

MUHLENBERG WAS A PIETIST

by

Tim Soukup

Prof. Fredrich

Senior Church History Z

April 11, 1988

Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary Library
11231 N. Seminary Drive. 65W
Mequon, Wisconsin

OUTLINE

Introduction

- I. Definition of a Pietist
- II. Muhlenberg's Background
- III. Muhlenberg as Author
- IV. Muhlenberg's Orthodoxy
- V. Muhlenberg's Pietism
- VI. The Situation in America
- VII. How he Dealt With People
- VIII. Berkenmeyer vs. Muhlenberg

Conclusion

Recently I read an intriguing book called A Sense of History. It's one of those volumes you need to read slowly with a lot of thinking time to muse things over. Interestingly, the first thirty-seven pages form a section entitled, "I Wish I'd Been There." Numerous historians, scholars, and editors were asked to choose the one event they would most like to have witnessed. Each was asked to respond to the same exciting question. What is the one scene or incident in American history you would most like to have witnessed and why? I found myself glued to those thirty-seven pages, fascinated by the answers. Let me give you a quick sampling:

A history professor at Yale selected for his fantasy the opportunity to look inside the mind of Colonel Robert E. Lee on the occasion when Lee was being offered the command of the Union forces in 1861.

Another said he would like to have been with Lewis and Clark in November of 1805 when they first glimpsed the sparkling object of their labors, the Pacific Ocean. He wished he could have looked over the shoulder of William Clark as he scribbled in his log book, "Ocean in view-oh, the joy!"

Finally one said, there was a time when he would like to have been a fly on the wall of the bunker watching the last days and hours of the Third Reich. "But no longer, for the last decade I have yielded entirely to the wish that I could have been there in the White House on that day when Richard Nixon decided to resign his Presidency and knelt with my old friend Henry Kissinger to pray."¹

After reading that section I thought to myself wouldn't it be interesting to limit the choices to American Lutheranism? Ask yourself, what one event would you want to witness and why? If this humble historian had to pick his one event it would be December 30, 1742. On that cold windswept day Henry Melchoir Muhlenberg faced off with Count Zinzendorf and his band of merry men

in a small hall in Philadelphia. Can't you just hear Zinzendorf's sharp accusation stab into the sitting Muhlenberg? "The Hallenses are Pietists. Were you not educated at Halle?"² I imagine Muhlenberg's voice was a virtuoso on the keyboard of human emotions in that moment of his reply. His answer was: "I was educated in Hanover, studied at Gottingen, and also at Halle. I am a LUTHERAN and so shall remain."³ Reminds me of another historic figure who said, "Here I stand." Perhaps if we were there we would know once and for all whether or not Muhlenberg was a Pietist. Just the tone of his voice would have forever tipped the scales. Since we weren't there the debate will probably rage on until the end of time. The purpose of this paper is to convince you that, yes, Muhlenberg was a German Lutheran Halle Pietist from start to finish.

Now this is not to say Muhlenberg was a Pietist in the sense the word has come to mean today. How many Christians would want to be labeled a Pietist nowadays? The word has gained the equivalence of a swear word associated with smug self-righteousness and escapism. This was not Henry Melchoir Muhlenberg. His life was a mixture of courage, discipline, fervent love, confessionality, Scripture centeredness...in a word Pietism. In the June 1986 issue of "Christian History" there is a paragraph on the character traits one should expect of a true Pietist. "Pietists were basically interested in the religious renewal of the individual, belief in the Bible as the unfailing guide to faith and life, a complete commitment to Christ which must be evident in the Christians life, the need for Christian nurture through the faithful use of appropriate devotional aids, including sermons and hymns, and finally a concern

to apply the love of Christ so as to alleviate the social and cultural ills of the day."⁴ While this list is by no means comprehensive it will suffice to describe the Pietist we're trying to unmask in Muhlenberg. So let's take a fresh insightful look at the Patriarch of the Lutheran Church in America and hopefully discover a diehard Pietist.

There can be no doubt that Pastor Muhlenberg's early theological career dripped with Pietism. He was influenced early on by Professor Joachim Oporin. Oporin put confessional orthodox steel into Muhlenberg's backbone by his emphasis on sin and Christ centered justification. But Oporin also molded Pietism into his character. "Oporin did not construct his theology to create an objective system of belief, but with an eye to encountering persons in their subjectivity, and also to encourage godly living."⁵ Later Muhlenberg was educated at Halle which is located in present day East Germany. Halle was the then known center for Pietistic studies largely because Auguste Herman Francke controlled the university. Auguste Francke is considered by some to be the father of Pietism. It was under the tutorship of his son, Gotthilf August Francke, that our man began to hammer out many of his Pietistic convictions. A new emphasis in Christian experience, social concern, Biblical authority, and a zeal for mission work soon became engrained into the young Muhlenberg's mind at Halle. This can be attested to by the fact that while at Halle Muhlenberg wrote his only major work—a defense of Pietism. "In 1741, the year before Muhlenberg set out for America, a pamphlet of his was published in Germany in which he warmly defended pietistic conventicles against a critic, Senschreiben an

den Herrn Doctor Balthasar Mentzer."⁶ This student feels that Muhlenberg would have written more for Pietism at this earlier time too. However, his maiden effort received so many barbs of criticism that he was content to orally speak his views.

Some historians of the "Muhlenberg was not a Pietist" camp like to point out that because he did not write of Pietism later in life he forsook the movement. But actually history tells us that he was a prolific writer of Pietism his entire life. "As a pietistic Pastor of the eighteenth century, Muhlenberg was always alert to observe what he regarded as remarkable evidences of the operation of the Holy Spirit in the lives of individuals."⁷ Throughout his entire ministry in America Muhlenberg set down in writing what we would today probably call case studies. "Muhlenberg called these 'merkwuerdige Exempel'."⁸ Many times Muhlenberg used these "merkwuerdige Exempel" to edify or admonish mourners at funerals. A practice by the way that many Pietists, especially August Francke were quite fond of. Historian Theodore Tappert cites the reason why he feels many of Muhlenberg's case studies have not been published today: "These have not been published because our taste in 'edifying literature' has changed since the eighteenth century and because we are no longer so sure as Muhlenberg was that the hand of God can easily be discerned in the events of an individual's career."⁹ Sounds to me like these 'merkwuerdige Exempel' are excellent examples of Pietism. At the risk of sounding bias maybe many of these writings are better off left untranslated because Muhlenberg is better off left not a Pietist? As was said earlier "Pietist" is a four letter word today and who wants the Patriarch of the Lutheran

Church in America labeled with a slanderous term. This, of course, is all subjective second guessing but again it's something to think about.

All the other writings Muhlenberg penned smacked of Pietism as well. "The only other occasional piece which Muhlenberg is known to have written for publication is the preface to the hymnal of 1786, *Erbauliche Lieder-Sammlung*."¹⁰ "All historians agree that the most vivid and memorable evidence of pietistic thought is to be found in their hymns."¹¹

In Colonial America Muhlenberg and his colleagues also sent regular reports to the directors of the Francke Institution in Halle. Passages were picked out of these reports and printed in Halle in a series of pamphlets. These pamphlets were intended to inform contributors about what was being done with their money in America and to stimulate further contributions. Here are a few samples that perhaps illustrate Muhlenberg's continual support of Pietism in his writing. One must remember, however, that the Reverend Halle Fathers picked out what they wanted to hear.

"I have to say, Reverend Fathers, that if a preacher or catechist has not been thoroughly converted in Europe, we can entertain but poor hopes of him in Pennsylvania; for the condition of affairs in this free, strange country is such that one may be very easily seduced into carnal indulgence and dissolute habits, and for young beginners it is actually dangerous."¹²

"I have used the following method of preaching during the last year and a half: I preach for about an hour or three-quarters of an hour, and then I catechize the whole congregation on the sermon. A catechism is as much a necessity for us as our daily bread. For in the schools the children ought to be well grounded in the truths of the catechism, and to do this it is important to have a uniform set of phrases."¹³

"But when I made up my mind to remain single, then the devil went to work in an infamous way... I could not get

along without some female servant. As to the principle of selection I considered nothing but sincere piety, such as might be convenient both for myself and my work. The Lord also regarded my prayers and granted me a young woman who is pure of heart, pious, simple-hearted, meek and industrious. My wife's parents are Lutherans by descent; but as matters were in such confusion in this country, my father-in-law has tried all sorts of persuasions. He was first awakened by the reading of the sainted Professor Francke's church postils."¹⁴

Muhlenberg's writings seem to indicate he wanted to be a Pietist. Now in fairness to other historians one could pick quotes that stress Muhlenberg's strict orthodoxy. Or one could point to Muhlenberg's role in writing the model congregational constitution of 1762, and the synodical constitution of 1781. But this student wants to say that orthodoxy and confessionalism were a big part of Muhlenberg's Pietism. By the way Prof. John C. Weborg believes that orthodoxy and a strong belief in justification were the earmarks of all true pietists. "No Pietist would deny or disregard the gospel of justification of a sinner by the free grace of God."¹⁵

To say Muhlenberg was every bit a believer in justification as Martin Luther is not to hedge on his Pietism either. They went hand in hand. Remember also that the congregational constitution of 1762 and synodical constitution of 1781 should probably be ascribed to the work of a committee. Men like Brunholz, Wrangel, Kunze, etc. should all receive the credit and not just an unpietistic Muhlenberg.

In the previous paragraph we briefly touched on Muhlenberg's orthodoxy and strict adherence to justification as an indication of him not being a Pietist. But let's examine this more closely. Muhlenberg's use of Biblical principles cut like a hot knife through the butterlike pacifistic position of Zinzendorf and the Moravians

of his day. No one will deny that. "Our primary need here," he once wrote back to Germany, "is another pastor, one who is truly devoted to the kingdom of God. He must have faith, be well grounded in exegesis and dogmatics, prove what he teaches by his life, and never forget love and truth."¹⁶ But for historians to conclude from his stress on orthodoxy or adherence to the unaltered Augsburg Confession that he was not a pietist is being simplistic. "Muhlenberg relied heavily on the emphasis in the Smalcald Articles on 'true repentance' also."¹⁷ He constantly was harping on true repentance to offset what he believed to be orthodoxy's overemphasis of justification as a matter of right belief. Preachers had become demandingly rigid right down to the last icicle of truth. Religion had become stiffer than last Sunday's gum under the pew and there was little if any room left for the fruit of faith. Bonhoeffer labeled it "cheap grace." "The pietists wanted to restore the religious and the personal/experiential dimensions to the relation between God and person's."¹⁸

"Muhlenberg's emphasis on 'true repentance' was meant to revive the fear of conscience and awareness of God's wrath, which were central motifs in Luther's theology, the Smalcald Articles, and early Lutheranism, but which had lapsed into merely formal theological categories in Lutheran Orthodoxy."¹⁹ Consider this series of questions created by Muhlenberg to examine candidates for the ordained ministry. Notice both the loyalty to the historic Lutheran position and yet at the same time hotflashes of the second Reformation he was after.

"I. The candidate is to prepare a sketch of his life, giving, in as brief a compass as possible, an account of its chief events and of his academ-

ical studies. As this may readily become too extensive, it will suffice, if he briefly narrate: 1. His first awakening; 2. How God furthered the work of grace in his heart; 3. What moved him to study for the holy ministry, and where, in what branches and under whose direction he has attempted to improve himself.

II. What theological books does he have?

III. Mention the Chief Divisions of Theology, and answer the following questions concerning-

1. What is theology? 2. A general answer to the question: What is sin, and a more specific statement as to what is Original Sin? 3. Describe the Sin against the Holy Ghost; 4. Give an extended description of the Justification of the sinner before God, and confirm it with proof texts; 5. What is saving faith? 6. Whether and in how far are good works necessary to salvation? 7. What is Sanctification, and how is it promoted? 8. In how far is death the Wages of Sin (a) in the converted (b) in the unconverted?

IV. Whether our Evangelical Lutheran is the only justifying and saving faith, and upon what Scriptural foundations does it rest?

V. Give an exegetical explanation of Luke 16:8.

VI. Prepare from this the theme and skeleton of a sermon, with application.

VII. Describe the true character and duties of an evangelical preacher.

VIII. How an evangelical preacher should conduct himself towards the dying who confess that they are sinners in general, without confessing any special sin?

IX. Whether and in how far evangelical preachers can and should be in subordination to each other?

The answers, with the questions and proofs, to be neatly written out, and to be ready for submission by three o'clock tomorrow afternoon. All for the glory of God, and the good of the church!"²⁰

In his article "Was Muhlenberg a Pietist?" Robert Scholz seems to be advocating that Muhlenberg was not a Pietist. But he readily admits Muhlenberg's theology was different from the Lutheran standard. "What is more, his own working theology, explicitly or implicitly, ignored the Formula's 'norming' theses in three areas: he seemed to care little for the third use of Law; he emphasized response, and decision and voluntarism in matters of repentance,

faith and belief to a degree unanticipated in the Formula's strictures on free will; and he employed an inclusive definition of justification in his emphasis on the 'whole' of Christianity."²¹

Scholz then says it was the "theological dynamics within the history of the Lutheran confessional movement" that brought these trends along in Muhlenberg's life. Perhaps, but could it be that the Patriarch of the Lutheran Church in America wanted to be even more of a Pietist but could not because of his situation?

In America Muhlenberg was thrust into a position which included orthodox Lutheran's constantly beating the dead horse of a formalistic belief in justification. Then on the other side of the coin Muhlenberg had the fickle minded Moravians blowing in the wind of emotionalism like a broken shudder. Muhlenberg could ill afford to be too pietistic for the sake of either side. So he became a synonym for gutsy, pietistic, confessional Christianity. Muhlenberg realized that's what his situation demanded. He once observed:

"It seems as if the world does not wish to have anything to do with the whole of true Christianity; it wants either godliness without change of heart and faith, or faith without preceding change of heart and consequent sanctification."²²

Throughout his career Muhlenberg preached a pietistic emphasis on repentance and new awakening to check his immoral members. It also helped to disassociate himself from the starch orthodox Lutherans. "As a rule," he once observed, "at the first awakening there exists between the awakened listener and the awakening preacher a relationship of tender love or dependence, which is gradually improved after further growth."²³ Here's another example of Pastor Muhlenberg's bent for practical Pietism:

"In the afternoon I preached very briefly and then conducted kinderlehre for the numerous young people; this was something new in the congregation and resulted in wholesome emotion and awakening among old and young. The children were quite unaccustomed to using their limited intelligence and powers of judgment and to fashion their answers in accord with the questions, for in former times they had been required only to say, 'Yes' and 'No' mechanically. In the evening I conducted another simple, practical devotional meeting in the church and again had a large attendance. The people are rather taken back to hear that inward, practical Christianity is necessary and possible and to learn that an opus operatum is inadequate."²⁴

But he also continued to adhere to the articles of the church and stick to good order to suppress the Moravians. So much so that it was quite common for Muhlenberg to applaud Luther in his letters for rediscovering the source of salvation. Let me share with you a quick example of the orthodox way Muhlenberg often dealt with his people:

"Aaron Rambo brought his twenty-three year old English wife Anna (Bolton's daughter), who desired to be baptized. I first examined her in the most important rudiments, commended her in prayer to her Lord, who had bought her, had her recite the Three Articles of the Christian faith, the Lord's Prayer, and the Biblical verses concerning Holy Baptism..."²⁵

Interestingly even throughout the entire Revolutionary War Pastor Muhlenberg maintained his middle of the road pietistic orthodoxy. "Throughout the Revolution Henry Melchoir Muhlenberg pursued a thorny path of exceedingly difficult neutrality."²⁶ It would have been easy for him to go off the deep end on a pietistic crusade against the war. Especially since he often expressed such a view privately to his sons who were deeply involved in the war. "And he harbored a rather low opinion of the rank and file of the American army, and this was confirmed, he believed, by their shameful desecration of church buildings."²⁷ but Muhlenberg had learned early on how to control his pietistic leanings in the best interests

of the Gospel.

Perhaps the best indication that Muhlenberg was a true Lutheran Halle pietist was by the way he dealt with people. Another flag mark of a true Pietist was his fervent love for people. That's where their theology was hung out to dry. "At Halle, for example, the industries and shops of the city were pressured to take orphans as apprentices in the various trades. The guilds of these various crafts objected strenuously, which might have been one of the first examples of an affirmative action program, started by pietists no less!"²⁸ What's so striking about this is that within just a space of three years the number of orphans cared for at Francke's orphanage had grown to 100. Inside the friendly confines of Halle, the personhood of each child was enhanced in everyway. Contrary to accepted procedures of the day, each orphan was given a bed, a practice that was ridiculed as extravagant. But it wasn't to Pietists. "The practice of love, personally and institutionally, was the most humanizing endeavor of all."²⁹

Our man Muhlenberg began such an orphanage as well, in Göttingen under the influence of Dr. Oporin whom we mentioned earlier. "In the year 1736, Muhlenberg, conjointly with two other students of theology, rented a room and began to instruct poor ignorant, neglected children in spelling, reading, writing, and the catechism, the teachers deriving no pecuniary advantage from their labors."³⁰

Muhlenberg demonstrated this pulsating pietistic love throughout his entire life as we have already seen in many of his letters. F. Bente characterizes Muhlenberg in these words: "Depth of religious conviction, extraordinary inwardness of character, apostolic zeal for the spiritual welfare of individuals, absorbing devotion

to his calling and all its details, were among his most marked characteristics. These were combined with an intuitive penetration and extended width of view, a statesman like grasp of every situation in which he was placed, an almost prophetic foresight, coolness, and discrimination of judgment, and peculiar gifts for organization and administration."³¹

Muhlenberg was different than any Pastor in America at his time. Why? Because he was a Pietist in a sea of orthodoxy. He operated differently. Oodles of examples could be cited from his journals. But perhaps the best example of the Pietism Muhlenberg demonstrated as a Seelsorger can be seen in his conflict with Pastor Wilhelm Berkenmeyer. "The situation in question involves the Raritan parish in New Jersey, in which a certain Johann August Wolf was pastor, sent in 1734 by the Hamburg Consistory as a successor to Daniel Falckner."³² It didn't take Wolf long to get himself neck deep in controversy. Muhlenberg reported to the Halle authorities in 1745: "This Wolf showed himself a capricious character, full of pride and self-impotence. 'The points of the controversy were these: he did not preach from memory, as had his predecessor; he conducted an irregular marital life; he did not attend to his work.'"³³

The congregation tried to toss Wolf out on his robe peacefully but he wouldn't leave. So in came Pastor Berkenmeyer to settle the issue. Acting on a strict provision from a constitution which a number of congregations got shoved down their throats under his leadership, Berkenmeyer summoned an assembly to arbitrate the matter. To make a long meeting short in the end Berkenmeyer presented

eight points for consideration. These points stressed the illegality of ousting a pastor without the approval of a higher body. Wolf was therefore to be reaccepted in the parish "upon the condition that his reverence by way of counter obligation, obligate himself, within such a time as it pleases him to stipulate, to preach from memory. Meanwhile, by way of amnesty, on both sides, to forgive and to forget all, the pastor showing fidelity and friendship toward his congregation, and the church members likewise true and sincere love and friendship to the pastor."³⁴

The congregation was forced to pay delinquent salary and make any future dismissal conditioned upon the approval of the Hamburg Consistory. Clearly then Berkenmeyer was not a Pietist. He just didn't show the love for truth, repentance, and the Gospel a Muhlenberg would show. Krieder says it better than me:

"One must recognize the approach and person of Berkenmeyer throughout-the assembly made no impartial investigation of the controversy, in order to arrive at a just settlement, but was forced to accept the pre-arranged settlement which had been formulated in the study of Loonburg (by Berkenmeyer and Pastor Michael Christian Knoll, who determined to retain Wolf's position, and the congregations had to suffer under him for another decade before he was finally₃₅ exposed for the despicable character that he was...

After repeated requests from this Raritan parish Muhlenberg entered the picture to help them out of their troubles. After weeks of strife it was decided to arbitrate the affair before four clergymen-Berkenmeyer and Knoll on the part of Wolf, Muhlenberg and Tobias Wagner on the congregation's side. The very fact that Berkenmeyer later refused to participate in the hearings betrays some of his orthodox spirit. When the congregation finally refused to retain Wolf, Muhlenberg asked himself:

"How could we, with any kind of justice, have forced these congregations to acknowledge as their spiritual guide a lazy servant, an adulterer, a perjurer, a wolf, a destroyer of the flock, a man who did not rule even his own house, and compel them to pay him so much every year for his wickedness?"³⁶

The whole stinky mess ended with the parish paying Wolf 90 pounds to relinquish his call and split. Then Muhlenberg took care of the congregation himself until 1748 when he assigned them a graduate. Krieder comes up with two terms from this controversy- the "Muhlenberg Way" and the "Berkenmeyer Way." The "Muhlenberg Way" was the way of true Pietism. Please remember also what kind of Pietism we're looking for. The new order or "Muhlenberg Way" represented the response Pietism made to the social order of the American nation.

"One was the old order following the stern, unbending orthodoxy inherited from a bitterly controversial period in Europe; the other was the new order following the sympathetic, broad-visioned Pietism inherited from the revival of the European church. The new order while holding on to all that was best in the life of the European church, nevertheless insisted upon developing its own life in the land in which it found itself."³⁷

Muhlenberg's Pietism recognized a place for democratic procedure in church life, the right of a congregation to call, strict adherence to the confessions and an extreme emphasis on the Word and sacraments. We have briefly touched on this already but it is important to speak of it again since many historians list these characteristics as evidence that Muhlenberg was not a Pietist.

Perhaps Pietism itself is a much maligned movement that received a bad name from a few bad eggs. While we have all been warned about the phoney emotionalism of this religious age; faith is still an emotion. Pietism realized this. It also realized

that the church was slowly decaying in dead orthodoxy. As Glatfelter concluded:

"At a time when the church people were in the process of ordering their religious affairs from a compulsory to a voluntary basis, it (Pietism) called the attention of the clergy away from their rights and privileges in a static society to their obligations to a spiritually starving people in a dynamic one. How much power, prestige, and salary he had were questions of far less importance to the Pietist than were such matters as the state of grace of those souls which had been redeemed by Christ and placed for a time in his care. A patient, levelheaded, a preserving clergyman whose whole life was the cultivation of piety would find Pennsylvania voluntarism tolerable, and he would in turn be respected by the vast majority of those with whom he came in contact with."³⁸

Pietism's influences can still be felt today as well. Bible study groups, rich hymnology, devotional life, and mission work all received a shot in the arm from Pietism. The stone throwing critics of Muhlenberg's Pietism should realize these accomplishments. Muhlenberg himself was more than an irritating malcontent, a reckless idealist who wouldn't sit down. He was a Pietist. Better yet he was a "courageous visionary." The Patriarch of the Lutheran Church in America was the Paul Kelm or David Vallesky of his day. It is my humble opinion that historians who fail to admit this fail to do justice to the historical record. I do not pretend to have crawled into every nook and cranny of Muhlenberg's life. But hopefully from what we have learned together in this paper you will agree with me that Henry Melchoir Muhlenberg was, in the real sense of the word, a pietist.

ENDNOTES

- ¹From "I Wish I'd Been There," A Sense of History, (New York: American Heritage Press), pp.1-37.
- ²William J. Mann. Life and Times of Henry Melchoir Muhlenberg, (Philadelphia: General Council Publication Board), p.122.
- ³Ibid, p. 122.
- ⁴A.K. Curtis. Christian History Vol.5, No.2, June. (1986), p.3.
- ⁵Kenneth R. Lentz. Life and Theology of Joachim Oporin, Professor and Teacher of Henry Melchoir Muhlenberg, (TH.D. Thesis, Heidelberg University), p.149.
- ⁶Theodore G. Tappert. "Muhlenberg as Author," Concordia Historical Institute Quarterly Vol.34, No.3, Oct. (1961), p.82.
- ⁷Ibid, p.87.
- ⁸Ibid, p.85.
- ⁹Ibid.
- ¹⁰Ibid, p. 82.
- ¹¹William Brackney. "From the Archives," Christian History Vol. 5, No.2, June. (1986), p.32.
- ¹²John W. Dobberstein and Theodore G. Tappert. The Journals of Henry Melchoir Muhlenberg Vol.1, (Philadelphia: The Muhlenberg Press), p.101.
- ¹³Ibid.
- ¹⁴Ibid, p.102.
- ¹⁵John C. Weborg. "Reborn in Order to Renew," Christian History Vol.5, No.2, June. (1986), p.17.
- ¹⁶Dobberstein and Tappert, p.91.
- ¹⁷Robert F. Scholz. "Was Muhlenberg a Pietist?" Concordia Historical Institute Quarterly Vol.52, No.2, Summer. (1979), p.62.
- ¹⁸Weborg, p.17.
- ¹⁹Elert Werner. The Structure of Lutheranism, (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House), p.45.
- ²⁰Brackney, p.32.
- ²¹Scholz, p.63.
- ²²Dobberstein and Tappert, p.382.
- ²³Ibid, p.162.
- ²⁴John W. Dobberstein and Theodore G. Tappert. The Journals of Henry Melchoir Muhlenberg Vol.2, (Philadelphia: The Muhlenberg Press), p.342.
- ²⁵John W. Dobberstein and Theodore G. Tappert. The Journals of

Henry Melchoir Muhlenberg Vol.3, (Philadelphia: The Muhlenberg Press), p.615.

²⁶Theodore G. Tappert. "Henry Melchoir Muhlenberg and the American Revolution," Church History Vol.11, (Indiana: The American Society of Church History), Dec. (1942), p.301.

²⁷Ibid, p.296.

²⁸Weborg, p.35.

²⁹Ibid.

³⁰Mann, p. 10.

³¹F. Bente. Early History of American Lutheranism and The Tennessee Synod, (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House), p.69.

³²Frederick S. Weiser. "The Muhlenberg Way," Concordia Historical Quarterly Vol.34, No.2, July. (1961), p.50.

³³Dobberstein and Tappert, p.105,106.

³⁴Weiser, p.51.

³⁵Harry J. Kreider. Lutheranism in Colonial New York, (NewYork: A.M.S. Press, 1942), p.97.

³⁶Dobberstein and Tappert Vol. I, p.107.

³⁷Krieder, pp.112-113.

³⁸Charles H. Glatfelter. "The Colonial Pennsylvania German Lutheran and Reformed Clergyman," unpublished doctoral dissertation, (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University), 1952, p.36.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- A Sense of History. New York: American Heritage Press, 1985.
- Bente, F. Early History of American Lutheranism and the Tennessee Synod, St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1919.
- Brackney, William. "From the Archives," Christian History Vol. 5, No. 2. June. (1986), p.32.
- Curtis, A.K. Christian History Vol. 5, No. 2. June. (1986), pp. 3-36.
- Dobberstein, John W. and Tappert, Theodore G. The Journals Of Henry Melchoir Muhlenberg Vol. 1. Philadelphia: The Muhlenberg Press, 1942.
- Dobberstein, John W. and Tappert, Theodore G. The Journals of Henry Melchoir Muhlenberg Vol. 2. Philadelphia: The Muhlenberg Press, 1942.
- Dobberstein, John W. and Tappert, Theodore G. The Journals of Henry Melchoir Muhlenberg Vol. 3. Philadelphia: The Muhlenberg Press, 1942.
- Glafelter, Charles H. The Colonial Pennsylvania German Lutheran and Reformed Clergyman, Baltimore: The John Hopkins University, 1952.
- Kreider, Harry J. Lutheranism in Colonial New York, New York: A.M.S. Press, 1942.
- Mann, William J. Life and Times of Henry Melchoir Muhlenberg. Philadelphia: General Council Publication Board, 1887.
- Scholz, Robert F. "Was Muhlenberg a Pietist?" Concordia Historical Institute Quarterly Vol. 52, No.2. Summer. (1979), pp. 50-65.
- Tappert, Theodore G. "Muhlenberg as Author," Concordia Historical Institute Quarterly, Vol. 34, No.3. Oct. (1961), pp.82-85.
- Tappert, Theodore G. "Henry Melchoir Muhlenberg and the American Revolution," Church History Vol. 11. Indiana: The American Society of Church History, Dec. (1942), pp.284-301.
- Weborg, John C. "Reborn in Order to Renew," Christian History Vol.5, No. 2. June. (1986), pp.17-18, 34-35.
- Weiser, Frederick S. "The Muhlenberg Way," Concordia Historical Quarterly Vol. 34, No. 2. July. (1961), pp.45-53.
- Werner, Elert. The Structure of Lutheranism. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1962.