
argued, Manning and other Maritime Baptists found in Fuller a respectable

32 Manning Diary, Apr. 19, 1822; Apr. 8, 1822, Manning Collection.
33 Manning Diary, Apr. 8, 1822, Manning Collection.
34 Manning Diary, Oct. 22, 1822, Manning Collection.
35 On Fuller, see Peter J. Morden, The Life and Thought of Andrew Fuller, 1754-1815 (Milton
Keynes, Bucks, UK: Paternoster Press, 2015); and Keith S. Grant, Andrew Fuller and the
Evangelical Renewal of Pastoral Theology (Milton Keynes, Bucks, UK: Paternoster Press,
2013), especially ch. 3.
theological framework and an emphasis on social reform that did not require them to sacrifice their evangelicalism.\textsuperscript{36} Fuller himself was profoundly influenced by Edwards’s writing on the affections, and warned ministers from preaching an “unfelt gospel.”\textsuperscript{37} In a sermon on the importance of “an intimate acquaintance with divine truth,” Fuller contended that feeling and doctrine were complementary, rather than opposed. He wrote, “Knowledge and affection have a mutual influence on each other. ... Affection is fed by knowledge ... By the expansion of the mind the heart is supplied with objects which fill it with delight.”\textsuperscript{38} When Manning read that sermon in 1822, he professed, “I find ... the sentiments of my own heart better expressed than I could express them myself.”\textsuperscript{39} More than twenty years later, Manning was still reading Fuller regularly, and wrote, “I am much taken with [his] sentiments and heart religion.”\textsuperscript{40} As will be discussed below, Manning also read Fuller’s biographies through the lens of his own emotional self-fashioning.

There was a fine line between evangelical heart religion and enthusiasm. It could be difficult to maintain an affective piety without succumbing to subjectivism or sheer emotionalism. Yet by avoiding the ditch of enthusiasm on one side, it was possible to fall into cold rationalism on the other. Commenting on one Church of England author, Manning explained the dilemma: “He has to soften many points to keep from the charge of enthusiasm that it rather tends to blunt the edge of

\textsuperscript{36} Goodwin, Into Deep Waters, 13, 122-5.
\textsuperscript{38} Fuller, Works, vol. 1, 169.
\textsuperscript{39} Manning Diary, Sept. 2, 1822, Manning Collection.
\textsuperscript{40} Manning Diary, Nov. 11, 1845, Manning Collection.
While it was easy to distinguish between enthusiasts and rationalists, Manning constructed an approach to religious emotions that attempted to maintain the tension between experience and reason. He continued to seek “raised affections [and] true zeal.”

“A sweet union”: Emotional community across borders

In the 1790s, Charles Inglis worried that the religious passions of New Lights like Manning would be a solvent to social order. He insisted that loyalty and enthusiasm ran in opposite directions. In a way, he was right. Henry Alline’s message, spread while the American Revolution was waged, was never overtly republican—if anything, it was indifferent to political events and allegiances—but its strong individualism did challenge the traditional supports of community life. The later Edward Manning, by contrast, maintained both the personal heart religion of evangelicalism and a broad set of social concerns, including education, temperance, and global missions. But if Manning was not so indifferent to social order and social reform as Alline, neither did his social affections neatly align with nationalist or imperial loyalties. By virtue of his itinerancy, correspondence, and consumption of print, he participated in both American and British cultures. He wrote with gratitude that his “Nation and Province” was blessed with “civil and religious liberty in an eminent degree” but he also described the United States (with apparent sincerity) as the “Land of light and Liberty.” Manning’s political feelings,
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41 Manning Diary, March 29, 1823, Manning Collection.
42 Manning Diary, Jan. 20, 1821, Manning Collection.
43 Manning Diary, Oct. 16, 1814; Feb. 1, 1820, Manning Collection.
at least those expressed in his spiritual journal and correspondence, tended to be subordinated to his evangelical sensibilities. Largely silent about politics in the existing record, Manning did offer a few reflections during the War of 1812 and at the defeat of Napoleon that offer insight into how his political and religious feelings intersected.

The War of 1812, for many North Americans on both sides of the border, was a period of intense nationalistic feeling. Indeed, Nicole Eustace has argued that for many American war supporters, “emotional arousal was ... the central achievement sought by American belligerents.”\footnote{Eustace, 1812: War and the Passions of Patriotism, 220. For a discussion of historiographic themes around the War of 1812, including emotions, see Rachel Hope Cleves, et al., “Interchange: The War of 1812,” \textit{Journal of American History} 99, no. 2 (2012): 520-55. For other elements of the cross-border conflict, see Alan Taylor, \textit{The Civil War of 1812: American Citizens, British Subjects, Irish Rebels, and Indian Allies} (New York: Vintage, 2010); Donald R. Hickey, \textit{The War of 1812: A Forgotten Conflict}, rev. ed. (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2012); John Boileau, \textit{Half-Hearted Enemies: Nova Scotia, New England and the War of 1812} (Halifax, NS: Formac, 2005); and Errington, \textit{The Lion, the Eagle, and Upper Canada}, ch. 4.} If the war’s military gains were dubious, the widespread sense of patriotism and national purpose was itself a kind of victory, ushering in what has been called the “Era of Good Feelings.” British North Americans also had an emotional investment in the conflict. Manning’s near contemporary, Beamish Murdoch reflected on the feelings of Nova Scotians:

The effects of the war upon this province, and particularly upon the people of Halifax, were very marked. Always sympathizing closely with the national glory of Great Britain, they were now drawn more than ever to feel a lively interest in military and naval transactions.\footnote{Beamish Murdoch, \textit{A History of Nova-Scotia or Acadie} (Halifax, NS: James Barnes, 1867), as quoted in Boileau, \textit{Half-hearted Enemies}, 25.}

But for Edward Manning, the tension between nations was an occasion for him and his American correspondents to reaffirm their participation in a transnational
affective community, sharing a common religious identity and mission. They intentionally cultivated feelings that superseded nationalistic fervor. Gordon Heath has argued that this cross-border spiritual community weathered the experience of war because of shared ideological commitments, “regardless of national or imperial loyalties.” On January 9, 1813, Manning recorded in his diary, “This day felt uneasy in the morning and unpleasant sensations. But in reading and meditation found my mind sweetly led out after God and a sweet union to American brethren, notwithstanding the dreadful war that exists between the two powers.”

Manning’s New England correspondents concurred with this cross-border affection. On the eve of the conflict, Daniel Merrill, a Baptist minister, author, and member of the Massachusetts State Legislature for 1812-13, remarked to Manning, “I wish the differences between your government and ours may be so accommodated, as to promote the good of both, and subserve Zion’s best good. But I fear a contest is before us.” He continued, “However the differences may be between the governments among men, be it our concern to be in obedience to the

---

47 Manning Diary, Jan. 9, 1813, Manning Collection.
government of God.” Rhode Island minister and author David Benedict aptly summarized the sentiment, writing to Manning, “While there is War among the nations, I hope there will be peace among the Saints.”

National interests were ultimately relativized by common evangelical hopes for revival in the short term, and an eschatological approach to history over the longer term. Patriotism was swallowed up in larger spiritual hopes for all nations. Partway through the conflict, Manning prayed, “O that the American people may be induced to come upon pacific terms, that they may not return themselves to continuing a war that they precipitated themselves into lest their obstinacy prove their ruin.” Nevertheless, he expected that wars would continue until “the commencement of the Millennium,” when peace would prevail among the nations, and there would no longer be “divisions among the professing people of the Lord.”

Political differentiation did not ultimately define or supplant their sense of belonging to a transnational evangelical community. Even at the height of political tensions, the correspondents expressed mutual affection and a fervent commitment to their common missionary project.

Manning’s response to news about the Napoleonic Wars also eschewed simple nationalism, adopting a spiritual and eschatological perspective. In late May 1814, he recorded in his journal, “Heard of the Defeat of Buonaparte and the Coronation of the French King and the success of the British Arms on the Continent of Europe. O that these successes may be a means of the establishing a general peace

49 David Benedict to Manning, July 4, 1812, Manning Collection.
50 Manning Diary, May 24, 1814, Manning Collection.
and permanent all over the world." He continued with a prayer that suggested that triumphalism had no place among Christian feelings for their nation: “O that the successes of the British Nation [may not] tend to puff them up with pride lest they fall into ruin and disrepute. For Righteousness exalteth a nation but sin is a reproach to any people.” While Manning did interpret military victories in terms of divine providence and eschatology, emphasizing God’s apparent superintendence over the events of history, this tended to impose a sobering moral obligation on the nation, rather than justifying its every deed.

The same chastened sense of national feeling was evident three days later, when Manning led the church and community in a service of thanksgiving for the military victory in France.

On application being made to have the Meeting House illuminated this evening as a token of joy and gladness on account of the victory of combined armies of Great Britain and the other confederate powers of Europe over Buoneparte and the French nation, accordingly the house was illuminated and the neighboring houses. The concourse that attended behaved discretely in the Meeting House, and, at the request of some of the respectable inhabitants of the town, I sang an appropriate hymn or two and publically acknowledged the good hand of God to our nation. Gave a short address and dismissed the people who retired from the house. Continued firing until late but which of itself would have been well enough but to spend the evening as some (I fear) did is no honor to the God of Peace, but manifest dishonor. O when will people be rational, be discreet, and be religious. Alas, not until man has done sinning. O that the Lord [would] hasten the time when nations shall have done with sinning, and then wars will cease.

Citizens of Cornwallis Township celebrated the martial success of Britain and her allies by lighting up the windows of the meetinghouse and private homes, by singing and praying in gratitude, and then by firing their guns long into the night. As Gordon
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51 Manning Diary, May 24, 1814, Manning Collection.  
52 Manning Diary, May 27, 1814, Manning Collection.
Heat observes, even as he led in this public fête, Manning was reluctant to condone the “unbridled passions that often went hand-in-hand with celebrations.”53 Despite Inglis’s fear that Nova Scotia New Lights were fomenting support for the republican passions of the French Revolution, as the long conflict in France came to a close, Manning had become as eager as Inglis to avoid any kind of enthusiasm, whether religious or political. Unwilling to give nationalism free reign, he was also communicating that for him, political loyalties were circumscribed (though not undermined) by religious identities and sentiments.

“Found my heart much inlarged”: Voluntary associations for reforming society

Manning expressed a restrained sense of imperialism, reluctant to allow national pride or political passions to overwhelm religious propriety. Yet it would be a mistake to assume that Manning, in his concern for personal salvation, exhibited the same ambivalence to society as Henry Alline. To the contrary, Manning was very optimistic that heart religion and social reform could be complementary.54 He no longer assumed, as Handley Chipman or Jacob Bailey had done, that an established church (whether Congregational or Anglican) would be the means of promoting religious virtue in society. Rather, Manning believed that the way to reform society was for individuals, stirred in their hearts, to join voluntary associations to address a mesh of linked religious and social causes, such as temperance, Bible distribution, education, and international missions. Whereas
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54 For an insightful discussion of these twinned themes in British North American evangelicalism, see Michael Gauvreau, “Protestantism Transformed: Personal Piety and the Evangelical Social Vision, 1815-1867,” in The Canadian Protestant Experience, 48-97.
Charles Inglis had asserted that enthusiasts cared so much about the heart that they disrupted social order, Manning and many evangelicals of the early nineteenth century saw voluntarism as the means to focus on individual religious experience and social reform without contradiction. The voluntary nature of these benevolent organizations meant that leaders such as Manning appealed to the affections as well as the reason of individuals in their communities. As Manning’s experience suggests, the apparent progress of these associations was perceived to be of historical and eschatological significance, freighting them with powerful emotions. Reading about these societies, Manning once remarked that he “found [his] heart much inlarged.”

Around the turn of the nineteenth century, evangelicals in the Anglo-American Atlantic turned to voluntary associations as the vehicles for religious and social activism, addressing causes as diverse as Bible and tract distribution, the promotion of Sunday schools, temperance, the abolition of slavery, international missions, prison reform, and the alleviation of poverty. While these societies focused on single issues, their leaders and participants tended to be linked.

55 Manning Diary, Feb. 1, 1820, Manning Collection.
Contemporaries provided the term “the Benevolent Empire” to describe the web of such Protestant societies in the early nineteenth-century United States, including the American Tract Society, the American Bible Society, and the American Temperance Society. “Benevolence” was the humanitarian disposition of the heart that motivated individuals to sympathize with others and turn to activism. This voluntarist, joining impulse in Protestantism mirrored developments in wider society, as an increasingly informed and active citizenry depended less on state power, political parties, or religious establishments to cultivate virtue in public life.57 Manning’s extensive journal provides an unusually detailed account of one British North American’s wholehearted participation in this movement.58 In the brief compass of this discussion it is possible only to illustrate his involvement in voluntary societies, and to highlight the intense emotions that their progress evoked.

58 For an overview of Manning’s benevolent activities, see Moody, “Manning, Edward.”
Manning was an early advocate in Nova Scotia for the British and Foreign Bible Society (BFBS), which he called, “this incomparable Society.”

Founded in England in 1804, the goal of the BFBS was to print Bibles in English without explanatory notes (and therefore avoiding theological difference) and to distribute them at little or no cost. In 1813, Manning was invited to represent the Baptists on the committee of the Nova Scotia Bible Society, and by October 1814 an auxiliary of the BFBS was formed in Cornwallis Township. Shortly after the launch of the Cornwallis auxiliary, Manning reflected on the relationship between the nation, religious associations like the BFBS, and broader society. He wrote that Nova Scotians had been given “civil and religious liberty in an eminent degree.” However, he lamented, “those liberties are lamentably abused.” Much-vaunted British liberties were not adequate on their own to cultivate national virtue; they imposed an obligation on individuals to “improve” the national blessings they enjoyed. But it would be voluntary societies like the BFBS, rather than the state itself, that would be the “instruments” of social and religious reform. That same

59 Manning Diary, June 15, 1821, Manning Collection.
61 See John Burton to Manning, Dec. 18, 1813; and T. F. Addison to Manning, March 31, 1814; and Manning Diary, Oct. 5, 1814, Manning Collection.
62 Manning Diary, Oct. 16, 1814, Manning Collection.
year, Manning wrote a circular letter to the Baptist churches of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, in which he reiterated the sense of obligation they should feel because of the constitutional liberties they enjoyed as British subjects. He asserted that their affections should be stirred, motivating them to action on behalf of the BFBS and other benevolent associations:

We think that the institution of the British and Foreign Bible society is the most benevolent institution ever formed by man. Its motive is so pure, its object so great, and the plan so well calculated (under God) to accomplish the great event of general illumination, that it must attract your attention; and we wish it may excite spirit of benevolence in the heart of every lover of the Lord Jesus to contribute freely in aid of this Godlike institution.63

Manning appealed to their affections, and like many other reform movements during the late Enlightenment, he intended to cultivate benevolence among the people. “This,” he said, “is a favourable time to show our zeal for God.”64 As will be discussed below, alongside the distribution of Bibles, Manning was also intensely interested in the wave of foreign missions that had begun in his lifetime. He was a key regional figure in the formation of missionary societies and, in 1845, the sending of New Brunswick Baptist Richard Burpee to Burma.65 Manning recorded in his journal that he was “much affected” as he read about “the many benevolent institutions found in the world.”66
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66 Manning Diary, April 30, 1818, Manning Collection.
Reading Manning’s diary, it is striking how suddenly he became persuaded by arguments for temperance, and how thoroughly he became an advocate for the movement. In the early months of 1829, when he first read temperance pamphlets and sermons by Lyman Beecher, Jonathan Kittredge, and Heman Humphrey, among others, temperance became an almost-daily preoccupation, so that it was no exaggeration for him to declare, “The subject of intemperance greatly engrosses my mind.” Manning read temperance tracts and periodicals in a variety of public settings—from family hearths to wedding receptions to labourers in farm fields—and was instrumental in the spread of local temperance societies. One might even compare Manning’s growing concern with intemperance to his anxieties about religious enthusiasm. Years later, Manning reflected on the extent to which temperance ideas had been adopted in his community, reflecting his broad reforming social vision: “I bless the Lord that I have lived to see so much done to

67 Manning Diary, Aug. 6, 1829, Manning Collection. Lyman Beecher, Six Sermons on the Nature, Occasions, Signs, Evils, and Remedy of Intemperance (Boston: Crocker & Brewster, 1827), Jonathan Kittredge, An Address Delivered before the Temperance Society of Bath, N.H. July 4, 1828. Also, an Address Delivered before the American Temperance Society at Its Second Annual Meeting, Held in Boston, Jan. 23, 1829 (Boston: Perkins & Marvin, 1829), and Heman Humphrey, Parallel between Intemperance and the Slave Trade: An Address Delivered at Amherst College, July 4, 1828 (Amherst: J. S. and C. Adams, 1828). For the role of evangelical religion in the early phases of the temperance movement, see Janet Noel, Canada Dry: Temperance Crusades before Confederation (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995), chapter 2; Sandra Lynn Barry, “Shades of Vice and Moral Glory”: The Temperance Movement in Nova Scotia, 1828-1848” (M.A. Thesis, University of New Brunswick, 1987); Ian R. Tyrrell, Sobering Up: From Temperance to Prohibition in Antebellum America, 1800-1860 (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1979); and Michael P. Young, Bearing Witness against Sin: The Evangelical Birth of the American Social Movement (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006). Noel, Canada Dry, 24-25, argues that Manning and other dissenting ministers saw the temperance cause as a means of gaining social respectability. While undoubtedly true, his emotional reactions suggest there was also something less calculated in his preoccupation with temperance, akin to a religious conversion.

68 For examples of his public reading, see Manning Diary entries in 1829: Feb. 25, March 12, May 8, July 28, Dec. 10. For the Temperance Society in Cornwallis, see Manning Diary, March 8, 1834 and July 6, 1842, Manning Collection.
prevent crime, and wretchedness by the formation of Temperance Societies, the publishing [of] temperance sermons, tracts, etc.”

As has already been mentioned, Manning the populist itinerant who was reckoned in Machias to be an opponent of liberal education became a strong supporter of education societies (later universities) in Maine and Nova Scotia. Manning’s itinerancy in Maine brought him into the orbit of the region’s Baptists who had formed the Maine Literary and Theological Institution at Waterville (later Colby College). Manning visited the Institution in 1819, was made an agent for the purposes of raising support, and was invited to move to Waterville to take a more prominent role—an offer he considered at length. Less than a decade later, the self-educated Manning was instrumental in the formation of the Baptist Education Society for the churches of the Maritime provinces, serving as its president for the rest of his life. That society supported the creation of Horton Academy, which eventually became Acadia University. From his initial ambivalence about
education, Manning came to declare, about the expanding college in Wolfville, Nova Scotia, that, “the cause of true religion needs such an institution.”

Manning and many of his contemporaries perceived the remarkable expansion of religious and benevolent associations to have unparalleled theological significance, interpreting them in a frame of optimistic millenarian eschatology. Their view was that the message of the Bible would increasingly spread, and that a great part of humanity would receive salvation. Basing their understanding of history, in part, on the Book of Revelation, chapter 20, they believed the success of such missionary efforts would inaugurate a millennium of global peace and blessing, culminating in the victorious return of Jesus Christ. The events of history, political as well as religious, could be read as signs of progress, portending the millennium. Reading about the defeat of Napoleon, for example, Manning wrote, “O that these successes may be a means of the establishing a general peace and permanent all over the world.” Wars, he contended, would end with “the commencement of the Millennium ... Then shall the curse be removed and the earth be a paradise again.”

Most importantly for Manning, the success of the missions movement, widespread Bible distribution, the advance of the temperance movement, or even nearby revivals could be read as signs of spiritual progress, soon to be followed by the Millennium. Reading of such developments in the Baptist Magazine, Manning declared that he was “much delighted,” and fervently hoped that, “Those missionary exertions and the Bible Societies and other similar institutions equally benevolent
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72 Manning Diary, Nov. 15, 1838, Manning Collection.
73 Bebbington, Evangelicalism in Modern Britain, 62, 81-86; Crawford, Seasons of Grace, 124-38; Westfall, Two Worlds, 159-90.
74 Manning Diary, May 24, 1814, Manning Collection.
will be owned and blessed of God for the introduction of [the] Millennial State and Glory.”

Little wonder, then, with such an interpretation of their historical significance, that Manning was often emotionally overwhelmed when reflecting on the progress of benevolent associations. Without abandoning his concern for evangelical piety and heart-felt experience, Manning had travelled a considerable distance from New Light ambivalence about “externals” in religion and society.

“O how many things brot tears from my eyes”: Sympathy, reading, and imagined communities

Reading was an intensely emotional experience for Edward Manning. He confided to his diary in January of 1821, “Reading the Intelligence from Burmah: the death of the King, the conversion of Maung Nau, the Death of Mr. Wheelock, ... all tend to excite various immotions.” And later the same day, “Have been reading the Magazine this day ... Many pieces have struck my mind and moved my affections. ... my heart hath quite overflowed. Various have been my immotions.”

In November 1830, he and his wife discussed the latest missionary news. He wrote, “I was so overcome that it was with much difficulty that I could keep from crying out loud; from tears I could not. My heart hath been rather soft ever since.” And of that quintessential evangelical biography, Jonathan Edwards’s Life of David Brainerd, he wrote, “O how many things brot tears from my eyes, and blushing in my face, and
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75 Manning Diary, April 29, 1818, Manning Collection.
76 See Goodwin, Into Deep Waters.
77 Manning Diary, Jan. 2, 1821, Manning Collection.
78 Manning Diary, Nov. 6, 1830, Manning Collection.
groans from my heart.” Only a few volumes of Manning’s library are still extant, but one strongly suspects that were more to be found, many of them would be tear-stained.

Manning’s tearful approach to certain kinds of reading is further evidence that he did not become less feeling as he attempted to leave aside his enthusiasm. The extensive record of his reading suggests that he sought a new framework for understanding affections in religious life, reconciling them with learned culture, rather than marginalizing feelings. Paying attention to his tears while reading is another way to measure the importance of emotion in his religious experience. In particular, his tears expressed the *sympathy*, the sense of empathetic connection, that linked Manning to religious and emotional communities beyond his Cornwallis locale.

Admittedly, such intense emotional responses to texts might seem unthinkable to modern readers. It could reasonably be asked, did he actually cry so much over his books, and if so, was such emotionalism primarily a product of an overwrought psyche? The hanging death of his father and Manning’s various insecurities certainly leave room for such speculation. However, Manning does not seem to have been constantly in tears; his descriptions were consistently connected with particular kinds of reading. Or perhaps he was writing figuratively? To be sure, there could be some exaggeration or conventions of speech at work, but on the other hand, Manning’s descriptions appear to be detailed and physical, rather than generalized. Additionally, Manning recorded these lachrymose episodes in his
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79 Manning Diary, March 26, 1835, Manning Collection.
private diary, which he had no expectation of publishing. Yet even supposing that he was, at least sometimes, writing metaphorically or conventionally, that too would be interesting, and useful as a gauge of what sentiments he thought he should have. As historian Barbara Rosenwein says of formulaic emotional phrases, “Commonplaces are socially true even if they may not be individually sincere.”

“The sources,” she says, “tell us at least what people thought other people would like to hear (or expected to hear).” It seems likely, based on the many instances of tearful reading, that Manning really did respond so viscerally to many of his religious texts, and that on other occasions he expressed the emotions he was attempting to cultivate (even if not always easily). In both kinds of situations, it appears that evangelicals expected to be moved by what they read. Manning’s reading also makes it possible to recover, at least in part, the felt experience of participating at a distance in the early events of missionary expansion. Manning’s tears were not as idiosyncratic or unusual in the context of early modern reading and religion—they, too, have a history.
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80 For brief comments on his practice of diary-keeping see Manning Diary Feb. 8, 1827 (“Will any one ever read these lines! Perhaps not. Well I have had comfort in writing them. It is one way of recording the goodness of the Lord, and my own awful depravity. But each is done imperfectly”); and July 26, 1836 (“O my God, be pleased to enable me to record anything in this simple d-y but what may be for thy glory, and what is calculated to procreate that best of all objects. Let it be inserted, however humiliating”); Manning Collection.

81 Rosenwein, Emotional Communities, 193.

Manning tearfully read memoirs and missionary literature. These newly-abundant genres of religious print gave evangelicals a common emotional experience, and they also, by offering models of evangelical feeling, provided a means of fashioning particular emotions. Manning read memoirs with deep sympathy, identifying with an evangelical textual and emotional community that transcended denominational affiliation. His reading of missionary literature reveals how Manning experienced imperial expansion—how emotions such as sympathy, pity, and belonging helped him locate provincial Nova Scotia in changing global relationships. Paying attention to his tears makes it possible to examine the emotional experience of evangelical and imperial identities from one reader’s perspective.

“Holy sympathy”: Identifying with an evangelical community

Manning was “melted to tears” by reading, among many others, the memoirs of David Brainerd, Ann Judson, and William Wilberforce—religious biographies that were among the period’s most popular, included in an informal canon of evangelical texts.83 By far the most tears dropped onto the pages of the biography of his
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"favorite author," Andrew Fuller, and of Fuller’s memoir of Samuel Pearce.\textsuperscript{84} Biographies were ubiquitous in late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century print, and as Scott Casper has demonstrated, most biographies published in the period were didactic in orientation. Memoirs of the great and the obscure were read to shape character and feeling, whether Republican virtue, domestic sentiment, or evangelical affections.\textsuperscript{85}

Sympathy was central to Manning’s reading of these biographies, as he strongly identified with the circumstances—and feelings—of their subjects. Of David Brainerd, Manning wrote, “I feel much sympathy for him ... I have experienced much of that gloom, and temptations he has experienced ... The feelings he endured ... I have felt in my soul.”\textsuperscript{86} Of the memoirs of Samuel Pearce, he wrote, “[I] find so many things that I have experienced that I feel truly an affection for [him]”—an affection, he says, that “would warm me in Greenland, comfort me in New Zealand, and make me happy in the Valley of the Shadow of Death.”\textsuperscript{87} Manning found connections between his own biography and those he read, observing common trials, interest in the missionary cause, and even similarities in health complaints. Although Manning was certainly moved by extraordinary events or exceptiona

\textsuperscript{84} See, for examples, Edward Manning Diary, September 5, 1833 (Judson); March 26, 1835 (Brainerd); January 3, 1839 (Wilberforce); November 17, 1821 and December 7, 1821 (Fuller); January 22, 1822 and December 23, 1826 (Pearce), Manning Collection.
\textsuperscript{86} Manning Diary, March 25, 1835, Manning Collection.
\textsuperscript{87} Manning Diary, April 20, 1818, Manning Collection.
characters, he proposed that what made biographies “most useful” was “their plainness and simplicity, or being common to all Christians.”

Evangelicals were not the only nineteenth-century readers to emphasize feeling and sympathy. Manning was reading at the trailing edge of the “culture of sensibility.” Elizabeth Barnes summarizes the literary and emotional milieu: “Sympathetic identification emerges in the eighteenth century as the definitive way of reading literature and human relations.” Rather than being an aberration, then, Manning’s response of being “melted to tears” was actually, in the period’s culture of sensibility, an expression of “the highest form of reading.”

Religious memoirs as a genre elicited sympathy and shaped sentiment through narrative techniques that mirrored those of novels. Though novels are conspicuously absent from Manning’s record of reading, he approached memoirs in a way that would be familiar to historians of sympathetic novels. That the title of the first American novel was The Power of Sympathy indicates that Manning’s “holy sympathy” had fictional counterparts. It appears that Manning and fellow
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88 Manning Diary, Dec. 6, 1821, Manning Collection.
89 See Barker-Benfield, Culture of Sensibility; and Janet Todd, Sensibility: An Introduction. Stokes, Altar at Home, and Van Engen, Sympathetic Puritans, assess literary scholarship on sentimental novels in relation to religious history. The canonical text for the sympathetic underpinnings of eighteenth-century moral philosophy is Smith’s The Theory of Moral Sentiments, which begins by describing sympathy: “By the imagination we place ourselves in his situation, we conceive ourselves enduring all the same torments, we enter as it were into his body and become in some measure the same person with him” (13-4).
90 Barnes, States of Sympathy, 2. The same theme is also present in the period’s hymnody, as in this verse from John Fawcett’s “Blest Be the Tie that Binds” (1782): “We share our mutual woes, // our mutual burdens bear, // and often for each other flows // the sympathizing tear.” I am grateful to Derek Murray for suggesting this connection at a conference in Manchester, England.
91 Van Engen, Sympathetic Puritans, 172.
evangelicals read memoirs in the same way that some of their contemporaries read sentimental novels: they identified with the central characters, sought to imitate their virtues, and read these texts with intense emotions. As with the more didactic novels, readers of evangelical biographies sought both religious sanctification and readerly satisfaction. The editors of the *Baptist Missionary Magazine of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick* encouraged that very comparison, describing the emotional and spiritual utility of missionary memoirs: “to read their journals is indeed delightful, they possess all the deep interest of a romance, and one is continually obtaining knowledge of other men, and countries, and manners, while his heart dilates with religious emotions, and his gratitude and joy are awakened by the success of the cross.”

Yet Manning did question the religious nature of this sympathetic identification. He recorded one particularly heightened response to reading about an author’s death: “My feelings have been wrought up to such a degree that I suppose 20 times I could scarcely contain myself.” He reflected, “Surely this cannot be all religion, but a sort of sympathy. If it was real evangelical Religion, why not when I think of the Dying of the dear Lord Jesus.” Were his tears symptomatic of a religious inclination, he wondered, or of some baser response of the passions? In his pious reading, Manning sought to cultivate what he called, “the holy sympathy the
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94 Manning Diary, Dec. 7, 1821, Manning Collection.
gospel produces in the poor soul,” but he did worry about excessive or misplaced sympathy.95

Indeed, sentiment in late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century print was contested terrain. Manning’s occasional worries about excessive sympathy reflect wider concerns about readers becoming too absorbed by sentimental novels. At its most extreme was the European phenomenon described as a “reading mania,” or what Robert Darnton called an “epidemic of emotion,” as readers were overwhelmed by sentiment in novels by Rousseau in France, and earlier by Richardson in England, or Lessing in Germany. The rise of sentimental fiction generated worries about a dangerous surplus of emotion, ungoverned by reason. Others believed that the emotional satisfactions of “escapist” literature discouraged readers from attending to less fictional obligations.96 Sympathetic and tearful Edward Manning, then, was not the only early nineteenth-century reader to use texts for emotional self-fashioning, or to worry about excessive sympathy while reading.

95 Manning Diary, March 30, 1835. At other times Manning worried that his reading was not feelingly sensible enough: “I think there is nothing in any publications that interests my feelings” Manning Diary, Jan. 15, 1825, Manning Collection.
Manning not only sympathetically identified with the subjects of biographies—he aspired to emulate their particular affections. Reading was used to fashion emotions. Reading the memoir of Brainerd, Manning exclaimed, “O that I could feel as that dear man of God did!”97 Of another, Manning wrote, “O that I could feel the composure of Pierce, and feel the happiness he enjoyed.”98 One particularly poignant example of the way memoirs were employed for emotional self-fashioning was the deathbed conversations between Manning and his ill adult daughter, Nancy. Over several months, from November 1819 to March 1820, Manning’s diary entries were shot through with the vocabulary of particular emotions—joy, terror, resignation, composure, happiness, pleasure—feelings that both Manning and his daughter attempted to carefully regulate.99 The emotional intensity of the conversations that Manning recorded in his diary reveal the emotions that were particularly valued by the transatlantic evangelical community, affections that were modeled or admonished in texts, and which individuals like Manning and his daughter attempted to emulate in their own situations, often with great difficulty.

Early in her illness, Manning talked with Nancy, and “enquired [about] the particular feelings of her heart …, and read to her the piece in the 4th No. of the American Missionary Magazine upon being prepared for death.”100 The article that Manning read to his daughter emphasized the emotional preparation for one’s last
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97 Manning Diary, March 25, 1835, Manning Collection.
98 Manning Diary, March 17, 1835, Manning Collection.
100 Manning Diary, Nov. 20, 1819, Manning Collection.
days, suggesting that, “We cannot love that which is unwelcome to us.”101 Feelings such as anticipation for heaven, “a tender sense of [God’s] authority,” or a “contrite heart” would be evidence of a divine work of grace in one’s heart.102 Finding one’s way not only to doctrinal understanding, but also appropriate feelings about those beliefs, was an important part of evangelical spirituality. Manning said that Nancy worried “that she does not sence [such feelings] as she aught.”103 Without discouraging the attempt, Manning told Mary that such an emotional struggle was as inescapable as it was important:

Says she has a hope, feels composed, and longs to go, but still she does not feel as she wants to feel. She wants to feel more reconciled, more holy, and more happy. I told her she never would feel as she wanted to feel until she got home.104

Perhaps more than any other setting, these deathbed moments reflect how emotional life was for these nineteenth-century evangelicals, as Reddy puts it, a “domain of effort.”105

Manning admitted that he, too, had difficulty generating the feelings he thought he should. While he attempted to be composed with the thought of Nancy’s eternal home, he confessed that he found the “sympathy of nature” at times overwhelming: “I am much affected, but I guard against it.”106 He recognized that there was an apparent contradiction between his natural and his religious feelings,

101 Theophilus, “Importance of Actual Preparation for Death [Part 2],” American Baptist Magazine and Missionary Intelligencer, New Series 22.4 (July 1819), 122. For Part 1 of the article, see 22.3 (May 1819): 87-90.
102 “Preparation for Death [Part 2],” 121, 122.
103 Manning Diary, Nov. 19, 1819, Manning Collection.
104 Manning Diary, Feb. 22, 1820, Manning Collection.
106 Manning Diary, Jan. 27, 1820, Manning Collection.
and even in the private space of his diary he did not want to leave the impression that he was not moved by the suffering or imminent death of his daughter. He explained:

I feel comfortable and happy, and not because I do not love my child, for I never loved her so well. But the thought of the Goodness and Sovereignty of God, and what he has done for my child, and the Glory that awaits her, fills me with consolation.\footnote{Manning Diary, March 4, 1820, Manning Collection.}

Or at least he hoped that he could maintain that sense of consolation, while other feelings threatened to discompose him.

Throughout the illness, Nancy and her father relied on texts to help them shape their emotions. In addition to the Bible, they sang hymns (especially those by Isaac Watts), and reflected on the dying experiences of others as represented in popular evangelical memoirs. Manning, for example, wrote one evening, “Have been just reading the death of the incomparable Harriett Newel [missionary in India and Burma]. I suppose it prepared my mind for this struggle. I hope, I pray, that I may be calm.”\footnote{Manning Diary, Feb. 19, 1820, Manning Collection. On the influence of this memoir, which Manning read often, see Cayton, “Canonizing Harriet Newell.”}

More than once they spoke of the memoir of Samuel Pearce, who, in a long illness described himself as feeling “hot but happy.” Manning wondered if his daughter could make such a declaration in her fevered state. He recorded the exchange: “‘Can you say so, Nancy?’ She paused, and said, ‘Yes, I think I can. I do not feel raptures as I have read of some feeling, but I feel composed and think I feel happy.’”\footnote{Manning Diary, Jan. 25, 1820, Manning Collection. Pearce’s memoir was written by Andrew Fuller. Manning also found comfort and an emotional exemplar in the biography of Fuller himself.} Nancy’s response illustrates how consciously evangelical readers used
memoirs to shape their own emotional reactions, her hesitancy perhaps also speaking to how difficult such self-fashioning could be. The comments also demonstrate the complexity of religious and natural affections that they sought to cultivate—not only raptures, but also composure, happiness, and a sense of calm. By sympathizing with the figures in evangelical memoirs, individual readers attempted to fashion their affections according to the transatlantic emotional community of which they imagined themselves a part.

**Imperial Emotions? Feelings and the experience of Empire**

Missions literature, as well as memoirs, brought Manning to tears. In January of 1825 he wrote, “I spent the evening reading Baptist magazines and read out loud so that Mrs Manning and Mary might hear, and partake of the feast. O how many times I wept for joy, and I trust holy sympathy, with the many precious souls and in knowing what God is doing in our world.” Again, he records, “Received the American Baptist Missionary Magazine, 131[st] number. The conversion and suffering of the converted Jews at ... Constantinople, the conversion of two Buddhist priests ..., the 10th Anniversary of an Association in Connecticut ... seems almost to overwhelm me.” These, and many other instances, capture the emotional experience of evangelicals interpreting the early decades of the missionary movement and struggling to find their place in new imperial relationships.

---

110 For the phrase “imperial emotions,” see Haggis and Allen, “Imperial Emotions.”
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112 Manning Diary, Jan. 3, 1828, Manning Collection
Manning’s sentimental reading also raises questions about the emotional and religious experience of empire and colonization. Reading the outpouring of missionary literature was the primary means of “bringing the Empire home.”¹¹³ British subjects—like Manning—experienced the expansion of the British Empire as “missionary intelligence.” As Susan Thorne observes, missionary print culture “encouraged Victorian evangelicals to think about colonized people on a regular basis.”¹¹⁴ It is striking how much Manning, a self-educated reader living in rural Nova Scotia, came to know and care about events in India and Burma. Benedict Anderson has influentially argued that expanding print made it possible for readers to see themselves as members of an “imagined” national community.¹¹⁵ Missionary periodicals helped readers to imagine, or perhaps feel, their connections in the global community that was the British Empire.

With an imperial context in mind, at least three kinds of tears can be identified from Manning’s diary: tears of sympathy, tears of pity, and tears of grateful belonging—together suggesting that the experience of empire was emotionally complex. First, Manning sympathetically identified with the evangelistic work and personal suffering of the missionaries he read about. Despite the many differences between the locales, Manning felt connected: “Have been reading the

¹¹³ Susan Thorne, “Religion and Empire at Home” in At Home with the Empire: Metropolitan Culture and the Imperial World, ed. Catherine Hall and Sonya O. Rose (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 146.
¹¹⁴ Thorne, “Religion and Empire at Home,” 154, 144. See also idem, “Missions and the making of an English middle class, 1795-1845,” in Congregational Missions and the Making of an Imperial Culture in Nineteenth-Century England (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1999), 53-88; and Elbourn, Blood Ground, 14.
¹¹⁵ Anderson, Imagined Communities.
sufferings of the missionaries in Burmah. My heart hath sympathized with them.”

As with other varieties of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century humanitarianism, sympathy underpinned the missionary movement. It was by this identification that Manning felt close to far-flung places and peoples.

Yet, as Laura Stevens has observed, missionary texts tended to place Anglo-American missionaries—rather than Indigenous inhabitants—at the center of their narratives, and therefore as the primary objects of sympathy. So while he wept tears of sympathy for the missionaries, Manning also cried a second kind of tears—of pity—for the colonized people. “Why,” he wrote, “do [we] not feel more for the heathen, buried in horrible idolatry[?]” Pity, compared with sympathy, was a feeling of difference, rather than identification. Note the complex combination of affection and superiority in Manning’s diary entry for October 3, 1834: “This day rec’d the ... Magazine for September, and am much affected with the acc’t of the success of the missionaries ... O how shocking, and how horrible is heathen idolatry. It melted me to tears today to think of our superior privileges.” Manning’s
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116 Manning Diary, Dec. 20, 1826, Manning Collection.
118 Stevens, Poor Indians, especially 7-22. Also see Edward Said, Orientalism (London: Penguin, 1977); Haggis and Allen, “Imperial Emotions.”
119 Manning Diary, Nov. 10, 1838, Manning Collection.
120 Stevens, Poor Indians, 7-8.
121 Manning Diary, Oct. 3, 1834, Manning Collection.
feelings, that is, expressed the racialized assumptions of difference between Anglo-American missionaries and colonial subjects.

That same diary entry also identifies a third category of imperial tears: “tears of gratitude” for “our ... privileges.” It may be that reading helped Nova Scotians to feel more closely tied to Britain, belonging to something larger. The reading of missionary periodicals gave Manning and other British North Americans (and provincials in places like Edinburgh and Manchester) a common emotional experience that helped them to feel themselves to be full participants in the British Empire, aligned sentimentally with the metropole.\textsuperscript{122}

Examining Manning’s reading through his diary, we might observe, as Robert Darnton did of readers of Rousseau’s \textit{Nouvelle Héloïse}, that “one is struck everywhere by the sound of sobbing.”\textsuperscript{123} It is difficult for modern readers to recover this experience of reading. Yet the strangeness of Manning’s intense emotional encounter with texts is far more understandable in the context of the period’s preoccupation with sympathetic reading, the emotional impact of expanding print and missions, and the felt experience of imperial belonging and colonial difference.

\textsuperscript{122} See Stevens, \textit{Poor Indians}, 14. For the role of print to mediate a distinctive version of provincial British identity, see Eamon, \textit{Imprinting Britain}; and Connors and MacDonald, \textit{National Identity}. Catherine Hall, \textit{Civilising Subjects: Metropole and Colony in the English Imagination, 1830-1867} (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002), among others, has urged reconsideration of how colonization and missionary activity affected the metropole, but less attention has been given to how those same expansionist activities have affected mostly-white settler colonies (like Nova Scotia)—which fell ambiguously between the metropole and other colonies. Also see Hilary M. Carey, \textit{God’s Empire: Religion and Colonialism in the British World, c.1801-1908} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011). For a helpful overview of the place of British North America in the historiography of Britain and the British Empire, see Nancy Christie, “Introduction: Theorizing a Colonial Past: Canada as a Society of British Settlement,” in \textit{Transatlantic Subjects}, 3-41.

\textsuperscript{123} Darnton, “Readers Respond,” 242. See also, Vincent-Buffault, \textit{The History of Tears}, 10-14.
Conclusion

For some early nineteenth-century evangelicals, like Edward Manning, discourses of affections and sentiments changed, but feelings were no less prominent in their experience and theology. Manning's conversion narrative certainly affirms the importance for New Lights of having one's soul “wrapt up in God’s Eternal Love.” But stepping back from that climactic moment, Manning’s experience also illustrates how very problematic feelings could be—the difficulty of generating and maintaining the right emotions, and the uncertainty of “reading” one’s feelings properly as evidence of religious change. His reliance on sensations and impressions, to the exclusion even of the Bible, during the “new dispensation” tumult of the early 1790s was an example of how emotions were contested by ordinary people in local communities, and not only philosophers and theologians in treatises.

Although by the late 1790s Manning and many of his New Light peers had repudiated their more “enthusiastic” practices and demonstrative emotional displays, they did not cease to regard affections as central to their evangelical piety. They continued to emphasize the religion of the heart and felt experience. Manning sought new theological frameworks and emotional discourses, finding them in Puritan devotional works, the Great Awakening theology of Jonathan Edwards, and the moderate Calvinism of Andrew Fuller. Together these provided Manning with an approach to religious affections less at odds with doctrine and order. Rather than emphasizing the suddenness of feelings, he sought a changed disposition—
happiness, but not necessarily raptures. Manning’s diary provides extensive evidence for his daily preoccupation with emotional self-fashioning and regulation.

Unlike the other figures in this study, Manning came to maturity after the upheavals of the American Revolution. He displayed little anxiety about national identity, at ease on both sides of the border between British North America and the fledgling United States. Even during the period of heightened national and imperial feelings during the War of 1812 and the wars in France, Manning was careful not to let political passions run free—he seemed to guard against any form of enthusiasm, political or religious. He built an affectionate transnational network through his itinerancy and correspondence, fashioning an identity that was probably more religious than political.

That is not to say, however, that Manning was indifferent to society in the same way that Alline had been. Indeed, Manning was an energetic advocate for a variety of social reforms, including education, the distribution of religious print, temperance, and international missions. He found no contradiction between the interiority of evangelical conversion and the “externals” of social institutions. In the era of religious disestablishment (uneven though it was), Manning and many other early nineteenth-century evangelicals acted on a voluntarist impulse for social reform—working through voluntary associations, stirring the passions of individuals to become active in various causes that had far-reaching social import. While later in the nineteenth century, activists would employ associations without evangelical motivation, or work to achieve their social goals through the use of legislation rather than moral persuasion, for the decades of Manning’s involvement,
heart religion and social reform went hand in hand. Manning interpreted the progress of these various social and missionary initiatives as being momentous in human and divine history, the emotional impact of which is captured in his often tearful diary.

Those tears also provide a window into the importance of sympathy for Manning’s religious (and imperial) experience. The unprecedented abundance of religious print allowed Manning and at least some of his Nova Scotian parishioners to feel themselves as part of evangelical and denominational communities that transcended their locale. As Manning read the burgeoning works of evangelical biography, he sympathized with their subjects’ experiences and consciously (through writing and conversation) emulated their religious affections. Manning’s tearful reading of missionary accounts provides historians (now accustomed to viewing missions with a degree of deserved scepticism) with a sense of how emotionally overwhelming those events could be for evangelicals—experiencing a flood of printed literature and news, interpreting missionary expansion in eschatological terms, and riveted by the pace of developments. Sympathy helped Manning to feel connected to missionaries, far-flung peoples, and perhaps to the project of British (and American) imperialism. From enthusiasm to affections to sympathy, feelings remained central—though not unchanging—in Manning’s evangelical experience.
CONCLUSION

It is a given that the upheavals and changes of the late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century Enlightenment Atlantic evoked powerful emotions. How could they not? Revolution fired the passions of some and set others adrift in uncertainty; the explosion of print was as overwhelming as it was liberating; and previously assumed identities and ideas were vigorously contested. This study has made soundings of some of these emotional experiences. And yet the residents of Cornwallis Township were anything but passive, merely buoyed along by the waves of passion. No, they expressed their agency by using emotions—and several discourses about those feelings—to navigate the changes of their times. Emotions—framed as passions, affections, or sentiments—were debated by the most prominent philosophers and theologians of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, from David Hume and Adam Smith to Isaac Watts and Jonathan Edwards. Many of their treatises were found on Nova Scotia bookshelves, their ideas adapted to address local concerns, to define local communities. Emotions, in one form or another, were a central preoccupation of the best thinkers of the “Age of Reason.”

Ordinary British North Americans did not only participate in transatlantic debates about emotions as recipients. They also contributed to the conversation, if within a more circumscribed sphere of influence, through their letters, songs, circulated essays and journals, poetry, commonplace books, sermons and the occasional published book. They asked many of the same questions as their better-
known contemporaries: where feelings came from, how passions could be regulated, how affection could be cultivated, if emotions were reliable sensory evidence, whether sentiment could motivate moral behaviour, and what effects personal emotions had on society. The answers at which Cornwallis writers arrived were not merely derivative, though they certainly drew upon transatlantic ideas and conventions, for they engaged in that wider debate to shape a distinctive local culture.

The contributions that Nova Scotians (and, to be sure, ordinary people in other places) made to this transatlantic conversation were born of what historian Phyllis Mack has called “reflexive emotionalism”—the need not only to feel, but also to analyze those feelings.¹ One could label their efforts a kind of intellectual history from the bottom up, in that they took up, with varying degrees of persuasiveness or coherence, these perplexing questions of debate. But they did so chiefly to make sense of their own feelings, or those to which they aspired, and to come to terms with the passions or unfeeling actions of others in their communities. Reflecting on passions, affections, and sentiments helped British North Americans navigate the emotional swirl of changing political and religious communities.

The questions about emotions, politics, and religion that have been the focus of this study were certainly not unique to Cornwallis Township, Nova Scotia. Nevertheless, an unusually rich set of personal documents makes the community a useful site for historical analysis of this sort. Just as importantly, the people of Nova Scotia could speak to a broad range of experiences in the British Atlantic world.

¹ Mack, Heart Religion, 134.
None of the subjects of this study were born in the province, and arrived in Nova Scotia at a moment when the British Empire, the United States, and the province itself were undergoing important reconfigurations. They could not help but reflect on their communities and identities in a self-conscious way. And although the community in Cornwallis township was more racially homogenous than some places in the Atlantic world, its inhabitants came from different parts of the British world and under different circumstances, thereby creating several emotional communities that overlapped and competed in this one township.

Cornwallis provides, then, a place to stand—looking outward—to examine the swirl of emotional experiences, discourses, and communities that touched down there. Without smoothing over the significant differences present in the emotional landscape of the province, each of the individuals examined made a conscious decision to moderate the stronger passions and to appeal to sociable affections. The enthusiasts cultivated humility and community, the loyalists knew their share of national lament, and religious identities tended to temper political feelings. It is certainly not the case that American Patriots were “emotional,” while British Loyalists were not—but they did appeal to different discourses and tended to adopt different strategies for shaping their emotions.

Political Emotions

2 “The political culture of Nova Scotia at this time was ... rich in its relationship with eighteenth-century political philosophy.” Donald Desserud, “Nova Scotia and the American Revolution: A Study of Neutrality and Moderation in the Eighteenth Century,” in They Planted Well,” 99-100.
Emotions were integral to the formation—and disruption—of early modern political identities. Imperial and national officials intentionally used emotions to lend cohesiveness to their projects and to foster a sense of belonging among citizens. They did this through the affectionate language of oaths and petitions, by using the calendar to shape national historical narratives, by appealing to common experiences. Revolutionary leaders incited other passions to disrupt that cohesiveness and to make new national stories plausible. The rich documentary evidence for Cornwallis Township, Nova Scotia, opens a window onto the lived—or felt—experience of those political emotions. One of the findings of this study of their experience is a better sense of the wide spectrum of political emotions that were feelable in this period. In part, this analysis of political emotions has been accomplished simply by restoring the emotional experience of loyalists (broadly conceived) to the narrative, adding to the careful studies that have been undertaken of the passions of revolutionaries in Europe and North America. To the extent that loyalist affections expressed commonly held feelings in peace times, they make it possible to sketch more of the emotional landscape of the period, rather than only the heights of revolutionary ferment. How would our understanding of political life change if it were loyalist affections, rather than revolutionary passions, that were taken as normative (though certainly not exclusive) for the so-called Age of Revolutions? At the same time, this study has also noted a diversity of loyalist emotional experiences. Loyalty was compatible with both Anglophilia and British disaffection, with whig criticism and tory conservatism, and with devotion to the monarchy and disillusionment with royal duplicity. Among the surprises of the
preceding case studies was the contrast between the robust royalism of Puritan Planter, Handley Chipman, and the sour British disaffection of Anglican Jacob Bailey—both of whom self-consciously reaffirmed their loyalty. Historians have come to delineate a range of rationales by which North Americans became Loyalists, from ideological conviction to pragmatic necessity; there was an equally broad array of loyalist emotions. What follows brings together some of those threads.

Jacob Bailey was certainly fond of his ties to England, and his early life could be a case study of the process of anglicization. Yet it appears that even before the American Revolution, Bailey grounded his loyalty in something more than affection for Britain. His loyalty, as a coherent set of ideas and values that he held before the 1770s, was closely tied with a polite version of Christianity and with the transatlantic culture of sentiment, which together emphasized the importance of cultivating the capacity for sociable feelings. His political affections, that is, were more broadly humane and cosmopolitan than they were Anglophilic. Loyalism allowed Bailey, in a marginal provincial community, to be connected—via the British Atlantic—to a more cosmopolitan Enlightened culture of sentiment. Even Bailey’s costly commitment to his royal oaths was based less on his feelings of devotion to the person of the King or even the system of monarchical rule, than on a more universal belief in the power of oaths (and by extension, the power of words in civil discourse) as necessary for the good of society.

Bailey narrated the history of New England—and later the American Revolution itself—as the inverse of those commitments. In his unpublished
Compendious History of New England, written as the imperial crisis was unfolding, Bailey portrayed his native region as narrowly self-interested, cut off from the refined culture of Enlightenment Europe, and prone to political (as well as religious) enthusiasm. He asserted that the rhetoric and violence of the American Revolution inured colonists to the gentler feelings and sympathies that he believed were essential to harmonious civil society, making them insensible to the inhumane treatment of Loyalist neighbours. His own loyalist ordeal, recounted in detail in his correspondence, was emotionally overwhelming and dispiriting. As Bailey reflected on the causes of the American Revolution, he perpetuated a conspiracy theory that, however incredible in its details, articulated the way that emotions were stirred up and policed during the conflict.

Bailey’s experience as a Loyalist refugee in Nova Scotia left him profoundly disaffected with Britain, disillusioned not only by his own displacement, but also by what he perceived as the mismanagement of the War and the abandonment of the Loyalists. And yet Bailey did not surrender his loyalism. He did, however, self-consciously persist in his loyalism “without,” in his own words, “any remainder of affection,” framing his loyalism even more clearly in terms of universal principles, English constitutionalism, and personal integrity. His disaffection arguably made him less optimistic about the power of sympathy to bring together diverse peoples into a single, feeling public, a change reflected in his turn to acerbic satirical poetry circulated only among a circle of loyalists. Bailey became more convinced that passionate writing was required to awaken British officials to their unfeeling
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3 Bailey to Mr. ___ Dec. 3, 1778 (letterbook copy), Bailey Papers, NSA, 91-21.
treatment of loyalist refugees. His writing captures the emotional tumult of the American Revolution and reflects the role that emotional discourses—from passions to sentiment—played in the potential outcomes of such a conflict.

Given Bailey’s characterization of Cornwallis Township’s former New England residents as having a “prevailing attachment to the American cause,” the ardour of Handley Chipman’s British affections is surprising. From his position in Nova Scotia, Chipman demonstrates the wide range of political emotions that were feelable during and after the American Revolution, beyond the polarities of “Patriot” and “Loyalist.” In the months between the Battle of Lexington and Concord and the Declaration of Independence, Chipman’s commonplace digest of his reading displayed a strong affirmation of his commitment to the liberties of the English constitution, his belief in the idea of monarchy, and his affection for the person the King. He provided a remarkable illustration of how an individual Briton internalized historical culture to shape feelings of Britishness. That is not to say, however, that Chipman reflexively parroted nationalist bromides. His whig sensibilities made him suspicious of ministerial power and alert to the dangers to Britain’s precarious liberties. His strident criticisms of the British ministry for mismanagement and malfeasance were entirely in keeping with those of his former New England neighbours, and yet he held out hope that the future of America laid within the British Empire. Chipman articulated a set of political sentiments that it has become difficult to imagine in the wake of the American Revolution; before that conflict’s polarizations, however, such sentiments were widely held, and it was not inevitable

4 Bailey to Mr. Domett, Feb. 11, 1780 (letterbook copy), Bailey Papers, NSA 91-24.
that the anti-monarchical rage of Thomas Paine’s *Common Sense* would overcome the irenicism of, say, John Dickinson’s *Letters from a Farmer*, which more closely resembled Chipman’s writings in its emotional register.\(^5\) As harried as some coastal Nova Scotians were by privateering or threats of invasion, Handley Chipman’s writings suggest that it remained possible in that province till at least the eve of the War of Independence, to express American sympathies and British loyalty without contradiction. Chipman is also a reminder that loyalism (broadly construed) was a coherent and durable set of ideas and affections with a history that extended well before and long after the disruptions of the North American conflict, rather than merely a reactionary defense of the *ancien régime*.

Chipman’s diaries from the 1790s also bear witness to the mingling of sadness and lament with his loyalty. To be sure, Chipman had internalized a narrative of British history marked by milestones of “remarkable providence.” But, grieved by the ruptures of the American Revolution and the continuing bloodshed caused by the wars in Europe, he felt keenly the painful gap between providential design and contemporary events. Chipman’s nuanced (if brief) reflections on national identity and providence provide a useful reminder of how complicated the “protestant” dimension of eighteenth-century British identity could be.

Henry Alline managed to combine profound ambivalence about politics and social institutions with a populist message that was disruptive to traditional authorities and community cohesion. That is, while critics such as Bailey may have

\(^5\) Robert Calhoon insightfully observes, “Like ships in the night, loyalist and patriot moderates unknowingly approached one another along parallel paths of ideological engagement.” Calhoon, *Political Moderation*, 74.
overstated the republican sympathies or seditious nature of “enthusiastic” New Light preachers, they were not wrong to perceive that their message was dangerous to the status quo. To be sure, Alline used the language of “liberty” and “tyranny” and “slavery” in a way that was not dissimilar to republican agitators in New England, but he decidedly did not turn this energy to political ends. Nevertheless, his message did have social implications. At a local level, one of the effects of Alline’s preaching about heart religion and the danger of “externals” was to loosen the covenant ties that were so integral to the traditional New England canopy of church and society.

On this point, Jonathan Scott was not incorrect in his assessment of Alline’s itinerancy. For New Lights, voluntarism became more determinative than covenantal relations. As individuals emphasized experiential piety more than conventional credentials, they were empowered to challenge or separate from their ministers. In other words, if Alline and his followers did not participate in the Revolution, they certainly did, in the religious sphere, participate in the shift toward individualism in public life that had implications that were at least as important.

Emotions helped Edward Manning to feel his place in ever-wider communities beyond his provincial locale. He cultivated an affectionate network that reached across the border with the new United States, and felt sympathetically connected to the far-flung regions of missionary and imperial expansion. Coming of age after the American Revolution, Manning’s political feelings were not nearly so fraught as those of Bailey or Chipman. Without any contradiction to his British loyalism, he referred to the United States as the “land of light and liberty,” and did
not express any anxiety about the influence of republican sentiments.\footnote{Manning Journal, Feb. 1, 1820, Manning Collection.} He helped to forge a local religious culture from hybrid British and American influences, apparently without feeling a need to favour either approach; for example, he simultaneously worked on behalf of the British and Foreign Bible Society and as an agent for American religious publishers. Even during the heightened nationalism of the War of 1812, Manning (and his U.S. correspondents) eschewed exclusively political identities, or at least set aside nationalism long enough to join hearts and hands in common evangelical causes. Manning seemed to belong as much to the “Benevolent Empire”—that loose coalition of Protestant voluntary associations—as the British Empire.

Sympathy was central to Manning’s sense of his place in the world. Through his often-tearful reading, Manning came to feel Cornwallis Township as intimately connected with places as distant as Burma and India. It is difficult to exaggerate how emotional Manning’s experience of missionary expansion was, although attending to his lachrymose reading helps to recapture some of the significance and novelty he felt. It was a sympathy born of evangelical and humanitarian urgency, and was conveyed through the missionary memoirs and news that became the backbone of newly abundant religious periodicals in the first half of the nineteenth century. Manning and his peers interpreted missionary expansion in a frame of optimistic millennial theology that freighted these events with still more emotional import. Little wonder that Manning cried so often as he read his missionary magazines.
Manning’s missionary sympathy may also help shed some light on the emotional experience of imperial expansion. Even though missionary and imperial projects were not identical and occasionally diverged sharply, missionary news was how many Britons and Americans learned about colonial spaces. As much as Manning expressed affectionate concern for the indigenous inhabitants of the distant places about which he read, it was ultimately the missionaries themselves with whom he felt the greatest sympathy. The feelings of pity and benevolence he nurtured for colonial “Others” reaffirmed, however incidentally, a sense of cultural superiority. Complex though it was, Manning’s sympathy helped him and other British North Americans reimagine religious community in transnational and global, rather than primarily local, terms.

Religious Emotions

Emotions were the topic of a long argument within early modern Protestantism, a contest that was continually aggravated by the evangelical heirs of the Great Awakening. David Hempton and Molly Worthen have suggested that the evangelical tradition is best defined by its ongoing tensions and perpetual quarrels, rather than by the resolutions of any particular group or moment. This observation is particularly true for eighteenth- and nineteenth-century arguments about emotions, the site for ongoing tensions between faith and reason, between the religion of the heart and orthodox doctrine, between individual piety and communal

---

order. While each of the figures of this study could agree with Jonathan Edwards’ dictum, “True religion, in great part, consists in holy affections,” the several discourses of emotions they employed—from passions to sentiments—reflected the widely varying conclusions to which they came. It is important to state unequivocally that this emphasis on the affective dimension of religious experience was not a retrograde aspect of early modern religious culture—religious actors were not “emotional” because they failed to be sufficiently “rational.” For theologians, philosophers, and many ordinary people alike, emotions were the topic of rigorous debate. To emphasize their disagreements, taking their polemical rhetoric too much at face value, misses the degree to which they shared common assumptions about emotions and started with the same questions.

In an era of political realignments, mobility and displacements, religious disestablishment, and denominational pluralism, the figures of this study were, in one way or another, attempting to work out how the religion of the heart should relate to society, how to dovetail individualistic and communitarian impulses. Similarly, it was not that some religious groups were “emotional” while others were not; rather, eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Protestant traditions drew on different emotional discourses, but emotions were indeed important for all of them. The evidence from Cornwallis Township also suggests that the thoughtful management of emotions was a central concern of religious communities—even those groups that were branded unthinking enthusiasts by their critics. The culture of revivalism and the culture of sentiment alike required the work of reflective
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emotional fashioning. Because religious communities of many stripes prioritized this emotional work, they could be incubators of emotions that were then expressed by individuals in other settings. In their church communities, early modern Nova Scotians might learn to turn their passions against traditional authorities, to moderate their feelings for the sake of communal harmony, or to feel sympathy for people in distant imperial spaces. There was not one single way to coordinate religion and politics in the period, but emotions provided one of the frequent points of intersection.

Handley Chipman’s library and manuscript notebooks provide ample evidence that affections were central to eighteenth-century Protestant devotional culture. But they also demonstrate how very contested emotions could be. As he did with his political affections, Chipman sought a moderation in evangelical affections that proved difficult to sustain in a single religious community. The volumes in Chipman’s Cornwallis library convey the importance of the heart in Protestant piety—from Matthew Henry on cultivating the pleasures of religion to Isaac Watts on using reason to regulate the passions. These texts were a devotional literature that Chipman used in his personal emotional self-fashioning. He also created his own devotional texts, abridging spiritual works and commenting on scripture as a form of heart-felt meditation. “O my Soul,” he wrote, “Let us not be deceived by specious pretences and Shews in Religion. But may we Enjoy true Vital Religion in
our Hearts.” Chipman’s texts help to keep events in Cornwallis in a wide frame of transatlantic Protestant textual and emotional culture.

Chipman went to Nova Scotia from Newport, Rhode Island, where he had the acquaintance of prominent evangelical authors and leaders, Sarah Osborn and George Whitefield. Osborn published a well-known book that explored how the transformation of the affections could provide reliable evidence of salvation. Her work demonstrates the exchange of ideas between evangelical theology and Enlightenment philosophy. In George Whitefield’s preaching, Chipman found the combination of orthodox theology with the passionate and “soul searching” preaching that he felt best suited its subject. But Chipman also knew that this evangelical emphasis on the affections was contentious, and in his library inventory were works by both Jonathan Edwards, who attempted to distinguish between real and spurious affections in revivals, and Charles Chauncey, who charged revivalists with irrationality and enthusiasm.

Chipman saw in Henry Alline the heart-centred piety and soul-searching preaching for which he revered Whitefield, and the only extant manuscript copy of Alline’s journal is in Chipman’s handwriting. He apparently circulated Alline’s spiritual journal in the province, helping to shape New Lights into an emotional community. It was, however, a contested community, and in 1793 Chipman found himself circulating different manuscripts—lengthy essays he composed to address what he perceived as emotional excesses in the New Light Congregational Church during the “new dispensation” episode. Without surrendering his conviction that
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9 Chipman, Scripture Commentaries (1797), ii.999.
10 Chipman, Family Memoir, 57.
ministers should exhibit "zeal according to knowledge," he decried dramatic emotional displays in preaching.\footnote{Chipman, Essays, i.10-11.} And while he remained convinced that Christians could have a feeling of assurance about their salvation, he attempted to dissuade local preachers from relying on sudden emotional impressions to draw such conclusions. In other words, in the midst of an apparently idiosyncratic religious controversy, rural Nova Scotians were contending with some of the same vexing questions as the period's leading theologians and philosophers, attesting to the experiential importance of those intellectual questions in locales like Cornwallis.

Jacob Bailey rejected what he described as the somber narrowness of New England Puritanism, and recoiled from the enthusiasm of the Great Awakening, finding in eighteenth-century Anglicanism the more refined feelings of polite Christianity. It was not so much that Bailey turned from emotional to rational religion; to the contrary, he accused enthusiasts of being unfeeling, failing to nurture the sentiments of disinterested benevolence and sympathy that were central to the emotional culture of cosmopolitan Anglicanism. Like Charles Inglis, Bailey worried about the overlap between religious and political enthusiasm. He asserted that evangelicals in New England and Nova Scotia were so ruled by passions that they were susceptible to republican leaders who manipulated religious naïfs for their own ungodly ends. In vivid language, he described evangelicals as "the People, That weathercock, which rides the Steeple."\footnote{Bailey to Samuel Peters, May 4, 1780, Peters Papers, Hawks Collection, Archives of the Episcopal Church, Austin, TX, Vol. 1, no. 44.} He argued that in their disregard for the communal and social aspects of religion—in order to emphasize the personal...
and affective dimensions—evangelicals were easily swept along by populist revolutionary leaders, who knew how to use religion, to cynically “mix and blend it well with politicks.” Bailey’s disparagement of New Light passions, however, should not obscure the importance of feelings (though with different emphases, to be sure) to his more communitarian expression of Christianity. In a statement that could have been made by Chipman, Manning, or even Alline, Bailey declared, “The principal design of the gospel is to purify the heart ... reaching beyond our external behaviour and penetrating even to the secret affections of the soul.”

The New Light writings of Charlotte Prescott, Nancy Lawrence, Elizabeth Blair, and Henry Alline himself offer a surprise of a different kind: even enthusiasts had problems with their feelings. Although they did indeed aspire to the heights of rapture and religious ecstasy that so vexed their critics, New Lights more often wrestled with unfeeling hearts and invested significant effort to cultivate a wide gamut of religious affections. Focusing on the moment of conversion or the passions of a revival meeting can obscure the other emotions and longer-term affective transformations that were also important to New Lights. The hymns of Henry Alline expressed something of this more complex emotional portrait: the problem of generating the right religious feelings, the possibilities and uncertainties of using feelings as evidence of spiritual transformation, and the striking Enlightenment-era theme of this-worldly happiness. The unpublished letters exchanged within the New Light emotional community portray, among other things, the thoughtfulness and
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13 Bailey to Samuel Peters, May 4, 1780, Peters Papers, Hawks Collection, Archives of the Episcopal Church, Austin, TX, Vol. 1, no. 44.
14 Bailey to Mr. D. Rogers, Jan 15, 1783 [Letterbook copy], Bailey Papers, NSA, 94-18.
agency with which ordinary Nova Scotians engaged in their emotional self-fashioning. Accused of being anti-social, they relied on a vibrant lay community (as well as their leaders) to shape their feelings. Charged with succumbing to merely instinctual passions, New Lights wrote and sang about their desire for remarkably selfless affections. That is not to say that New Lights did not yield to populist, anti-intellectual, or anti-social tendencies in some circumstances, for they surely did. The debate between Alline and Scott demonstrates that New Lights were not necessarily aware of all of the social implications of their heart-focused piety. However, the extent of agency, self-consciousness, and variety exhibited in the affective aspect of their religious experience invites more nuance in how they are described.

Examining the emotional experiences and ideas of Edward Manning makes it possible to follow some threads of this discussion into the early nineteenth century. Manning attempted to keep personal and social affections in tension—a balancing act that Chipman could not accomplish in any single religious community, a feat that Bailey regarded as impossible, and which Alline treated with ambivalence, if not hostility. Manning’s narration of his conversion demonstrated that New Lights construed the difficulty of generating the right emotions as a spiritual problem. His experience as a leading agitator of the “new dispensation” movement of the early 1790s provoked a radical discontinuity in his emotional career—so that the respectable, orderly, well-read, institution-building Manning of the 1830s is barely recognizable as the same person. And yet there are important continuities in his story.
Manning did not surrender the centrality of heart-felt experiential piety. Through his extensive devotional and theological reading, Manning found authors—including John Flavel, Jonathan Edwards, and Andrew Fuller—who integrated the affections with orthodox (and moderately Calvinistic) doctrine, and he drew upon evangelical memoirs for his emotional self-fashioning. Manning also attempted to marry the religion of the heart with a concern for social reform, in marked contrast to New Light ambivalence about “externals.” He coupled the two emotions through his energetic participation in and endorsement of voluntary religious associations for a variety of causes, including education, the distribution of religious books, and missions. Though the social reach of these organizations, taken cumulatively, was comprehensive, their voluntary nature meant that they started with the individual and appealed to the heart. Manning also cultivated emotions that helped him reach far beyond his own locale. Sympathy figured prominently in his experience of reading the flood of missionary literature that reached his doorstep, helping him to feel closely connected to far-flung missionary and imperial spaces. An enthusiast no more, deep feelings, tears, and sympathy continued to shape his religious life.

What did emotions do?

As historian Joanna Bourke writes, “emotions are not simply reports of inner states.” 15 Early modern Nova Scotians did things with their emotions. At the intersection of the personal and the public, of religion and politics, of experience and

15 Joanna Bourke, “Fear and Anxiety: Writing About Emotion in Modern History,” History Workshop Journal, no. 55 (2003), 124; see Van Gent & Young, “Introduction,” 463. The categories used by Bourke and Van Gent and Young have been helpful in articulating how Nova Scotians used emotions and emotional discourses.
reflection, and of broad historical forces and individual agency, emotions provide a unique site from which to examine the tumultuous changes of the Enlightenment and Revolutionary Atlantic world. What can we conclude about this public history of personal emotions?

First, emotions were instrumental in early modern self-fashioning, in the construction of religious and political identities. Alongside, say, their education, manners, and consumption, early moderns viewed their emotions as helpful (or detrimental) in the shaping of a self, of the kind of person to which they aspired, or the identity they wished to exhibit. They were conscientious about seeing emotional life as a “domain of effort”—that their feelings, motivations, and responses were to be cultivated intentionally, rather than only exhibited impulsively. Handley Chipman’s notebooks illustrate how important print culture was to this emotional self-fashioning, and those same volumes also expose the agency he wielded in his reading. Starting with readers shows that more was at work than simple reception or, adoption of, the political or religious emotions recommended by distant authorities. Chipman’s commonplace volume, for example, exhibits a complex process of selection, paraphrasing, ordering, and internalizing of the material he gleaned from his wide reading. Such self-fashioning was not done in splendid isolation, however. The letters of New Light women such as Nancy Lawrence and Charlotte Prescott portray the communal context of self-fashioning.

Second, emotions were also employed to create, express, or subvert power relations. Both patriots and loyalists, for example, deployed discourses about emotions and appeals to the passions during the American Revolution in attempts to
persuade, or failing that, to subdue. As elsewhere, the Pownalborough Committee of Safety accused Loyalists like Bailey with “disaffection” to the cause of liberty—policing the allowable spectrum of wartime feelings. Not for the first or last time, emotions were used as a powerful tool in the political realm. The charge of “enthusiasm” was similarly premised on the ability of emotions to upend social order, recalling the tumult and regicide of the English Civil War, during which subjective religious passions were unchecked.

Third, the experience of British North Americans suggests that they used emotions to create and to contest communities. Emotions could help individuals feel a sense of attachment, to “imagine,” in Anderson’s term, their place in communities beyond their own locale. Handley Chipman, first in Rhode Island and then in Nova Scotia, came to express a strong sense of Britishness, a set of national feelings that he chose to reaffirm during years of unsettling change. The younger Jacob Bailey participated in a transatlantic culture of sentiment that optimistically linked people of refined feelings whether they were in metropolitan or provincial settings. The circulation of New Light texts—hymns, letters, and journals—helped to shape Nova Scotians, mostly transplanted from elsewhere, into an emotional community. Sympathy allowed Edward Manning to locate provincial Cornwallis Township in transnational religious communities of feeling.

Emotions could, however, also disrupt communities. Henry Alline professed himself indifferent to the covenantal ties of the Puritan social vision, and Jonathan Scott’s experience seems to confirm that Alline’s New Light message did indeed incite divisions and separations in Nova Scotia congregations. Jacob Bailey
contended that the passions kindled by revolutionary leaders may have inspired political change, but those strong emotions also made them insensible to the suffering of others. And Edward Manning’s sympathetic participation in “imagined” religious communities at times relativized national feelings; while allowing himself to be drawn into one kind of community, he sometimes found other emotional ties stretched thin. The felt experience of Nova Scotians was that emotions were both centrifugal and centripetal.
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