

*Michał Choiński*

## **From Pulpit to Stage – the Rhetorical Theatricality of George Whitefield’s Preaching**

### **Introduction**

George Whitefield (1714–70) is ranked amongst the most prominent preachers of the Great Awakening period, the relatively long and extensive religious revival in the American colonies between 1739 and 1742. The three years of the revival had a considerable impact on the pre-revolutionary American society, in particular on the shape of religion and the appreciation for the power of the spoken word in the colonial society. At the time of the Great Awakening, groups of itinerant preachers crisscrossed the land, delivering countless sermons and bringing the revivalist “New Birth” to scores of colonists. The proponents of the movement devised new manners of rhetorical expression and innovative ways of appealing to large audiences, harvesting the hearts and minds of the spellbound multitudes. As a key proponent of the movement, George Whitefield played a pivotal role in these events and was one of its staunchest defenders. His rhetorical skill also laid the foundations for the birth of modern evangelicalism.<sup>1</sup> As a result, the importance of George Whitefield for the development of the early American preaching tradition can hardly be underestimated. This article examines the preacher’s sermonic oratory with a special focus on how he utilized his theatrical skills to render his sermons particularly appealing to colonial audiences.

---

<sup>1</sup> The influence of the Great Awakening on the American evangelical tradition is stressed, among others, by Kidd (2007).

## 1. George Whitefield's Preaching Rhetoric

### 1.1. George Whitefield's Oratory in the Colonial Context

Interestingly, George Whitefield was an Englishman and a member of the Church of England. His membership of the Church was tainted by frequent feuds with his religious superiors and numerous controversies which surrounded him. After some time, Whitefield's bitter criticism of the Church of England closed the doors and pulpits of many churches for his homiletic oratory and, as a result, he had to move outside church buildings and preach in the markets, fields and squares; the new rhetorical context encouraged this subversive speaker to seek out new ways of oratorical expression and to remodel the traditional preaching scheme. In addition, Whitefield began searching for eager audiences outside England, across the Atlantic. In his lifetime he travelled to America seven times and more than a dozen times to Scotland, as well as to Ireland, Bermuda, and Holland. In all, he preached at least 18,000 times and addressed perhaps 10,000,000 listeners (Dallimore 1979: 40). His farewell sermon on his most famous preaching tour of 1739–40 was attended by a crowd of 23,000 people, more than Boston's entire population at the time.

During his trips to America, Whitefield saw the aforementioned crowds materialize in the fields and demanding him to speak in every town he visited. One particularly interesting account of Whitefield's preaching was written by Nathan Cole, a parish farmer and a carpenter who lived twelve miles from Middleton, where the preacher delivered a sermon on October 23, 1740:

When I saw Mr. Whitefield come upon the scaffold, he looked almost angelical – a young, slim, slender youth before some thousands of people with a bold, undaunted countenance. And my hearing how God was with him everywhere as he came along, it solemnized my mind and put me into a trembling fear before he began to preach. For he looked as if he was clothed with authority from the Great God, and a sweet solemn solemnity sat upon his brow, and my hearing him preach gave me a heart wound. By God's blessing my old foundation was broken up, and I saw that my righteousness would not save me. (Cole 1993: 12)

Whitefield's rhetorical grip over Cole was not unprecedented. The preacher's oratorical *actio* was legendary and one can hardly enumerate all of the anecdotes connected with it. David Garrick is said to have claimed that he would be willing to pay a hundred golden guineas if he could say "Oh" like George Whitefield; Sarah Edwards wrote to her brother Jonathan Edwards that the preacher from England was a "born orator" (Stout 1986: 126). Benjamin Franklin initially treated the news of Whitefield's talent with a considerable degree

of incredulity yet, having attended one of the meetings, he found himself compelled to offer money to a Georgia orphanage sponsored by Whitefield (Franklin 2003: 161). If Whitefield's oratory had such a grip over the deistic Founding Father who embodied the principles of the Enlightenment, one can only imagine how earnestly and enthusiastically that orthodox, Puritan audiences must have received his sermonic oratory. Because of a combination of luck and his own intuition, Whitefield made use of his talent in the right place at the right time and, consequently, was bound to achieve success in the American colonies.

## **1.2. George Whitefield's Rhetorical Success**

George Whitefield's enormous popularity among the colonial communities may be attributed to a number of factors, yet, above all, to his innovative style of preaching. Tracy observes that "he preached under the influence of an affecting view of the worth of the soul, and an intense desire that his hearers might be saved," thus using "voice of wonderful flexibility, compass and power, and accompanied with the most graceful, impressive and appropriate action" (1842: 45), but it was not just the genuine zeal that allowed Whitefield to make thousands of people cry and manifest the physical symptoms of the "New Birth."

Whitefield's sermons were not the outcome of strenuous and meticulous studies – he was a natural extemporaneous preacher. The preacher employed a lot of gestures, he laughed, cried and sang, transforming the traditional colonial pulpit into a stage. Stout observes that "in seeing Whitefield preach, many Americans were for the first time in their lives seeing a form of theatre" (1991: 94). He also used music and spontaneous prayer to gain the attention of his audiences and actively involve them in the preaching process.

In addition, Whitefield travelled a lot, which rendered his oratory very attractive to audiences; he was like a "heavenly comet,"<sup>2</sup> passing through endless congregations, leaving only a tail of "revived" colonists in his wake. In this way the preacher encountered new audiences, leaving his earlier listeners spellbound with the freshness of his methods. In consequence, Whitefield did not give his hearers the chance to become bored with his preaching rhetoric and continued his triumphant tour through the colonies.

Finally, the growing popularity of Whitefield may be attributed to the very argumentative appeal he employed in order to attract the audiences. Whitefield

---

<sup>2</sup> As suggested by the title of Harry Stout's article (1993).

accused the representatives of the Church of England and the local colonial clergy of neglecting the obligations of true Christians and of abandoning the genuinely elevating grace. The preacher stressed that the notorious laxness and loosening of moral codes ought to be attributed to the shortcomings of the ministry, which was infiltrated by ungodly preachers, the “sheep in wolf’s clothing.”<sup>3</sup> Such an appeal shifted the burden of responsibility from previous generations and placed it squarely on the shoulders of the colonial communities, thus providing the hearers with a tangible scapegoat they could blame for their alleged moral shortcomings. Ordinary “saints,” common members of the church were liberated from the responsibility for the failure of the theocratic scheme, in consequence they readily embraced the words of a preacher who pointed out that the fault was not entirely theirs.

### 1.3. George Whitefield’s Theatrical Rhetoric

Harry Stout points out (1991) that a large part of Whitefield’s rhetorical success ought to be attributed to the acting skills he acquired in his youthful amateur theatrical experiences. In later life Whitefield looked back at his youthful fascination with drama with the utmost disdain, but it is hardly debatable that he owed at least a part of his oratorical success to it. Still, much as he drew on the theatre, his orthodox religiousness did not permit him to overtly embrace this fact. The bitter conflict between the pulpit and the stage at that time resulted from the fact that their rhetorical and persuasive natures were to a certain degree alike, and aimed at capturing the attention and minds of hearers and spectators. In drama, as well as in preaching, language was employed to evoke emotions and mould human minds; a certain vision of reality was projected onto people who, enchanted by the power of the spoken word, were more prone to accept it. Just like Plato in Book X of his *Republic*, to non-conformists the stage “introduced the risk of losing control, of imposing passions, directless feelings over the intellect” (Stout 1991: 23). As a consequence, Whitefield’s acting manuals offered an implicit vision of the world that could not be reconciled with his budding orthodoxy: “In place of thinking man the manuals substituted impassioned man and from there articulated a theory of self-presentation in public setting that was every bit as comprehensive and self-contained as a preacher’s manual and rhetorician’s text” (Stout 1991: 10).

---

<sup>3</sup> The idea that the “unconverted” ministers are responsible for the lack of genuine grace among the colonists became a popular preaching theme among the proponents of the Great Awakening. Gilbert Tennant’s *The Danger of an Unconverted Ministry* seems to be the most impactful sermon in this respect (Heimert 1955: 161–5).

Interestingly, colonial audiences did not perceive Whitefield's drama-like sermons as a form of theatre and eagerly embraced the new means of rhetorical expression which, combined with captivating rhetorical presences of the speaker, left them spellbound.

## 2. From Pulpit to Stage: George Whitefield's Sermons

One can observe that the "theatricality" of Whitefield's sermons manifests itself in different rhetorical modes. The three sermons analyzed in this article (*The Temptation of Christ*, *Abraham Offering His Son* and *The Eternity of Hell-Torments*) demonstrate these distinct manners of the preacher which fused the pulpit and the stage.

### 2.1. The Temptation of Christ

In this sermon the preacher recreates the Biblical scene of the temptation of Christ as a rhetorical duel between two accomplished orators. Whitefield's rendering of the scene reminds one of the rhetorical tradition of *agon*, a duel of skilful orators. The argumentative skirmish between Christ and Satan is a battle of wits and persuasive skills. By portraying the temptation in this manner the speaker makes rhetoric itself a theme of his sermon and passes an indirect comment on the persuasion used in religious discourse, simultaneously confirming the superiority of spiritually elevated oratory. Whitefield also makes sure that the dynamic, dialogic structure of the *sermo* allows him to appeal to his audiences more effectively and offers him an opportunity to make ample use of his legendary acting skills.

In the very first words the preacher creates the context for the whole sermon; he addresses his listeners stating that they "are invited to take a walk into the wilderness, to behold, sympathize with, and get instruction and comfort from a Saviour tempted" (1832: 216). Whitefield focuses his rhetorical attention on the audience (as suggested by the use of the passive construction), on the very moment of the delivery and enumerates the goals he sets before himself: he seeks to metaphorically engage his audience in the process of understanding of the divine message, "inviting" them to the sermonic spectacle, with him as the director and lead actor.

The preacher presents the conversation between the Satan and Jesus as a titanic rhetorical struggle. The importance of the confrontation is persistently expressed by the speaker by means of warlike imagery: the temptation is

nothing short of a “combat,” Satan’s arguments are “arrows in his quiver” and the exchanges are like crossings of “weapons” (1832: 218). Interestingly, it is Satan who becomes figuratively presented as a malicious attacker and Jesus is portrayed as the noble defender. Such metaphorical imagery and the use of words with strong pejorative and positive connotations allow the speaker to antithetically contrast Jesus’ and Satan’s behaviour and rhetorical skills, it also makes it possible to emphatically antagonize the relationship between them; this, in turn, helps Whitefield to dramatize the scene and to make it more appealing to the audience.

Whitefield initially stresses that Satan’s temptation of Christ is a continuation of the manipulative scheme manifested in the temptation of Adam and Eve and constitutes a crucial episode of the sacred history. Satan’s main weapons are seeming and appearance: he “would fain appear to be his [Jesus’] kind friend,” but the Son of God “saw through the disguised enmity of his antagonist” (1832: 218). Whitefield sets the two characters of his “drama-within-sermon” in a particular contextual background: they stand in the midst of the desert and then appear on the pinnacle of the temple. The dynamic set of exchanges between Satan and Christ is embellished with the brief commentaries of the preacher, who emotionally reacts to what he himself “performs” for the audience – as if becoming a spectator of his own show and guiding the hearers into how they should interpret what they witness.

Having presented the utterance of Satan, “For it is written . . . he shall give his angels charge concerning thee, and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone” (1832: 219), Whitefield voices his own comment on the tempter’s rhetoric: “This was artful, very artful” (1832: 219). The preacher’s apparent appreciation for Satan’s manipulative prowess grows as he presents the next argument, an eristic appeal to authority. Drawing on the importance of *Sola Scriptura* for the colonial audience, Satan quotes the Scripture to reinforce his previous point. Whitefield again praises Satan’s skill: the quotation is “plausible” and “fair,” but he also unravels the manipulative character of the appeal as the tempter left out a small section of the passage that changes the sense of the quote. At this point it becomes clear that the rhetorical mode employed by Satan is manipulative and, as the preacher himself observes, “filthy” (1832: 219). The “antagonist” of Christ uses deceit and, as a result, becomes the incarnation of all the negative associations the colonial audiences had for the art of oratory.

Christ’s answer is very different from Satan’s utterance: “It is written again, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God” (1832: 219). The statement is straightforward, non-negotiable and simple in its form; in his commentary Whitefield

stresses that, unlike his rhetorical “antagonist,” in his next utterance, the Son of God does not seek to abuse the Scripture by misquoting it. Instead, he employs logical argumentation, inferring his ideas from general premises and applying them to himself. At this point the critical difference between the rhetorical modes of the two characters becomes apparent: Satan employs manipulative, eristic type of argumentation, Christ’s responses are more placid and moderate, employing the means of logic. In consequence, Christ becomes the ideal of a rational, Aristotelian orator who does not exploit his rhetorical expertise to manipulate the emotions of the audience, but, instead, assuredly states his judicious and sound considerations.

The antithetical contrast between the two rhetorical stances becomes more visible with each turn. Whitefield skilfully increases the tension of the rhetorical exchange between Christ and Satan. Interestingly, he does not do so by changing the tone of the two speaker’s utterances, instead, he employs more and more figures like exclamations, apostrophes and rhetorical questions, to imply his surmounting emotionality, e.g., “It not high time for thee, O thou enemy of souls, to be commanded to depart!” (1832: 220). Ultimately, Whitefield’s emphatic cry that “the battle is over, the important combat is ended, Jesus hath won the field, Satan is routed and totally put to flight” announces the end of the rhetorical duel.

Whitefield’s rhetorical skill in *Temptation of Christ* resides in how the preacher was able to render theatrical language and dialogue as prominent elements of the discourse, both in terms of the theme of the sermon and the very persuasive appeals employed within it. At the same time, the author of the sermon was able to manoeuvre his rhetoric in such a way that the doctrinal message of his words remained both compelling and forceful. Finally, one ought to observe that the whole sermon is constructed in such a way that it offers the preacher an opportunity to present his acting skills by enacting the characters of Christ and Satan.

## 2.2. Abraham Offering His Son

In this sermon, Whitefield reconstructs the story of Abraham and Isaac as a drama that was to be “acted out” on the pulpit by the preacher; he produces numerous dialogues and monologues, and divides the plot into scene-like sections, which gradually leads to the “dramatic” climax, and fosters the mounting tension. The ultimate goal of the speaker: instigating a moral transformation in his hearers, is achieved through an amalgam of sermonic discourse, storytelling and the language of theatre.

The division into these three discursive modes is clearly visible in the different communicative roles the speaker assumes in the sermon: Whitefield interchangeably acts as himself, an awakening preacher addressing his audience, as the narrator of events and as an actor of the sermonic “spectacle.” Each of these communicative positions operates within a different context. As an awakening preacher, Whitefield constantly turns to his hearers and explains the text of the Scripture to them. As a storyteller, the speaker introduces the background of the story, and provides contexts for the “dramatic” dialogues of the sermon. Finally, as a performer in his sermonic spectacle, he acts out the dialogues of his characters, which function in the “reality” of the represented world, yet at the same time, however, they are directed at the actual audience, the addressees of George Whitefield. One ought to observe that in a number of places in the sermon the above communicative roles overlap and mix, and these “transition points” are usually used by the speaker to reinforce his appeal to the audience by means of rhetorical figures.

Another visible trace of the “dramatization” of the sermon might be the fact that it lays so much emphasis on emotional suspense and re-living the terrifying ordeal which the patriarch experienced. This aspect of Whitefield’s rhetorical discourse is best visible in the tense of verbs he employs as a storyteller and an actor. The persistent use of Present Simple and Present Progressive creates the impression that the plot is unfolding with the preacher’s words, and that Abraham’s story is not just a narrative, but a re-enactment of a human drama and guideline for salvation. In consequence, the story becomes directly accessible to the audience.

It is crucial to observe that in his creation of the character of Abraham Whitefield does not draw directly from Scripture. The sermonic drama features a vision of the patriarch as a rational and emotional being which the audience may sympathize with. The terror of what Abraham is to do pushes him into grim considerations, which are presented with a dramatic monologue. The character addresses himself in the “reality” of the sermonic drama, but at the same time his words reveal to the audience the inner emotional struggle accompanying him during his ordeal. Abraham’s emotions are indicated through the figures Whitefield embellishes his discourse with: exclamations suggest dependency, rhetorical questions imply internal struggle and hesitation. At first Abraham abhors what he is ordered to do: “What! Butcher my own child! It is contrary to the very law of nature” (1832: 60). Whitefield presents his inner battle with his thoughts as he considers different aspects of the situation. Abraham juxtaposes the command with God’s earlier promise that through Isaac he would be granted posterity. The killing of his son, atrocious in itself, would also



go against the words of the Almighty: “But supposing I could give up my own affections, and be willing to part with him, though I love him so dearly, yet if I murder him, what will become of God’s promise?” (1832: 60). Abraham also considers the fact that he is the leader of the community: “I am now like a city upon the hill: I shine as a light to the world, in the midst of a crooked and perverse generation” (1832: 60). Whitefield’s audience must have instantaneously recognized the *topos* of a “city upon the hill” that goes back to the concept of the covenant, so vital for the first generations of colonists.<sup>4</sup> Abraham is aware of his role in the sacred history, but he cannot reconcile it with God’s most recent command. The patriarch’s last thought is for him the hardest: “But, above all, what will Sarah my wife say? How can I ever return to her again, after I have imbrued my hands in my dear child’s blood?” (1832: 61). Abraham knows that his wife will never forgive him for the murder of their only and long-awaited child.

In the monologue designed by the preacher, Abraham weighs up all of the aspects of his life: the feelings for his son, his future legacy, his social position and responsibilities and his marriage against the word of God. The Grand Itinerant constructs a patriarch who, in his considerations, takes into account the aspects of existence which were well-rooted in the reality of the colonial life. The main character of the “drama-within-the-sermon” realizes that in the dramatic choice exemplifies a conflict between his versatile earthly loyalties and the loyalty to God. One cannot overlook Whitefield’s creativity in his choice of figures and arguments used to portray the Biblical character as a person who is to a large extent similar to the average audience member of the *sermo*. Just like the playwrights of the period and the playwrights whose craft he admired in youth,<sup>5</sup> Whitefield employs a variety of resources to enliven his drama-like discourse.

In the next scene of the sermonic drama, Abraham and Isaac set off. The preacher gives the story a timeline: “perhaps it was near the fourth watch of the night, just before break of day, when God said, take now thy son; and Abraham raises up early to do so” (1832: 61). After three days of wandering they find the place of sacrifice. Whitefield tries to make his hearers see the scene in their minds and sets his narrative perspective as an onlooker, an observer from afar, who describes what he sees to other people: “Methinks I see the old good man walking with his dear child in his hand, and now and then looking on him,

<sup>4</sup> The concept of the covenant and the mission God assigned the colonists was critical for the shaping of the early American identity, as argued by Stout 1986 and Weir 2005.

<sup>5</sup> A number of authors point out the critical importance of rhetoric for the shaping of English verse and drama, e.g., Joseph 1966, Müller 1979.

loving him, and then turning aside to weep. And perhaps, sometimes he stays a little behind to pour out his heart before God” (1832: 62).

The final, climactic episode of the story takes place when Abraham and Isaac arrive at their destination. Whitefield emphasises the dramatic irony of the situation by pointing out that the patriarch’s son, still unaware of the true aim of the excursion, carries the wood to construct the altar: “Little did Isaac think that he was to be offered on that very wood which he was carrying upon his shoulders” (1832: 63). Interestingly, Whitefield does not see in the wood, as was usually done by early Christian commentators, the prefiguration of Christ’s cross; he focuses more on the dramatization of the story. Again, the perspective of the onlooker allows the preacher to see the elements of the story in the context of the whole. Whitefield praises the innocence of the boy with exclamations (“How beautiful is early piety!” [1832: 63]) and recalls Isaac’s question about the lamb for the burnt-offering. The patriarch’s exclamatory answer is the climax of the scene and the peak of the gradually surmounting dramatic tension: “with tears in his eyes, and the utmost affection in his heart, [Abraham] cried out “Thou art to be the lamb, my Son!”” (1832: 63). This exclamation stands out from the rest of the discourse and signals the dramatic moment of the disclosure of the terrible truth and Abraham’s utmost desperation.

*Abraham Offering His Son* well illustrates how heavily Whitefield’s revivalist preaching relied on theatricality and how skilfully the preacher combined the pulpit and the stage. Both the general structure of the *sermo* as well as its particular elements, are calculated to elicit a strong emotional reaction from the audience with the help of a complete reservoir of techniques utilised in theatre.

### 2.3. The Eternity of Hell-Torments

In *The Eternity of Hell-Torments* dramatization of the sermonic discourse is used by Whitefield in yet another manner. The speaker’s communicative goal in the *sermo* is to provide a compelling evidence for the eternity and severity of torments awaiting the damned in hell. The sermon exhibits numerous features of the “fire and brimstone” sermonic oratory, with its emphasis on violent imagery and emotional rhetoric. Unlike in the case of other two sermons discussed above, the “dramatised” elements of *The Eternity of Hell-Torments* do not constitute the discursive framework for the whole speech, but serve as brief, persuasive reinforcements for particular argumentative points made by the speaker.

Whitefield opens the *sermo* with the emphasis on the contrast between heavenly bliss and infernal damnation, antithetically juxtaposing the former with the latter. After the opening, the preacher meticulously delineates a series of inferences and arguments to support his introductory statement that for the damned the infernal suffering is never-ending and inescapable. At the same time, Whitefield adorns his discourse with numerous apostrophes, exclamations and reproaches towards sinners, rendering the sermon more dynamic and vibrant. The accumulation of animated rhetorical mechanisms also foregrounds the minor dramatic fragments the preacher employs as persuasive underpinnings of his discourse.

The speaker persistently stresses the fact that the punishment awaiting both the fallen angels and sinners alike is cruel and unavoidable. He vividly describes the scene of judgement, when Christ will shout out to the damned who stand to his left hand: “Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels,” before they will be “justly” cast into the “everlasting fire with the devil and his angels” (1832: 313). Strong epithets increase the emotional potential of the address and allow the preacher to stress the severity and brutality of Christ’s sentence. The brief scene is both dialogic and dynamic, and serves well as an effective rhetorical reinforcement for the argument advanced by Whitefield. The scene is followed by an extensive apostrophe: “. . . assure thyself, O obstinate sinner, whoever thou art, he [Christ – M.Ch.] will by no means spare thee” (1832: 313) which completes the persuasive appeal.

In the second part of the sermon, having proven the eternal character of hellish torments with logical argumentation, the preacher also attempts to reinforce reason with emotions and adorns the *sermo* with yet another minimalistic dramatic scene. He enacts an “unhappy soul venting his fruitless sorrow” (1832: 315) to emphatically illustrate the severity of infernal torments. The damned deplores his sinful behaviour on earth: “O foolish mortal that I was, thus to bring myself into these never-ceasing tortures, for the transitory enjoyment of a few short-lived pleasures, which scarcely afforded me any satisfaction, even when I most indulged myself in them” (1832: 315). The sinner expresses a series of figures of *optatio*, rhetorical wishes, pertaining to his earthly misbehaviour, despairing over his past stubborn sinfulness: “O that I had taken up my cross and followed Christ! O that I had never ridiculed serious godliness; and out of a false politeness, condemned the truly pious as too severe, enthusiastic, or superstitious!” (1832: 315). Finally, the damned soul stresses the fact that he had arrived at proper self-reflection and self-awareness much too late, after he was sentenced to infernal oblivion: “But, alas! These reflections

come now too late; these wishes now are vain and fruitless” (1832: 315), and briefly describes that he is body is tormented by infernal “flames” and his dignity is shattered by the “mockery of insulting devils.”

The figurative, emotional soliloquy of the “unhappy soul” evokes the compassion of the audience, but it also encourages the listeners to identify with the suffering sinner and, as a result, to experience the revivalist “New Birth.” Because of the minimalist dramatic elements, the speaker can easily resort not only to logical but also emotional persuasion, rendering the sermon more versatile, lively and appealing.

## Conclusions

Whitefield’s impact on the American preaching tradition was not only significant but also persistent. The preacher left no school or organized movement behind him, but his innovative style of preaching, an amalgam of preaching oratory and drama, marked a new chapter in the development of American preaching rhetoric, partly informing also the discourse of the American Revolution.<sup>6</sup> Whitefield’s sermons are not usually praised for their theological depth – in this respect he could not compete with another prominent preacher of the Great Awakening, Jonathan Edwards – but the novelty of his rhetorical method, the amalgam of the pulpit and the stage, which he employed to various communicate ends and in versatile rhetorical ways, makes him a prominent revival rhetorician and a forerunner of modern evangelicalism.

## REFERENCES

- Cole, Nathaniel. “I run from my horse with all my might.” *Church History*. 38 (xii, 2/1993): 12.
- Dallimore, Arnold. *George Whitefield: The Life and Times of the Great Evangelist of the Eighteenth-Century Revival*, vol. 2. Westchester: Cornerstore Books, 1979.
- Franklin, Benjamin, *The Autobiography*. Bedford: Applewood Books, [1771] 2003.
- Heimert, Allan. *Religion and the American Mind*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1966.

---

<sup>6</sup> The influence of the Great Awakening’s proponents on the rhetoric of the American Revolution is stressed by Heimert (1966).

- Joseph, Miriam. *Shakespeare's Use of the Arts of Language*. New York & London: Hafner Publishing Company, 1966.
- Kidd, Thomas. *The Great Awakening: The Roots of Evangelical Christianity in Colonial America*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2007.
- Müller, Wolfgang. *Politische Rede bei Shakespeare*. Tübingen: Narr, 1979.
- Stout, Harry. "Heavenly comet." *Church History*, 38 (xii, 2/1993): 9–15.
- Stout, Harry. *Divine Dramatist: George Whitefield and the Rise of Modern Evangelicalism*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1991.
- Stout, Harry. *The New England Soul: Preaching and Religious Culture in Colonial New England*. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Tracy, Joseph. *The Great Awakening: A History of the Revival of Religion in the Times of Edwards and Whitefield*. Boston: Trappan, 1842.
- Weir, Daniel. *Early New England: A Covenanted Society*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2005.
- Whitefield, George. *Sermons on Important Subjects by Rev. George Whitefield*. London: Henry Fisher, Son and P. Jackson, 1832.