

Poor Children and Enlightened Citizens: Lutheran Education in America, 1748-1800¹

Elizabeth Lewis Pardoe
Valparaiso University

In 1743, Henry Melchior Muhlenberg arrived in Pennsylvania as a missionary from the Lutheran University of Halle to the German congregations surrounding Philadelphia. From 1743 to 1748, Muhlenberg struggled to bring organization and confessional conformity to all the Lutherans of the Mid-Atlantic states. In 1748, the Lutheran congregations associated with Muhlenberg and the Halle mission gathered in Philadelphia for the founding of the “Evangelical Lutheran Ministerium of Pennsylvania and the Adjacent States.”² After five years of struggle to impose some semblance of old world order onto new world chaos, Muhlenberg focused attention on the state of Lutheran schools in America. The ability to educate a new generation of Lutheran believers stood at the heart of his mission, and with the Ministerium gathering strength, parishes could spare money and attention for children and classrooms. Muhlenberg strove to prove pastoral and cultural legitimacy among Lutherans. However, the Ministerium faced competition from a myriad of sects, and the nebulous distinctions between schoolmasters,

1. Many thanks to John Murrin, Anthony Grafton, A.G. Roeber, T.H. Breen, Nancy Maclean, Hermann Wellenreuther, Richard Dunn, Ignacio Gallup-Diaz, John Fea, Leigh Schmidt, Patricia Bonomi, Barry Levy, the members of the 1998 Harvard University International Seminar on the Atlantic World and the 1998-99 Princeton University Center for Human Values Seminar, as well as those who attended Session 22 at the 2000 Omohundro Institute for Early American History and Culture Annual Conference for their helpful comments. Special thanks to John Peterson and the staff of the Lutheran Archive Center at Philadelphia for providing cheerful guidance and assistance during my numerous visits.

2. I explore the first five years of Muhlenberg’s career and the Ministerium’s founding in chapter 3 of my dissertation, “Suffering Shepherds and Scattering Sheep” (Princeton University, in progress).

catechists, and pastors muddied consistorial order. Muhlenberg and his counterparts emerged from the extensive educational system in Halle. The Prussian university and schools had fine tuned pedagogical practices and engaged in a project of self definition since the first spate of Lutheran school ordinances in the sixteenth century. In Mid-Atlantic America, the structures of pedagogical and pastoral order it had taken Germans two centuries to build in Halle were entirely absent.

Long before contemporary political theorists such as Amy Gutman and Charles Taylor probed the complicated relationships between culture and community, pedagogy and politics,³ the Lutheran ministers of Pennsylvania explored the same nexus of identity and indoctrination within their own intellectual framework. That the building of a spacious, expensive schoolhouse nearly tore Muhlenberg's carefully woven community asunder defies mere coincidence. The issue of who claimed the power to teach whom and what would be taught took center stage in determining the nature and role of a Lutheran community in late eighteenth-century America. In the attempt to define an American Lutheran community capable of transmission to new generations of Lutherans born in America, ministers struggled to integrate the sectarian ideals of Halle with the democratic impulses of American government. As pastors and their parishioners changed the way they defined their role within their new society, schools changed the goals of their tuition. At mid-century, Henry Muhlenberg wanted to train American children to be good Lutherans. By the century's end, Johann Helmuth wanted to teach German to Lutheran children.

During the 1748 convention, Pastor Peter Brunnholtz of Philadelphia reported on the state of the Lutheran schools throughout the Ministerium's parishes. The only school to truly thrive in the well-settled areas of Philadelphia and Germantown relied upon a theological student and former Moravian, Mr. Doeling, but his students were not exclusively Lutheran. The outlying congregations had greater difficulties getting students and teachers into classrooms with the exception of the western center, Lancaster. Pastor Johann Friedrich Handschuh, from Lancaster, reported "that the school has been flourishing now for a year, since Mr. Schmidt has instructed nearly seventy children, in which work

3. Amy Gutman, "Undemocratic Education" in *Liberalism and the Moral Life*, Nancy L. Rosenblum, ed. (Cambridge, MA, 1989) 79-88; Amy Gutman, *Democratic Education* (Princeton, 1987); Charles Taylor, "The Politics of Recognition" in *Multiculturalism*, Amy Gutman, ed. (Princeton, 1994), 25-73; and Charles Taylor, *Sources of the Self* (Cambridge, MA, 1989).

Mr. Viger assisted." Now that Schmidt was departing for Europe, the pastor and elders were "anxious to know where they may get another in his place."⁴ The Lancastrians' anxiety was well founded. Engaged in a longstanding battle with Moravians for German souls, Schmidt's departure allowed the Moravians to gain Lutheran ground. By January 1749, Muhlenberg wrote in his journal that "The Zinzendorfers were taking advantage of the situation and had no lack of schoolmasters." Thus, Jacob Loeser, the assistant pastor from New Hanover, moved to Lancaster to teach. His departure both ended the school in New Hanover and left neighboring Saccum and Upper Milfort, where Loeser served as catechist, "to the tender mercies of the disorderly tramp preachers and Zinzendorfers who live nearby."⁵

As Muhlenberg grappled with empty pulpits and pocketbooks, the early 1750s saw new waves of German migrants flood American shores. In the cleric's mind they weakened the tenuous influence he had gained over American Lutherans. Defending the reputation of an unbelieving, unattractive woman, whom "superstitious and ignorant Pennsylvania neighbors" had considered a witch, Muhlenberg bemoaned the lack of Christian knowledge in his extended flocks. He claimed "Many superstitious and godless notions still prevail among the old, presumptuous people who have had no instruction in their youth and are unwilling to

4.. *Documentary History of the Evangelical Lutheran Ministerium of Pennsylvania and Adjacent States: Proceedings of the Annual Conventions From 1748-1821*, Compiled and Translated from the Records in the Archives and from the Written Protocols. Ed. Board of Publication of the General Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in North America (Philadelphia, 1898), 10-11.

5. *The Journals of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg*, 3 vols, trans. Theodore G. Tappert and John W. Doberstein (Philadelphia, 1942-58), I:213. In Loeser's place, Muhlenberg installed "another young married man who had taught school in the neighborhood for several years and with whom I was acquainted." Michael Walter arrived in Pennsylvania as a young man and "had been sold to a prominent Quaker until he came of age." What "little" Walter "grasped concerning the Evangelical religion in Germany had prevented him from espousing the views of Quakers." This adherence to Lutheranism struck Muhlenberg as particularly impressive given "the fact that he worked among them for many years, attended their meetings, and had many temptations" to join the Friends, "especially since he had no opportunity to attend his own church and further establish his faith." Walter posed an ideal example of someone who upheld the Augsburg Confession and withstood the appeal of surrounding sectarians. Not only Quakers offered an alternative faith, but "the few German People who lived thereabouts were adherents of the new Anabaptist denomination" – presumably the Dunkers. As soon as Walter "had his freedom, he took to schoolteaching." However, the "darkness and ignorance among the Quakers" cast a shadow upon Walter although he "learned to read and write English, and lead an unbridled life." During Walter's visits to the New Hanover services, he "was enlightened by God's Word and the Spirit connected with it." Walter's newfound experience of Word and Spirit led to "a godly sorrow for his sins," and "by help of this light," Walter began, "to his salvation, to know the only true God and Jesus Christ whom he sent." Already permitted to teach in the New Hanover school, Walter showed "good promise that he will continue and increase in true repentance and faith."

hear and learn the Word of God in their old age." New arrivals, "coming annually from various regions," were "no better; their heads, too, are full of fantastic notions of witchcraft and Satanic arts." Muhlenberg still hoped that "Under God's blessing thorough and godly schools could lay a better foundation for the future."⁶

During the 1750's the plight of German schools began to draw attention from English speakers as well. Benjamin Franklin ensured that German education became a broadly discussed topic during the turbulent decade. Franklin first politicized German education with a 1750 letter to James Parker in which he recorded his fear that Pennsylvania "will in a few Years become a German colony: Instead of their Learning our Language, we must learn theirs or live as in a foreign Country." Franklin also placed into doubt "How good Subjects" the Germans would be "and how faithful to the British Interest."⁷ With the preface that German-Americans were "of the most ignorant Stupid Sort of their own Nation," Franklin held that Germans' "own Clergy have very little influence over the people," who took "an uncommon pleasure in abusing and discharging the Minister on every trivial occasion." Franklin surmised that "Not being used to Liberty," Germans "know not how to make a modest use of it." Instead, German boys proved their manhood "by beating their mothers" and their freedom by "abusing and insulting their Teachers." As a result of this immodest independence, Franklin declared Germans "under no restraint of the Ecclesiastical Government."⁸

Benjamin Franklin and Conrad Weiser put their names to a "scheme," which appeared in the *Pennsylvania Gazette* on February 25, 1755, "for the Instruction of POOR GERMANS in this and neighbouring British Colonies." The article provided "A Brief History of the Rise and progress of the CHARITABLE SCHEME, carrying on by a Society of Noblemen and Gentlemen in London. The scheme was "for the Relief and Instruction of the poor Germans and their Descendants, settled in Pennsylvani, &c." The fear of Catholic influence on "the Protestant interest" provided the pertinent reason "not to neglect such a vast Body of useful People, situated in a dark and barren Region, with almost none to instruct them, or their helpless children." The benevolent Anglos saw that these German offspring were "coming forward into

6. *Muhlenberg*, I:349.

7. "To James Parker, March 20, 1750/1" in *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin*, vol. 4, ed., Leonard W. Labaree (New Haven, 1961), 120.

8. "To Peter Collinson, May 9, 1753" in *Ibid.*, 483-85.

the World, in Multitudes, and exposed to easy Prey to the total Ignorance of their Savage neighbours on the one Hand." An equal threat loomed from "the Corruptions of our Jesuitical Enemies, on whom they border, on the other Hand, and of whom there are already perhaps to[o] many mix'd among them."⁹

The Society¹⁰ aimed "to qualify the Germans for all the Advantages of native English subjects." Franklin's society threatened that Germans' "very Names will be held in Abhorrence by your own Children, if , for want of Instruction, their Priviledges should either be abridged here, or they should fall a Prey to the Error and Slavery of our restless Enemies." If German-Americans wished "to transmit the glorious Priviledges of Protestants and Freemen to your Posterity," they needed "to be extremely jealous of your Safety." The Society cast the Germans as desperate dependants upon English protection "in this time of Danger (when a Popish Enemy has advanced far into our Country, even to your very Doors)."¹¹

Although Franklin and his counterparts billed the charity schools as an ecumenical enterprise and promised that the society would print Lutheran and Calvinist Catechisms in both "English and Dutch" to be distributed among the poor with Bibles, Schlatter's position implied an essentially Calvinist effort. However, the society mentioned that New Hanover, New Providence and Reading would have the first schools, because these three Lutheran communities already had school-buildings and schools thanks to Muhlenberg's efforts. The anglicizing focus of the charity effort became clear with the demand that all schoolmasters must either be bilingual or willing to learn English. The newspaper article stressed that "unless the generous Society had made a Provision for teaching English as well as Dutch, it would not have answer'd their benevolent Design." This design "to qualify the Germans for all the Advantages of native English Subjects" looked like Franklin's version of the "White Man's Burden" for swarthy "palatine Boors."¹² The prominent German printer, Christopher Sauer, suspected as much and his

9. February 25, 1755, *Pennsylvania Gazette*, Accessible Archives on CD-ROM, vol. 2, 1751-1765, Item 5420.

10. Fully titled "for the Relief and Instruction of poor Germans and their Descendants, settled in Pennsylvania, & C." February 25, 1755, *Pennsylvania Gazette*.

11. February 25, 1755, *Pennsylvania Gazette*.

12. "Observations Concerning the Increase of Mankind" in *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin*, vol. 4, 234.

vehement opposition ensured the plan's failure.¹³ Nevertheless, the image of German colonists as doubtful patriots and questionable Protestants endured.

During the worst years of the Seven Years' War, the Lutheran Ministerium did not meet in full assembly. However, in 1760, the Lutheran pastors thoroughly re-evaluated the standards of their consistory. When Muhlenberg called the meeting he offered it as a antidote to the "great distance from our European mother-church" and the tendency "in this country" to be "mostly, and often too much dependent upon the *vox populi*." Muhlenberg hoped that "we poor preachers may at least have such freedom in our congregations as to be able now and then to meet, to tell to one another our troubles." The meetings could "afford mutual encouragement under difficult official burdens."¹⁴ The ministers voted to have the annual meetings move from location to location as evidence that no one congregation stood above the others and as an opportunity to make "a good impression" especially upon the "young people" in each community where the Ministerium met.¹⁵

Notably displeased with the state of affairs in the Ministerium's congregations, Muhlenberg followed in the footsteps of sixteenth-century reformers and concentrated on making the youth better Christians than their parents.¹⁶ The ministry questioned "*the best method of conducting 'Kinderlehre.*" Institutional consistency came first, and they determined that "The same Catechism should be used in all the United Congregations."¹⁷ In the tradition of early German school ordinances, the ministry required that preachers regularly visit "the schools in the towns," and that "in the country," parents oversee the "private devotions and catechization of children and servants."¹⁸ Visits to parishioner's homes could be used to gauge the spiritual standing of the entire congregation.

13. Lawrence A. Cremin, *American Education: The Colonial Experience, 1607-1783* (Evanston, 1970), 262. Muhlenberg appears to have laid low and allowed the Charity Plan debate to resolve itself without his involvement. – "Letter 157. An [S.Th. Albinus] [February 18, 1755]" in *Die Korrespondenz Heinrich Melchior Muehlenbergs: Aus der Anfangszeit des Deutschen Luthertums in Nordamerika*, Band II: 1753-1762, ed. Kurt Aland (New York, 1987), 233.

14. *Documentary History*, 44.

15. *Documentary History*, 51.

16. See Gerald Strauss, *Luther's House of Learning* (Baltimore, 1978); Susan Karant-Nunn, "The Reality of Early Lutheran Education: The Electoral District of Saxony – a Case Study," *Lutherjahrbuch* 57 (1990); Elizabeth Lewis Pardoe, "Education, Economics, and Orthodoxy: Lutheran Schools in Wuerttemberg, 1559-1617." *Archive fuer Reformationsgeschichte (ARG)* 91 (2000), 285-315.

17. *Documentary History*, 51.

18. *Muhlenberg*, I:446.

Pastors discussed browsing bookshelves, because "harmful" material "may often be encountered."¹⁹ The Swedish Provost, Dr. Carolus Magnus Wrangel, suggested that everyone follow his own practice of creating a "chart in which he entered the names of parent, children, servants, etc., and made notes of their excellencies and shortcomings." From these charts, "he could visualize the condition of the entire congregation and devise means for improving it." However, other pastors argued that this task would be "impractical" in large parishes.²⁰

Pedagogical technique found its way into the ministry records for the first time. Following in the tradition of Philip Melancthon, Luther's counterpart and prime pedagogue, the American Ministerium stressed the intervention of teachers to help students draw appropriate connections and conclusions in their readings.²¹ The pastors feared excessive memorization and stressed that "The truths of the Catechism should be instilled simply, intelligently, impressively, and attractively." This "milk for children" supplied the staple of a religious diet "supported by proofs from the Holy Scriptures according to the *nervus probandi*[sinews of proving]." In cases requiring memorization, "attention should be paid to the clear division of the material, to making it intelligible to their weak understanding." The impetus lay with teachers to explain subjects "in such a manner that it will not only be fixed in their memories, but also fill their souls with light and life." A bit of bribery would not go awry in enticing the children to learn. Thus the ministry "suggested that a small gift might occasionally be given to the children who applied themselves most diligently in the catechizations." Strikingly, someone argued "that children in schools ought not to be taught spelling and reading from the Testament or Bible, especially not if this is accompanied by scolding or punishment." The minister feared that such use "would give the children a dislike or contempt for the holy Word of God and, as they grow in years, would make them dread and despise the Book." Instead, "Schoolmasters, catechists, and preachers must see to it that the Bible is represented to the children as the greatest treasure and most precious gem and that it is so used that it tastes like sugar and honey to them." The ministry suggested the use of "other convenient and usable little books from which children can learn spelling and read-

19. *Muhlenberg*, I.:446

20. *Documentary History*, 51.

21. For an excellent examination of Melancthon's pedagogical methods see Sachiko Kusukawa, *The Transformation of Natural Philosophy: The Case of Philip Melancthon* (Cambridge, 1995) as well as Robert R. Bolgar, *The Classical Heritage and its Beneficiaries* (Cambridge, 1973).

ing.” The Bible retained special status “as the holiest of all books.” Removed from daily exercises, when the Bible “is opened in the presence of the children, they must be made to see, according to their limited and sensuous conception, as if a box of sugar, honey, and all kinds of sweets had been opened for distribution.”²²

The ministry asked “the Lord God” to “move our Fathers in the European mother church, who have a larger experience and a maturer judgment,” to “instruct us briefly how the holy Word of God may obtain the reverence which it deserves among both young and old people.”²³ The means of teaching was a central issue for the “Fathers” mentioned. August Hermann Francke, following in the wake of Philip Spener, revamped Lutheran pedagogical methods within the system of schools he founded at the University of Halle, where Muhlenberg and many other members of the Ministerium trained. The pietist pedagogical tradition stressed the importance of lived experience in leading students to God.²⁴ The Ministerium thought there was “no want of books and rules in the Evangelical Church which teach generally or specifically, how to read, value, use, apply, etc., the Word of God,” but the pastors recognized that “general practice shows clearly that rules are not enough.” The “Word of God, this richest treasure and most precious gem, is sacriliciously buried in a napkin by the Babylonian whore.” The pastors declared that the “Word” was “honored less by educated Protestants than the *Corpus Juris Romanum* is by jurists, and is treated by the common people like a beggar’s sack found by a sow.” Worse, in the aftermath of the French and Indian War, the Ministerium recorded, “The Papists actually put us to shame, for the children of this world are wiser than the children of the light.” The Catholic church “With a bone or relics, wherever they may have picked them up” could “lure people from far and wide and persuade them to adore these with trembling, etc., as if they were sacred.” They envied priests such “tomfoolery” with which “they hold up a monstrance, the people fall down and exhibit the greatest imaginable reverence.” By contrast, “Protestants have the holiest Word of God in the original languages and in our mother tongue, yet we do not esteem this heavenly gem, but rather make an apple of dis-

22. *Muhlenberg*, I:446-7.

23. *Muhlenberg*, I:447, *Documentary History*, 52.

24. August Hermann Francke, *Werke in Auswahl*, ed. Erhard Peschke (Berlin, 1969), 56, 120-150; August Hermann Francke u.a., *Pietistische Paedagogik* (Heidelberg, 1970), 6-22; Philip Jacob Spener, *Pia Desideria*, ed., intro., and trans. Theodore G. Tappert (Philadelphia, 1964), 103-123.

cord of it." The Ministerium declared that "The fault must be concealed somewhere." How they were to root out the source of their problems remained in doubt. Earlier in the discussion, the preachers "deplored" the "little time, opportunity, and strength" pastors could muster for the "important work" of education "among the widely scattered members of rural congregations and outparishes."²⁵ One month earlier, the Swedish pastors met and pledged closer union with the Germans and greater attention to the *Kinderlehre*. In particular, they wanted to print Luther's Catechism in English for children who understood neither Swedish nor German.²⁶

In 1760, the Philadelphia congregation erupted into discord that would continue for two years. The schoolhouse stood at the heart of the dispute. Parishioners claimed that the "large schoolhouse" was of a "curious construction" and was "laughed at by the English people."²⁷ Charges flew against Pastor Johann Friedrich Handschuh and the elders regarding the decision to build the large school when the parish already carried a heavy debt.²⁸ Complaints also arose against Handschuh's handling of the *Kinderlehre*. The pastor "devotes six or seven Sundays to a single Commandment and discusses it at such length that the children remember nothing at all of it."²⁹ The dispute carried a heavy symbolic burden. Not only were parish finances in question, but how the next generation would be led to adulthood and by whom. Derision by the English smacked of the patronizing assumption that Muhlenberg's ministry had grown too big for its minority britches. German Lutherans' rejection of Franklin's Schools for Handschuh's implied a faith in their cultural autonomy which challenged Franklin's dream of an entirely English America. On July 27, 1761, in the midst of congregational upheaval over its existence, Muhlenberg processed through the streets with Handschuh, elders, deacons, and school children and then dedicated the first formal German school in Philadelphia. Muhlenberg participated in the festivities despite his irritation with Handschuh's and

25. *Muhlenberg*, I:447.

26. *Muhlenberg*, I:431-2.

27. *Muhlenberg*, I:436.

28. See A.G. Roeber, *Palatines, Liberty, and Property: German Lutherans in Colonial America* (Baltimore, 1993) for a detailed analysis of the church politics surrounding the financing of the schoolhouse.

29. *Muhlenberg*, I:434. Handschuh was also accused of prejudice against the newly arrived "Swabians" from Wuerttemberg and their religious practices. For more on the role of anti-Swabian sentiment in the congregational upheaval see Roeber, *Palatines, Liberty, and Property*.

the elders' poor handling of congregational grievances. This ceremonial statement of German Lutheran uniformity far outweighed his reservations about the enterprise. Once within the walls of the school, Muhlenberg took the elders to task, but the outside world saw a united front.³⁰ At the Synodical conference one year later, visiting pastors and the instructor tested students; the results "astonished" them.³¹ The children "made an especially good showing in the catechization," earning each of them a pretzel as a reward.³² Arguably, the Lutheran schools "compared very favorably" to other – presumably English – schools of a "similar grade."³³

Despite this immediate success, the positive mood of 1761 soon disappeared, and Lutheran pastors began to complain that ignorance and disobedience pervaded their communities and schools. In 1764, Muhlenberg sympathized with the difficulties of Handschuh and Johan Ludwig Voigt in teaching their confirmands. Despite "all possible fidelity and diligence to the youth," trying to teach them was "like trying to hold water in a sieve; as soon as one turns around, the water is gone and the sieve is dry." Muhlenberg concluded that "we still lack proper catechization for the kind of young people we have in this country." The instructors needed "to put ourselves down on their level so that the young people would begin to think and make judgements of their own." Were this the case, "they would understand much sooner." Liking biblical truths to so many nuts, Muhlenberg proposed to follow the example of "Good nurses," who "crack open the nuts and chew them and then put them into the mouths of children so that they can assimilate the nuts and turn them into chyle." Without first preparing them, children would either swallow nuts whole only "to lose them by natural process of elimination without deriving any good" or "turn them over in their mouths for awhile and then spit them out altogether."³⁴

Muhlenberg blamed the particularities of Philadelphia's diversity and liberality for many of the Lutherans' problems as educators. The pastor

30. For the symbolic importance of processions and parades in early America see Rhys Isaac, *The Transformation of Virginia, 1740-90* (Chapel Hill, 1982); Simon Newman, *Parades and the Politics of the Street: Festive Culture in the Early American Republic* (Philadelphia, 1997); and David Waldstreicher *In the Midst of Perpetual Fetes: The Making of American Nationalism, 1776-1820* (Chapel Hill, 1997).

31. *Documentary History*, 66.

32. *Muhlenberg*, I:531.

33. Carl Frederick Haussmann, *Kunze's Seminarium* (Philadelphia, 1917), 10-11.

34. *Muhlenberg*, II:88.

declared, "It is really dreadful in this large, open city, teeming and swarming with young folk of all nationalities who are permitted all freedom and frivolity, for there is no strict policing or discipline." At fault stood "The otherwise noble and good laws," which proved "too lenient." Muhlenberg thought attempts to control skinny-dipping, swearing, "children and young people" equivalent to "trying to govern and check horses, mules, oxen, wolves, bears, swine, dogs, and cats with silken threads." Good parents could not protect their children in a Philadelphian "Sodom and Gomorrah" from freedom's "poisonous, pestilential plague!"³⁵ The pastor's tirade followed in the wake of boys disrupting the *Kinderlehre*. They had "clenched their fists at them[the deacons] and poured out English curses such as 'Go to h..ll!' 'You son of a b..ch!' 'God d..mn you!' etc." Muhlenberg found particularly abhorrent the boys' claim that "their parents would protect them against deacons, etc., etc." During the Sunday service, he instructed all parents that "if they were going to strengthen their children in their wickedness, we would be compelled to resort to the law of the land and have them forcibly ejected from the services of worship."³⁶ The friction between pedagogues and parents crisscrossed the divide between Hallensian clerics and Swabian farmers as well as that between established migrants and less prosperous newlanders.³⁷

In February 1765, Muhlenberg restructured the internal organization of the Philadelphia school to avoid overcrowding and disorder, but the problems had been building for some time.³⁸ The previous July, Muhlenberg noted that the school was "endangered by the establishment of competing schools, and the children gradually being enticed away, while those who still come cannot possibly be taken care of by the schoolmaster alone." Despite the school's designation as "the most important part of our work," little progress could be made. Johann Voigt denied that his position included helping the schoolmaster. When an eager young Saxon showed interest in the job but required training as an organist, the trustees prohibited him from studying and boarding with Voigt, because they thought Voigt should move into the schoolhouse.³⁹ In Germany and in America, pastors understood teaching as a

35. *Muhlenberg*, II:89-90.

36. *Muhlenberg*, II:90. Muhlenberg failed to note which law if any would give him such power.

37. For more see Roeber, *Palatines, Liberty and Property* as well as Aaron Fogleman, *Hopeful Journeys: German Immigration, Settlement, and Political Culture in Colonial America, 1717-1775* (Philadelphia, 1996).

38. *Muhlenberg*, II:199-200.

39. *Muhlenberg*, II:94.

demotion, which no doubt shaped Voigt's reticence.⁴⁰ Muhlenberg despaired that the church-members "know of hardly any other use to make of the preachers than that they must preach in order to gather the funds, live by their favor, and be their servants."⁴¹

Formal reorganization of the school into three separate classes took place on February 24, 1765. In his announcement on that day, Muhlenberg again emphasized the growing number of children in the school and the "sincere desire of all sensible, Christian parents that their children should not only learn something useful, but also that they may become respectable, decent, reverent toward their Supreme Creator and Benefactor." In a typically Lutheran treatment of the Fourth Commandment, Muhlenberg extended this reverence to "respectful" behavior towards "their parents and superiors; yea, they desire for them something even more glorious, that they may be reared and educated as true Christians." The church council observed with "deep sorrow" a reality far different from these aspirations. Muhlenberg railed from the pulpit that "the great majority of our precious youth, whom with their parents we must some day present before the judgement seat of God, are daily becoming more wild, unruly, ill-mannered, and godless." More specifically, "they revile one another and engage in fights and scuffles, and that some of them even curse and tear up the books." Worse yet, "they gather in groups during school hours and either make a great deal of noise in the courtyard or play pranks in the open street in front of the schoolhouse." Muhlenberg considered this behavior particularly egregious, because it embarrassed the congregation in front of those they most hoped to impress, "so annoying the people who pass by that respectable English and German people are saying that never before have they seen such unmannerly conduct in the city."⁴²

Muhlenberg again took parents to task for defending their children against the schoolmasters' attempts to impose discipline. According to Muhlenberg, students "tell their parents untruths, which the parents accept from their little oracles, and then begin to breathe out threats as to what they will do to the schoolmasters." Parents would even "threaten

40. Indeed, Pastor Handshuh taught school after leaving two congregations amidst a scandal. *Muhlenberg*, II:128-9. On Germany see Susan Karant-Nunn; Bruce Tolley, *Pastors and Parishioners in Wuerttemberg During the Late Reformation, 1581-1621* (Stanford, 1995); and Chapter 5, "Schoolmasters as Professionals," in Elizabeth Lewis Pardoe "Education, Economics, and Orthodoxy: Lutheran Schools in Wuerttemberg, 1556-1617" (M.Litt. diss., Cambridge University, 1995), 75-90.

41. *Muhlenberg*, II:94-95.

42. *Muhlenberg*, II:199.

and insult" the schoolmasters "in the most shocking manner" in front of the children. Such examples "make a deep impression," and Muhlenberg envisioned the day when the children would "richly repay their parents." "Yea," Muhlenberg warned, "they will be spears and nails in the hearts of their parents." As an example of the evil to come, Muhlenberg recounted a tale of a boy born to a Dutch mother and German father. First, she told her son that if the schoolmaster hit him, he was to hit the master back.⁴³ "Because this would not do," the boy "remained at home without discipline." After her husband died, the boy repaid his mother's favor by dragging her from the house, tearing out her hair, and beating her "until the blood flowed." Still the mother bailed her son out of jail, and the son met a "wretched end." Muhlenberg possessed a clear vision of what was going wrong in the Mid-Atlantic: "All too early the children taste the all too great freedom of this country, and all about them they see the wickedest sort of examples." If parents continued to help their children down the path to damnation, they "must not come to us later and complain when you reap from your children what you have sown."⁴⁴

The nature of the reorganization proved more spatial than spiritual. Muhlenberg asked the congregation to picture the chaos of three teachers trying to lead three separate classes all in the one room on the ground floor of the schoolhouse. Because "God is a God of order, and in His congregations everything must be done orderly," the church council ordered one class to move to the largest room on the second story of the school, leaving only two classes to share the lower level. Muhlenberg took great pains to explain that although in different rooms the children would still be attending the same school with everyone under his ministry. After decades of splintering factions, the pastor seemed to fear that different rooms would be understood as representing different churches. That one teacher had been accused of pietism probably accentuated the fear. On Monday the deacons cleared out the new classroom. The schoolmaster living on the second story was displeased and inspired Muhlenberg to write that "Really no European can clearly imagine how critical congregational affairs can be in a country like Pennsylvania." To Muhlenberg it seemed "the old *practicus* of darkness fights us every inch of the way when we undertake to do something

43. "Neen myn Kindgen, wan dig de Schoelmeester slaagt, soo slaag hem weder." Muhlenberg, II: 200.

44. Muhlenberg, II:200.

for the honor of Christ and the good of men." When school opened on Tuesday morning, Muhlenberg was present to explain to the children that they were all brothers and sisters despite working in separate rooms and should act accordingly. In October, the second floor of the schoolhouse was needed for the second pastor due to arrive at St. Michaels parish. Thus, the third class and Mr. Hafner returned to the ground floor. To facilitate instruction in crowded quarters, the teachers began to alternate "so that, for example, in the morning one teacher will drill the readers of the Bible and Testament, another the spellers, the third the ABC pupils, and then change about in the afternoon." The teachers would now divide the school fees of five shillings per pupil evenly among them.⁴⁵

Many of the challenges facing Muhlenberg and the Philadelphia Synod were not new. Two centuries earlier Martin Luther and Philip Melancthon confronted students and parents unwilling to accept their high pedagogical ideals⁴⁶ Like their famous predecessors, the Lutheran ministers in colonial America struggled to create a literate laity and pastorate from a flock of farmers and craftsmen to whom cash took precedent over the catechism. Their problems mirrored those of sixteenth-century Germany with amazing precision: a lack of students and teachers in the country coupled with too many unruly students and financially demanding teachers in the city.⁴⁷ In eighteenth-century Philadelphia as in sixteenth-century Stuttgart, competition from non-Lutheran schools posed a serious cultural threat. Religion was an essential part of the school curriculum. When students attended other schools they were exposing themselves to either opposing sects or to secular teachers, neither of which would be acceptable to Muhlenberg and his cohort. In the colonies, competing schools posed an additional linguistic threat to the Lutheran community. While Muhlenberg considered it important that children learn in the language they knew best and frequently preached in English, children in Ministerium schools still had an opportunity to learn formal German along with English. Losing chil-

45. *Muhlenberg*, II:276. Remarkably, five shillings was the same fee charged in sixteenth-century Wuerttemberg. According to John J. McCusker, *Money and Exchange in Europe and America, 1600-1775: A Handbook* (Chapel Hill, 1978), one German Schilling vls Banco was worth 0.577 English Shillings in 1765, whereas in 1609, one Schilling vls Banco was worth 0.748 English Shillings. See McCusker pages 35, 63, 78-9.

46 See Strauss, *Luther's House*; Karant-Nunn; and Lewis Pardoe in *ARG*.

47. Lewis Pardoe, *diss.*

dren to English schools undermined Muhlenberg's system of community building, both religiously and linguistically.

The specific connection between the University of Halle in Prussia and the Philadelphia Ministerium is vital to understanding both the pastors' theological orientation and their pedagogic background. In late seventeenth-century Halle, A. H. Francke advanced pietistic Lutheranism similar to the highly individualized Protestantism espoused during the Great Awakening⁴⁸ Francke developed a school system linked to the university and instituted pedagogical reforms. Francke's schools provided different curricula for students based on their social status but permitted students to transfer between schools as their talents allowed. Francke's system contained several schools. The Waysenhaus served as an orphanage and charity school. Another school provided appropriate training for future tradesmen and housewives. Students likely to enter the civil service learned letter writing and other necessary skills at the Paedagogium. Finally, in the Latin school, or Praeceptorium, students prepared for a classical university education by studying Latin, Greek, and other traditional subjects.⁴⁹

The structure and goals of the Halle schools seem well-suited to American congregations. The schools were pietistic, and Francke's broad-based system served students with diverse needs and interests. To indulge in an anachronism, Francke's method relied upon tracking according to ability. Francke believed in, and structured his system around, the existing social strata. However, students moved between tracks according to their individual talents. The most renowned school in Francke's system was the charity school, or Waysenhaus. Francke intended to provide access to Halle's resources for all parents who wished to educate their children and to all students who wanted the opportunity to study but lacked the financial resources to find room

48. Muhlenberg had a personal friendship with William Tennet. *Muhlenberg*, Vol. I, 437, 459, 463, 468, 565, 568, 689; Vol. II, 91. See also F. Ernst Stoeffler, *German Pietism During the Eighteenth Century* (Leiden, 1973), 25-6. Before Hallensian pastors received calls to North America, the correspondence between Cotton Mather and A. H. Francke already revealed a common ground between the Hallensians and the Protestant colonial-American tradition. According to some, Muhlenberg ranks among the Great Awakening revivalists. See A. B. Faust, *The German Element in the United States*, Vol. II (New York, 1969), vii, 202-5; Anthony J. La Vopa, *Grace, talent, and merit: poor students, clerical careers, and professional ideology in eighteenth-century Germany* (New York, 1988), 140-142.

49. La Vopa, 140-142; Wolf Oschlies, *Die Arbeits- und Berufs-paedagogik August Hermann Franckes* (Witten-Ruhr, 1969), 137-140; Stoeffler, 25-6.

and board in the town.⁵⁰ So far as he could, Muhlenberg modeled his Philadelphia school after the Waysenhaus, and the Philadelphia school served as a model for other Lutheran schools in the Mid-Atlantic.⁵¹

Johann Christoph Kunze's arrival in 1770 reinforced the connection between Philadelphia and Halle. Kunze came with two of Reverend Muhlenberg's sons who had completed their studies at the University of Halle.⁵² Kunze successfully integrated Hallensian and colonial traditions to form a seminary for American Lutheran pastors and teachers. Kunze's curriculum was sensitive to students' American surroundings while maintaining central tenets of Hallensian pedagogy. The Seminarium did not replicate Francke's Latin school entirely. Kunze incorporated some aspects of the Paedagogium, Francke's school for civil servants. American students wary of authority, and experimenting with freedom, could have followed their own interests in an exact replica of the Halle system. However, in contrast to Francke's system, Kunze and his counterparts failed to embed the Seminarium in a broader educational system. The Philadelphians trained teachers and pastors and expected others to follow through a trickle-down process of education. While students in Halle strove to find the education best suited to their talents among four curricula, Pennsylvanian students chose between two options: the disorder and limitations of a parish-based, German education, or the rigor of Latin and Greek at the Philadelphia seminary.

Kunze adapted to American diversity by educating pastors capable of maintaining German high-culture in their parishes while engaging in larger colonial, English-language, intellectual discussion.⁵³ The Seminar-

50. Otto Podczeczek, ed., *August Hermann Franckes Große Aufsatz*, Abhandlungen der Saechsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig – Philologisch-historische Klasse, Band 53, Heft 3 (Berlin, 1962), 43. George Whitefield founded a school for orphans in Savannah, Georgia explicitly based on the Francke model. See Faust, 203.

51. Haussmann, 10-11.

52. Although Kunze studied theology in Leipzig, not Halle, the Halle Ministerium provided his call, and Kunze was an alumnus of the Halle preparatory school. In addition, Philip Spener infused Leipzig with the same pietism that Francke later took to Halle. Thus, like Muhlenberg, Kunze was familiar with the Halle system and committed to Hallensian methods by his call. Kunze's relationship to the Muhlenberg family strengthened while he boarded with them, and he later married the daughter of his adoptive family. Kunze soon began his term as pastor of the St. Michaels' congregation in Germantown and recognized the need to train more Lutheran pastors in America. Francke u.a., 10-14; Haussmann, 15-16. In December 1765, Muhlenberg wrote: "Now that I am at the end of my life and look back, I often think of what the sainted and sensible Dr. Fresenius observed: Some of the people here ought to be educated by us and given a catechetical and practical training. The English Presbyterians have done this, and still do it, and they have made unbelievable progress throughout North America." *Muhlenberg*, II:295.

53. To use the language of Jürgen Habermas, Kunze wanted to train pastors capable of engaging in both a German-language and an English-language public sphere.

ium's lesson plan provided the details of daily activities and a point of comparison with the curricula and organization of Francke's schools. Adaptations in the languages of instruction highlighted the necessity of change in an American setting. Three days a week, students began their classes by reading the Bible in both English and German. A special English instructor spent another four hours each week teaching English, calligraphy, and epistolography. Curricular dedication to English education reached beyond pragmatic necessities. "English" students interested in studying at the seminary were welcome. Kunze wanted graduates of the Seminarium to be able to participate in humanistic discussions in English.⁵⁴ In the colonies, English became critical to pastors' "callings" and therefore to the demands of their Franckean educations.

Kunze's seminary followed the basic outlines of Francke's system. Students spent nine hours a week learning Latin and an additional two studying Greek. Instruction in speaking, reading, and writing German consumed ten hours of the weekly plan. Students in Germany may not have needed the same extensive training in their mother tongue – they would have to prove mastery of German before entering a Latin school, but further instruction proved critical to German education in America. Kunze's students studied geography, history, physics, mathematics, German literature, and polite manners, in addition to their traditional linguistic and biblical classes.⁵⁵ By comparison, instruction at the College of Philadelphia's Latin School covered only Greek and Latin language and literature.⁵⁶ The variety of subjects in Kunze's curriculum, particularly the sciences, remained consistent with Francke's premise that children should learn from experience and study subjects outside the humanities.

Kunze's Seminarium differed from Francke's Latin school most significantly by functioning alone rather than as one of several affiliated institutions. The aspect of Francke's system most applicable to a society of "all too great freedom," the open tracking system, disappeared. Kunze only intended to educate clerics and teachers. Certain aspects of the Paedagogium appeared in the Seminarium lesson plan. Nevertheless, Kunze dedicated a large percentage of school time to Latin and Bible study. The school for tradesmen and housewives, potentially most

54. Haussmann, 98-100.

55. Haussmann, 98.

56. "Memorandum: Weekly plans of study for the Latin Schools and the Collegiate Classes, 1791," Ms. 1669, The University of Pennsylvania Archives, Philadelphia (UPA).

applicable to a group of farmers, was nonexistent. Tracking could have attracted skeptical students by providing a clear educational mechanism towards their aspirations in any field. In contrast to Francke's system which provided both variety and mobility, Kunze's school offered only one option. This choice seems odd, but Kunze faced extremely limited funds and the Ministerium desperately needed American educated pastors. Therefore, Latin-based clerical education took priority over other types of schooling which might have attracted more students.

German immigrants' lack of formal training in the professions and trades was an anomaly among colonists. Twenty years earlier, in 1751, Benjamin Franklin wrote his recommendations for an English School within the Philadelphia Academy, which also had a Latin School. He declared that those following his curriculum would "come out of this School fitted for learning any Business, Calling, or Profession, except such wherein Languages are required." Franklin wanted to remove students' "corrupt or foreign Accents" and exhibited equal distaste for foreign languages. "Tho' unacquainted with any ancient or foreign Tongue," Franklin claimed, students would "be Masters of their own, which is of more immediate and general Use." Franklin saw the time saved from Latin and Greek as the key to providing a "Foundation of Knowledge and Ability" applicable in serving "the several Offices of Civil Life, with Advantage and Reputation to themselves and Country."⁵⁷ Although his obsession with accents was born of xenophobia, Franklin's practical curriculum still reflected an eighteenth-century change in educational philosophy. Rather than lengthy apprenticeships or formal schooling, youths turned to private teachers to instruct them for positions as skilled workers.⁵⁸ By ignoring skilled education, the professions, and civil service, Kunze lost the most "American" levels of Francke's system.

Although Kunze jettisoned the Waysenhaus and Paedagogium, the seminary remained a concrete effort to replicate Halle's Praeceptorium in Philadelphia. The Philadelphia seminary's unique stature as a training school for clergy and teachers provides a rare glimpse at pre-Revolutionary German-Americans in a self-conscious process of cultural adaptation. The order and sophistication of Philadelphia humanism countered Muhlenberg's and Franklin's unruly students and parents. Kunze's seminary aimed to create pastoral leaders like himself rather than dis-

57. "The Idea of the English School" in *Franklin Papers*, vol. 4, 101-108.

58. Cremin, *American Education: The Colonial Experience 1607-1783*, 400. For more on the relationship between apprenticeship and education see Bernard Bailyn, *Education in the Forming of American Society: Needs and Opportunities for Study* (New York, 1975), 29-36.

ruptive farmers and tradesmen. In the pre-Revolutionary period, these examples imply that those replicating and rejecting European roots existed at two separate levels of Lutheran-American society. Such analysis, however, oversimplifies. Kunze accepted a public realm of English speakers and thinkers, with whom his students would interact, but that outer world was not to undermine the central position of German high-culture in the German Lutheran community. Indeed, Kunze aspired to training a class of cultural mediators equally comfortable among Anglo-intellectuals and Swabian settlers.⁵⁹

The disparity between Kunze's goals and his students' lives revealed Lutherans in confrontation with at least two distinct cultural traditions within their communities in addition to the pluralism surrounding them.⁶⁰ The educated clergy attempted to transfer a German high culture of learning and theology to its representatives in the periphery. These intellectuals came from Saxony and studied in Halle and Leipzig, all in the eastern section of the Reich; they attempted to confer high culture upon immigrants from the rural, southwestern Rhineland. Muhlenberg and Kunze were primarily concerned with guiding their flock to the fulfillment of a high-German cultural model. German immigrants existed on the periphery of both high-German and Anglo-American culture. The high-German, Lutheran clergy faced a foreign southwestern German culture in addition to an anti-authoritarian American culture and British institutions.

The Revolution further disrupted the Lutheran-American ministry. Swedish Lutheran minister Nicholas Collin recorded with dismay his New Jersey congregation's disintegration as Sunday services degenerated into fistfights between Tories and Revolutionaries.⁶¹ In 1778, Muhlenberg complained that it was easier to find three soldiers than "one competent schoolmaster."⁶² Lutheran pastoral leaders struggled to stay neu-

59. For a discussion of cultural brokers and mediators see Peter Burke, *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe* (Aldershot, Hants, 1988), 65-87.

60. For analysis of English-colonial cultural interaction see T.H. Breen, "Creative Adaptations: Peoples and Cultures," in *Colonial British America* eds. Jack P. Greene and J.R. Pole (Baltimore, 1984), 195-232; Jack P. Greene, "Search for Identity," in *The Journal of Social History* 3 (1970): 189-220. For examinations of religion, ethnicity, and politics in colonial and early national Pennsylvania see Owen S. Ireland, *Religion, Ethnicity, and Politics: Ratifying the Constitution in Pennsylvania* (University Park, PA, 1995) and Alan Tully, *Forming American Politics: Ideals, Interests, and Institutions in Colonial New York and Pennsylvania* (Baltimore, 1994). For a detailed examination of schisms within the German community see Roeber, *Palatines, Liberty, and Property*.

61. *The Journal and Biography of Nicholas Collin 1746-1831*, trans. Amandus Johnson (Philadelphia, 1936), 236-7.

62. *Muhlenberg*, III:141.

tral while everyone around them took sides.⁶³ Simultaneously, the German community confronted problems created by second- and third-generation immigrants. The questions of leadership, authority, and order plaguing German ministers when Kunze founded his school remained unsolved when the seminary closed during the chaos of the British invasion. Kunze adapted his high culture to an American environment, but he failed to unite Lutherans. When the colonies won independence and Kunze left to accept a new call in New York, issues of Lutheran identity endured.⁶⁴

Lutheran pedagogical politics reached new levels of complexity when Reverend Justus Heinrich Christian Helmuth came to Philadelphia in 1779. Like Kunze and Muhlenberg, Helmuth studied in Halle, and Gotthilf Francke called him to the colonies. Unlike his predecessors, Helmuth insisted on the German language as the *only* medium for preaching within Ministerium parishes. Muhlenberg's integration of German, English, Dutch, and Swedish speakers faded into memory. Helmuth initiated a small German-Latin school in 1780 and proudly saw three or four students go on to the University of Pennsylvania. His students' success and the decision of the German Society of Pennsylvania to provide scholarships for recommended German students at the university encouraged Helmuth to make further pedagogical plans.⁶⁵

In 1785, the Philadelphia Ministerium collected reports from affiliated pastors throughout the Mid-Atlantic on the state of their congregations, including information on parish schools. The report revealed both the scattered resources of Lutheran communities and their interest in education. Pastor Voigt, now of Vincent Township in Chester County, described his parishes. Voigt provided poignant testimony to the status of rural schools: "Oh, that I might only live to see a better organization of our country schools effected!" Voigt admitted that "I lament, deplore, bemoan that in my congregations the schools are in so

63. Collin was taken prisoner by the New Jersey Militia in 1777. *Collin*, 237; *Muhlenberg*, III:101-104, 107, 123-127. The Ministerium's position was further complicated, because the British Court Reverend Ziegenhagen served an important role for the Halle mission to America.

64. Haussmann, 17.

65. Anthony Gregg Roeber, "The von Mosheim Society and the Preservation of German Education and Culture in the New Republic, 1789-1813," in *German Influences on Education in the United States to 1917*, Henry Geitz, Jürgen Heidiking, and Jürgen Herbst, eds. (Cambridge, 1995), 157-76. Roeber offers his interpretation of the language issue here and in "J.H.C. Helmuth, Evangelical Charity, and the Public Sphere in Pennsylvania, 1793-1800," *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 121 (1997): 80.

poor a condition."⁶⁶ "The lack of able schoolteachers" survived as a central difficulty.⁶⁷ In one of Pastor Melsheimer's communities near Lancaster, two German-school teachers had established themselves "through pride and self-will" rather than by congregational appointment. In two additional communities, schools existed entirely separate from the congregation. In Mountjoi, because the surrounding "country-people" hired the schoolmaster, the curriculum of "reading, writing, and arithmetic, etc." constituted a "socalled general school." The derogatory statement implied that the school was unsatisfactory, but whether in German and/or religious instruction is unclear.⁶⁸

Melsheimer returned to an analysis of moral decay uttered by others before the Revolution to explain the weak state of education. Like Muhlenberg, Melsheimer found parents to be an additional hindrance: "they have sunken to such a dull dead condition, that the first and simplest divine truths are far beyond their powers of comprehension." The pastor hoped schools would have a "moral influence" on congregations, but he assessed current "moral character" as "indifference to the highest degree." A lack of parental guidance again emerged as the cause. Parishioners born in the new world inherited "property" from their fathers "but not the knowledge how to make a good and wise use of the same."⁶⁹

In addition to what Melsheimer perceived to be moral decline, German schools lost students to schools founded by communities other than Lutherans. Pastor Conrad Roeller reported a congregation which despite the existence of a schoolhouse did not hold classes, because the neighboring Mennonites drew too successfully from the German student pool. The distance between parishioners and the schoolhouse led other students to attend "nearer schoolhouses where the youth receive instruction." Roeller failed to note whether these neighboring schools were English or German.⁷⁰ However, in Georg Jung's Hagerstown

66. Pottstown, the largest of Voigt's four congregations, had the smallest meetinghouse. In order to hear his sermons, Voigt's parishioners stood outside the windows of the church and climbed rafters so crowded "that they can scarcely sit, or rather hang, on them." Despite the overcrowding, the mixed Lutheran/Reformed congregation could not agree to construct a new building. However, the same community erected a "fine school house." Ludwig Voigt to Ministerium, 16 January 1786, PH481/E2, Lutheran Archive Center at Philadelphia (LACP).

67. Ludwig Voigt to Ministerium, 16 January 1786.

68. Fr. Val. Melsheimer to Ministerium, 21 January 1786(est.), PH48/E2, LACP.

69. Friedrich Valentine Melsheimer to Ministerium, 2 January 1786(est.).

70. C. Roeller to Ministerium, 28 October 1785, Ministerium of Pennsylvania Synodical Correspondence, B 1749-1799, LACP; First name confirmed in *Muhlenberg*, III:627.

parish, the once well-attended school “was weakened by the English School.”⁷¹

On July 4, 1785, the German singing school gave a concert that provided a public forum for defining the cultural life of the German-Lutheran community in the new nation. “On the Day of Independence of the Thirteen States of North-America”⁷² the children gathered to praise God’s hand in helping “Freedom forge ahead.”⁷³ However, the most telling verse in the song asks God to “Expel the sinful night:/Which well, you can in your freedom find,/.”⁷⁴ That “Proud Britain’s scornful cries/Affect us no longer, we are free” carried the burden of unleashed errors along with cherished liberties.⁷⁵ A printed copy of the lyrics remains in the Lutheran Archives, indicating that this patriotic hymn circulated among the congregation if not wider Philadelphia circles.⁷⁶ Similarly, when the choir performed at Pflingsten in 1785, and in October 1786 printed programs appeared. The October performance took place in conjunction with a “speaking-practice of several students and scholars of the German Academy.”⁷⁷

These assertions of cultural autonomy through schools and school ceremonies grew in importance as Pennsylvanians considered restructuring the new nation. In 1787, the men assembled to decide whether or not Pennsylvania would ratify the Federal Constitution took time away from their heated debate and attended the examination of German school students in Philadelphia.⁷⁸ The convention only attended one other commencement, at the University of Pennsylvania.⁷⁹ Frederick Augustus Muhlenberg’s position as the speaker of the convention may have influenced his colleagues to attend his father’s cherished school, but Frederick Muhlenberg’s position of power itself spoke to the success of his father’s efforts.

71. Georg Jung to Ministerium, 19 April 1786, Ministerium Correspondence, B 1749-1799.

72. “Auf den Tag der Unabhaengigkeit der Dreyzehn Staaten von Nord=America, den 4ten Julii, 1785.” H10/P5G3/7, LACP

73. “Er stand mit uns auf unserm Plan,/Und brach der Freyheit selbst die Bahn” – “Auf den Tag.”

74. “Vertreibe du der Suenden Nacht:/ Wohl dem, der in dir Freyheit findet,” – “Auf den Tag.”

75. “Des stolzen Britten Hohngeschrey/ Trift uns nich laenger, wir sind frey.” – “Auf den Tag.”

76. A.G. Roeber determined Helmuth to be the author of the broadside. A.G. Roeber, “J.H.C. Helmuth”

77. “Folgende Ordnung/ Wird Heute, als am 12ten October, 1786, bey der Vocal Music unserer Singschule, und Rede=Uebung verschiedener Studenten und Schueler der hiesigen Deutsche Academie, in Zion gehalten werden:” – H10/P5G3/7, LACP.

78. Merrill Jensen, ed., *The Documentary History of the Ratification of the Constitution*, vol. 2, *Ratification of the Constitution by the States: Pennsylvania* (Madison, 1978), III, A, 382, 423

In a situation of tenuous authority, Philadelphia's Lutheran intellectuals revealed their ties to other factions within the new nation. Although hoping to maintain German culture, Reverend Helmuth and his followers integrated politics, religion, and ethnicity into a world view inconsistent with the disorderly experience of rural Germans struggling to carve a niche for themselves in the new republic. Helmuth fought for the institutionalization of the German language and Lutheran beliefs, but his approach paradoxically included an intellectual brand of high German culture unfamiliar to rural farmers in the Philadelphia Ministerium's circle of influence. The self-conscious community Helmuth hoped to develop included ideologies that his flock rejected, while forbidding a central aspect of their lives – the English language.

Helmuth's plans for both a Pennsylvania-wide educational system and a German school at the University of Pennsylvania shed light on his pedagogical and social philosophies. In 1786, perhaps influenced by the Ministerium reports, Helmuth proposed that the Pennsylvania government levy "a general Tax" to support pre-existing religious schools and schools to be founded by religious and other societies "in which poor children may be taught gratis." Simply put, Helmuth proposed public, tax-based, funding for religious schools. Each religious or charitable institution was to have full autonomy over the government of its school. Helmuth asked that the "Societies respectively have full liberty to chose their own Trustees and these Trustees to chose or dismiss the Teachers of the Schools in their societies." In order to found a secular society, however, Helmuth insisted the members prove they had no church affiliation. School tax-money would be assigned to societies in proportion to the number of taxpayers in the society. Taxpayers also were to select "Superintendants" to oversee the distribution of funding. The superintendents would ensure that each society provided an education "in Reading, Writing, Arithmetic, Orthography, and religious principles" for its poor children and would "oversee with the trustees yearly public examinations." Helmuth instructed that if any schools should have excess funds, rewards of books and clothing should be given "as a premium for good behavior and Diligence" soon after the examination day.⁸⁰

79. Jensen, III, A, 327.

80. J.H.C. Helmuth, "Humble Suggestions of a plan how religious Schools might be established," X16, LACP.

The plan for religious schools was a subtle construct to create public funding for Lutheran, German-language schools. In all his guidelines, Helmuth never mentioned the languages of instruction, the content of reading material, or the nature of the Christian principles to be taught. In addition to his nine-point plan, Helmuth added a request that religious schools receive an increase from 60,000 to 160,000 acres of land in the form of a government grant. In an overt plea, the proposal named "the german Luth. Congregat. in and near the city of Phil." to "be the first to receive this donation as the[y] are the first in the whole state that have step[ed] forth in such a laudable Undertaking."⁸¹ With this idyllic plan, Helmuth would have received state funds, provided charity for his flock, and maintained German language and culture without interference.

Helmuth's concluding thought reflected his desire to preserve and shape Lutheran culture. "Children," he insisted, will always be better educated in their respective Societies than otherwise."⁸² Francke's system's fundamental purpose was to provide "a range of communities, care for the poor, endowments, orphans- [and] widows- homes, schools and the like."⁸³ The same concept of cultural transfer in Kunze's Seminarium guided Helmuth's proposal for charity schools. Kunze attempted to transfer the highest level of enlightened, humanist education. Helmuth proposed to transfer the concept of institutional social responsibility. Helmuth's plan would have allowed communities to provide charitable care and an education for their own children. In this framework, Helmuth could have propagated the German language and Lutheran faith to immigrants and their children while remaining part of a larger, American, tax-funded system. Perhaps Helmuth felt more confident of his ability to propagate Germanic tradition in a new, independent state, than Kunze ever could in an English colony. The desire to promote an expressly *German* rather than *Lutheran* culture marked a change in how the Ministerium formulated its identity. As the new nation attempted to define itself, Helmuth encouraged Lutherans to think of themselves as

81. Helmuth, "Humble Suggestions."

82. Helmuth, "Humble Suggestions." Roeber explores Helmuth's vision of "Christian republics" in Roeber, "J.C.H. Helmuth, Evangelical Charity, and the Public Sphere," 77-100.

83. "allerley Commuenen, Armen- Verpflegungen, Stiftungen, Waysen- und Wittwen=Haeuser, Schulen und dergleichen" - Otto Podczek ed., *August Hermann Franckes Große Aufsatz*, Abhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig - Philologisch-historische Klasse, Band 53, Heft 3 (Berlin, 1962), 41.

members of a linguistic community broader than their religious affiliation.

As Helmuth drafted his plans for local religious-ethnic schools in Philadelphia, Gotthilf Heinrich Ernst Muhlenberg followed in his father's footsteps from the frontier city of Lancaster. Beginning in 1785, the younger Muhlenberg kept a journal recording his thoughts on how to be a good teacher at home, in school, and from the pulpit. While sharing Helmuth's stress on classical languages, Muhlenberg thought German and English education should go hand in hand. He preferred any student entering the Latin school to have already mastered both languages, but knowing either one fluently and grammatically proved sufficient. To Muhlenberg the battle was "half won" as soon as a child learned his or her mother-tongue grammatically. To teach effectively, he insisted that all new vocabulary be introduced first in the mother tongue, not translated into a foreign language. A 1785 lesson plan demanded Bible-reading and Latin from six until eight in the morning, followed by Latin exercises from eight until twelve. The afternoon from two until six would cover exercises in writing, arithmetic, and "elaborien"[probably elaboration/exposition]. Lectures and reading ended the day between six and ten. Saturday would be spent in Catechetical exercises. In notes from 1789, Muhlenberg thought a first class should cover English reading, writing, and scientific language, a second would use German for the general German school, and a third would use Latin and Greek for the higher sciences.⁸⁴ Such concentration on the nature of bilingual education differed tremendously from Helmuth's monolingual focus and implied a different vision of how Lutherans would interact with their fellow citizens in the new republic.

In 1787, the first separate German college was founded in Lancaster under the auspices of both the Lutheran and Reformed churches and named after Benjamin Franklin. The mission of the college was to educate "the Youth in the High-German, English, Latin, Greek and other learned languages, Divinity and other useful and learned Sciences and Arts." The opening of the college marked perhaps the largest ecumenical gathering of ministers in America's early history. The event began with a procession. The county Sheriff and Coroner lead the march from the courthouse to the German Lutheran church. The pupils followed with the college faculty and University officials, and then President

84. G.H.E. Muhlenberg's Journal, vol. 1, BM892, v.1, American Philosophical Society.

G.H.E. Muhlenberg behind them. The Corporation of the Borough and Justices of the Peace separated the academics from the clergy. The Reformed Coetus, Lutheran Corporation, English Presbyterian Elders, and astoundingly, Roman Catholic Officers each processed in turn. The Episcopalians, Moravians, Reformed Corporation, and Lutheran Ministry finished the clerical section of the parade. The County Lieutenant and Officers of Militia, followed by "Citizens and strangers," took up the rear.⁸⁵ Having assembled at the church, the gathering proceeded to take part in a bilingual, truly ecumenical, Christian service.

Forty years before, Henry Melchior Muhlenberg would never have considered parading through the streets of Lancaster with Catholics and Moravians. To do so would have violated the essence of his faith. The younger Muhlenberg's willingness to present a sermon before such a gathering marked a tremendous transition in the life of Americans in general and Lutherans in particular. In part, the college marked Benjamin Franklin's victory. The Episcopal minister's address insisted on the need for Germans to learn English. However, a Muhlenberg at the helm and a heavily German professorate underlined the college's bilingual mission. Nevertheless, within a year, the college suffered from a surplus of students in the English Department and a dearth in the German Department. Franklin had instigated the notion of bilingual, ecumenical German education twenty-two years earlier with his charity schools. While Germans were unprepared to shed sectarian prejudice in 1755, in 1787 the most stalwart Lutherans were willing to institutionalize bilingual ecumenicism, even including Catholics. Peaceable relations with the French state removed the political dimension of Protestant-Catholic tensions and made such a public display a possibility. In the aftermath of revolution and ratification, Germans subsumed varying religions into one ethnicity and that ethnicity into a new diverse nation. Indeed, the sheriff's presence at the front and the militia's presence at the back of the procession, sandwiching a disparate cluster of clerics in between, provided an apt symbol of Federalism.

Benjamin Rush and Reverend Helmuth gave two of the addresses during the college "consecration." Rush proposed a provincial identity to usurp the former claims of ethnicity and faith. He hoped that the college would remove "the partition wall which has long separated the English & German inhabitants of the State." Having "bound together" chil-

85. Dedication Program reprinted in Frederick Shriver Klein, *The Spiritual and Educational Background of Franklin and Marshall College* (Lancaster, PA, 1939) 38-9.

dren through ties of marriage and friendship, Rush envisioned “the names of German – Irishman & Englishman will be lost in the general name of Pennsylvanian.” Further, Rush declared, “The Lutherans & Calvinists by sharing equally in the honors & government of the College will here bury all their past jealousies & disputes, while every other Sect will here find protection & support.” As for Languages, Rush argued that English would be necessary in the “foederal councils” of the new nation, while the college would save German from “extinction & corruption” by teaching it “in a grammatical manner.” Denying the influence that Germans had already had within Pennsylvanian – if not American – culture, Rush concluded that the college would prepare “sons of the Germans to shine” in all the professions and ensure that German “ministers of the Gospel & Schoolmasters will no longer be Strangers to their American habits & manners.”⁸⁶

Helmuth focused on convincing farmers that a college education was of some value for their sons. Helmuth asked his listeners to look around their neighborhoods and see how things had gone with the children of prosperous farmers. They had food and drink from their parents and knew they could expect a hefty inheritance and would become rich, but they lacked the understanding to hold on to what they were given let alone make it grow.⁸⁷ Ignorance pervaded the German youth, “because their understanding had not been enlightened in schools and they had not been taught true fear of God and religion, which would have led them to true knowledge and bliss.”⁸⁸ Helmuth’s frustration lay with children and parents who undervalued a classical education, denying Lutherans the American-trained pastorate needed to secure cultural autonomy in the new nation. He despaired of German fathers who were satisfied if their children could read, write, and reckon and thereby

86. *A Letter By Dr Benjamin Rush Describing the Consecration of the German College at Lancaster In June, 1787* (Lancaster, PA, 1945).16-17.

87. “Aber sehet euch einmal in eurer Gegend um, wie es mit vielen Kindern reicher Leute bisher gegangen ist. Sie hatten zwar bey ihren Eltern Essen und Trinken gelernet, sie hatten zwar gar bald wahrgenommen, dass ihnen ihre Eltern eine grosse Erbschaft hinterlassen, dass sie nun reiche Leute waeren, aber sie hatten den Verstand nicht, das zu erhalten, was sie geerbt hatten, und waren noch viel weniger geschickt, dasselbe zu vermehren.” – “An die Deutschen Einwohner von Pennsylvanien,” in *Freyheitsbrief der Deutschen Hohen Schule, (College) in der Stadt Lancaster, in dem Staate Pennsylvanien; nebst einer Anrede an die Deutschen dieses Staats, von den Trusties der besagten Hohen Schule.* (Philadelphia, 1787) 1787Lan, Library Company of Philadelphia (LCP), 9.

88. “...weil ihr Verstand auf Schulen nicht war aufgeklaeret, und sie durch den Unterricht in der Religion nicht zur wahren Furcht Gottes waren angefuehret worden, welche zur wahren Weisheit und daher zur Glueckseligkeit fuehrt.” *Freyheitsbrief der Deutschen Hohen Schule*, 9

encouraged their sons' natural laziness. Boys knew that their fathers were as reluctant to pay school fees as they were to be drilled in Latin and Greek vocabulary or mathematics. Thus, Germans sent their children to less demanding schools, kept them home, or apprenticed them to a trade.⁸⁹ The fear of unqualified preachers, which plagued the ministry long before its formal association, created Helmuth's anxiety. Helmuth pleaded from "whence will you finally call Preachers and Schoolmasters, if you won't let your children study?"⁹⁰

Helmuth's question remained unanswered in 1791 when the University of Pennsylvania asked him to provide his "opinion respecting the German School" at the university. Describing the gesture to allow Germans their own school as "a favor on at least one fourth of it's [Philadelphia's] inhabitants," Helmuth prefaced his recommendations with an apology that Germans had not utilized previous access to the University more fully. "It is exceedingly painful to me," wrote Helmuth, "when I consider that the Germans have by no means made that use of the goodness formerly conferred upon them which in Duty they ought to have done." Although Germans had "been very remiss in giving their Children an Education," the pastor announced, he predicted "a great Alteration in a number of young Germans who will doubtlessly bring Light and Knowledge amongst their Brethren" and become "enlightened Citizens." In designing his own plan, Helmuth hoped it "would not only be a greater encouragement to our Germans in the Education of their Children but also a stimulus to the Youth itself."⁹¹

89. "...Der Deutsche ist zufrieden, wenn sein Kind hochstens lesen, schriben, und ein wenig rechnen kan, wird er nunueberredet, ein Versuch zu machen, sein Kind studiren zu lassen, so geschiehet dis wohl manchmal, aber es ist dem Vater kein rechter Ernst, der unverstaendige Sohn merket dis, und weil er von Natur faul ist, so laeset er sich eine graue-haare darueber wachsen, ob er weiter kommt oder nicht, indem er weiss, er weiss, dass sein Vater es so muede ist, Schulgeld zu bezahlen, wie er es muede ist, sich mit Lateinisch und Griechisch Vocabeln zu schlagen, und sich den Kopf mit mathematischen Grillen zu plagen, und eh man sichs versieht, so wird der Sohn der Beschwerlichkeit ueberhoben, und entweder in eine andere Schule gesandt, wo er mehr faullenzen kan, oder man laest ihn wohl gar daheim, oder thut ihn hochstens zu einem andern Geschaefte..." *Freyheitsbrief der Deutschen Hohen Schule*, 11-12. Barry Levy put it nicely in his June 2000 discussion of my paper "Cultures and Curricula: Bi-lingual Education in Early America" at the Omohundro Institute annual conference. He described the decision of German farmers to send their children to basic English schools in order to preserve their labor as "an English-language solution to a German cultural problem." According to Professor Levy, wealthy German-speaking farmers, like those Helmuth addressed, refused to pay for labor from non-family members – unlike their English neighbors.

90. "...wo wollt ihr endlich Prediger und Schulmeister heruehmen, wenn ihr eure Kinder nicht studiren lasset?" *Freyheitsbrief der Deutschen Hohen Schule*, 12.

91. J.H.C. Helmuth to Bishop White, 4 December 1791, Ms. 566, UPA.

As in all of his endeavors, Helmuth placed the German language and social benevolence at the center of his scheme. The first plank of Helmuth's proposal was the reinstatement of the Latin and Greek professorship taught "through the medium of the German."⁹² Helmuth wanted to rename the German Department at the university the German Academy. The word "Academy" implied a comprehensive institution, and Helmuth suggested an extensive list of standards for the award of a degree of "Academicus" from the school.⁹³ A graduate was to have "a sufficient Knowledge of a common Latin Author" and of "the greek Testament." Consistent with these demands, Helmuth envisioned the school as a seminary for German preachers. Despite his great concern for the maintenance and purity of German language in the United States, Helmuth called for "a good English Education vizt. Reading, writing arithmetic- Bookkeeping- English Grammar." For other subjects, the language of instruction was not made explicit. Students were to acquire "a knowledge of German grammatically- with a competent knowledge of History-Geography-the Use of the Globes- vocal Music- and Composition particularly in Letter Writing."⁹⁴

Helmuth's division between languages of instruction aligned German with higher learning and English with practical skills. The German Professor held classes in Latin and Greek, and although not precisely clear, it appears history, geography, composition, and music were all German-language subjects. By contrast, English instruction replaced the role of the private tutor in providing fundamentals and a basis in bookkeeping. These practical skills provided a sufficient background for a German teacher or pastor to manage necessary administrative contact with English-speakers, while maintaining the preponderance of all cultural-intellectual information in German. Commencement exercises and orations further reinforced the Germanic nature of the degree by taking place "in one of the German Churches."⁹⁵

Helmuth suggested the creation of a separate German student com-

92. Reverend Kunze, who left Philadelphia for New York in 1784, had been the previous holder of this chair. Helmuth received the position of German Professor of Philology at the University the year of Kunze's departure. J. Sproal Sulz, "Mr. Helmuth appd Prof. of Phil.gy At a Meeting of the Trustees of the University of the State of Pennsylvania," 4 August 1784, Ms. 1190, UPA.

93. Eighteenth-century German Academies stood somewhere between schools and universities, as centers of learning without the corporate structures of universities or their division into profession-oriented faculties.. See R. Steven Turner, "Reformers & Scholarship in Germany," in *The University in Society*, vol. 2, *Europe, Scotland, and the United States from the 16th to the 20th Century*, ed. Lawrence Stone (Princeton, 1974), 499-502.

94. Helmuth to Bishop White, 4 December 1791.

95. Helmuth to Bishop White, 4 December 1791.

munity. Justified by his desire “to retain the german[sic] Language in its purity,” Helmuth asked that a special house be constructed for the Germans. Here, German and interested English students “would hear nothing but German spoken and so attain the Language in a much shorter time.” As added insurance, students would receive instruction in German grammar for one hour each day. Helmuth hoped to construct an entirely German environment by placing the German house “as near as possible to the Center where they [the Germans] mostly dwell.” The foundation of a school that would endear itself to German parents was Helmuth’s explicit aim, and “a Seminary where singing and praying is used” would surely appeal to parents as “Exercises they think much of being accustomed to them from their native Country.”⁹⁶

Helmuth walked a tightrope strung between multiple cultural traditions: the German seminary tradition of classic learning, rural German song and prayer-filled schooling, and the pride of some Anglo-Americans in their English tradition. In concluding his proposal, Helmuth recommended the building of a German Academy to train preachers “able to unite both English and German in their Schools,” thus bringing English to a “part of the State where the Inhabitants know little or nothing of it.” In later correspondence, Helmuth asked rural preachers to limit themselves to the use of German for fear that even occasional use of English would eventually corrupt their German. The English-speaking audience for Helmuth’s proposal may have inspired this inconsistency with his usual statements on language. Alternatively, the successive failures of Kunze’s seminary and Franklin College may have taught the pedagogue a lesson about how to recruit students. In either case, Helmuth tried to convince his readers to disregard Germans’ interest in their distinct cultural heritage: “overlook the seeming narrow Ideas of Persons so full of that which looks like their native Country and former Customs.” To portray the school as an Anglicizing rather than Germanizing agent eased Helmuth’s persuasive task. Helmuth reminded Episcopal Bishop William White that German customs “are in themselves for many reasons not to be despised and which Englishmen themselves admire if they are made nearer acquainted with them.”⁹⁷

The University of Pennsylvania allowed Helmuth to aspire to a com-

96. Helmuth to Bishop White, 4 December 1791.

97. Helmuth to Bishop White, 4 December 1791; Full name and affiliation confirmed in Dumas Malone, ed., *Dictionary of American Biography*, vol. 20 (New York, 1936), 221-222.

plete system of German education in Philadelphia. The St. Michaels' parish school provided the first stage. The system extended through the Academy to the University and continued in adulthood with a literary society. Helmuth alluded to grander notions in his plan for the German School by asking that students in the Academy receive permission to earn "higher Literary Honors" at the University.⁹⁸ In conjunction with his vision of lifelong German intellectual education, Helmuth organized The von Mosheim Society for the purpose of maintaining German intellectual discussion among the adult community in Philadelphia.⁹⁹ The society's name reveals a great deal about Helmuth's political objectives. Johann Lorenz von Mosheim led a movement in Germany to increase the clerical estate's political power as a check upon absolutist princes. Pastors governing by example possessed a long Lutheran history that Mosheim hoped to formalize.¹⁰⁰ Helmuth too hoped to inspire an activist clergy, one capable of representing the Germans in America's new republic. Indeed, Helmuth's interpretation of Federalism encompassed a myriad of religious-ethnic communities each represented by educated pastors in their state and the federal government.

Helmuth and his counterparts developed a social and political philosophy founded in the German language, intellectualism, Federalism, and religion. Post-revolutionary America confronted a new set of political and social issues produced by independence. In the mid-1790's, Helmuth demonstrated the degree to which he internalized the political thinking of the period in his "Reflections concerning the School Bill."¹⁰¹ Helmuth thought republican government and religion to be inseparable from education. A new form of government required new educational practices. In important ways, Helmuth rejected the Hallensian method. In 1800, the pastor wrote that he favored teaching fear of God through the Catechism over a program influenced by the Enlightenment – a movement he considered deleterious to the education of the common man.¹⁰² Helmuth adopted only the vertical structure of Franckean pedagogy. In Pennsylvania, Helmuth designed a complete

98. Helmuth to Bishop White, 4 December 1791.

99. Roeber, "The von Mosheim Society," 157-176.

100. John Stroup, *The Struggle for Identity in the Clerical Estate: Northwest German Protestant Opposition to Absolutist Policy in the Eighteenth Century* (Leiden, 1984), 51-81.

101. J.H.C. Helmuth, "Reflections concerning the School Bill," X16, LACP.

102. Roeber, "J.H.C. Helmuth, Evangelical Charity, and the Public Sphere," 81; Roeber, "The von Mosheim Society," 173.

educational program for those few he thought could benefit from Enlightenment learning. However, the pastor-pedagogue relegated the majority of common students to their respective parish schools.¹⁰³

In the dynamic environment of the early national period, Helmuth envisioned education as his sphere of social influence. Like Muhlenberg, Helmuth was wary of America's freedom and the disarray unleashed by the Revolution.¹⁰⁴ The pastor feared the power of the masses and believed education alone was capable of preserving the republic. Without religious learning, the culture and the nation would sink into depravity. "Civil government without Religion," Helmuth declared, "is like a Fabric without any foundation and will soon vanish away." Helmuth called each legislator, through his governmental positions, "to avail himself of the opportunity to show the Citizens that he has Religion and with it the true happiness of his Country at heart." The pastor thought politics could best serve religion by declaring educational institutions part of the church's domain. "Nothing could advance the interests of true Religion more, than if the principles of it could be inculcated in our Youth as early as possible," he argued, and "as this can be done no where better than in religious Schools, our Institutions for the Education of Children ought to be religious institutions."¹⁰⁵

Helmuth drew parallels between German, American, and sectarian experience to prove the value of diverse religious-ethnic communities to the new government.¹⁰⁶ Germans, in Europe and America, in urban and rural areas, integrated religion and education, and they could not "do otherwise as long as they intend to see their future Generations prosper as religious Generations." If unmoved by the necessity of religion for Germans, politicians only needed to see "what happy Effects this sort of

103. Further background on the ideology supporting the schools in Halle clarifies Hallensians' conceptions of democracy and the new republic. A. H. Francke and the pietists did not construct the *Waysenhaus* and other institutions to prove the inherent equality of men. To the contrary, Francke accepted the European social order and embedded the prevailing social categories in the structure of Halle's schools. Clergy would guide members of each social stratum to better completion of their worldly tasks through appropriate education. Because pastors were crucial to the well-being of the entire society, the clergy accepted members of the lower classes as revitalizing agents. Thus, talented poor and orphan boys studied to become pastors in the Latin School. For these reasons, students studied at their level of aptitude within Francke's system regardless of their social position. Students discerned their earthly "calling" and then fulfilled their destinies with utopian fervor. However, no position in the material world, regardless of its achievement, could affect the heavenly calling or grace received or denied an individual. La Vopa, 137-145.

104. Roeber, "The von Mosheim Society," 162-3.

105. J.H.C. Helmuth, "Reflections."

106. Helmuth, "Reflections."

Education . . . had in the Eastern States." To extract religion from a model of New England education was "to take a lifeless Statue for the animated being," or worse, to deceive and "offer our poor hungry Children a painted Loaf instead of a real one."¹⁰⁷ Helmuth announced that Pennsylvania already had "flourishing" religious schools "besides the Germans" and pointed to Quaker schools as a valuable model. Defining the Constitution as "the Standard of liberty of Conscience and Opinions," Helmuth affirmed the legislature's responsibility "to make by their Acts the Road smooth and easy for everyone to press to it [the Constitution] in his own way, as long as he does not hinder others in their Way." Under Helmuth's definition of Constitutionalism – a covenant between individual congregations and the state, legislation would naturally support religious schools. "No Law could be more satisfactory to the whole Community, than such a Law, that would assist every religious Society to educate its Youth in its own way."¹⁰⁸

Helmuth developed an argument for the sanctity and the efficacy of ethnic-religious communities. The schools themselves would be "Congregational, religious property" and as such would "shortly be endowed with presents, legacies etc." Denominations, "like so many different Families," would spend their easily accrued funds more wisely than the government. "One Hundred Dollars will certainly reach three times farther," calculated Helmuth, "when they are expended in a frugal way in every family by itself, than in a publick Entertainment, where they promiscuously dine together." Trustees, too, would behave best with "the Eyes of their own Society being fixed upon them." Parents and teachers would serve children more effectively in private schools, caring for both their "temporal" and "eternal Welfare," and would look to enlightened companions in Heaven as their only reward.¹⁰⁹

For Helmuth, the future of the nation lay in the careful construction of political and religious, state and communal realms, which intersected in schools. The pastor's anxieties about the Republic and democracy entered his discussion of the proper relationship between education on the one hand, and church and state on the other. According to Helmuth, the Pennsylvania legislature possessed a duty "to wipe off that Imputation as if all free Republican Governments . . . must pave the

107. Helmuth, "Reflections." For more on New England and Puritan education see James Axtell, *The School upon a Hill: Education and Society in Colonial New England* (New Haven, 1974).

108. Helmuth, "Reflections."

109. Helmuth, "Reflections."

way to Irreligion and that therefore [there] can be no permanency in them." The burden of the age was to produce "a religious free republican Gouvernement although it gives full Scope to liberty of Opinion and religious principle." If the legislature failed to acknowledge the connection between religion and education "and this to appear at the high [sic] of infidelity in our present times," it would "necessarily darken the prospect with regard to the happyness [sic] of future Generations in the western hemisphere." Thus, Americans lived on the edge of sin and anarchy. "Ignorance in true religious principles," Helmuth warned, "is the hotbed of Vice and infidelity." A political threat also lurked in "the dark and destroying power of Infidelity."¹¹⁰

German immigrants' distaste for authority increased rather than decreased in the new republic. In 1794, the Whiskey Rebellion threatened the young Federalist government. Although Germans played a small role in the uprising, they received significant attention because German-Americans possessed a history of anti-government attitudes. Ultimately, supporters of the uprising backed the Republican party. In 1793, a group of successful, Philadelphian tradespeople had founded the German Republican Club. Issues of Republicanism and Federalism survived the 1794 uprising and remained in community dialogue through the predominately German Fries Rebellion and Jefferson's inauguration in 1800.¹¹¹ Again, the clerical elite held itself apart from the congregation. Despite Germans' general turn to Jeffersonian Republicanism, Helmuth and Christian Endreß, the teacher at the St. Michael's-Zion parish school, remained staunch Federalists.¹¹²

Education took center stage in Helmuth's and Endreß's vision of American politics. Schools stood at the crossroads between church and state, charity and taxation, private community and public democracy, Republican farmers and Federalist clergy. The clerics successfully integrated these divergent aspects of American social and political life into a comprehensive world view. From their perspective, schools were not merely central; schools constituted the cornerstone of proper social existence. Only within these educational institutions could religion be transferred to the next generation, and only religion could maintain the

110. Helmuth, "Reflections."

111. A. G. Roeber, "Citizens or Subjects? German Lutherans and the Federal Constitution in Pennsylvania, 1789-1800." in *Amerikastudien/American Studies* 34 (1989): 49-68.

112. Christian Endreß, "Einige vermischte Gedanken ueber Regierungsform in Beziehung aufs Christentum," (Philadelphia, 1795), Evans Early American Imprints 28629.

charitable institutions that made communities whole and functional social units. With these aspects of private life secured, each community could select the worthiest and most capable from among them to participate in the federal government. The federal government existed to maintain the division between public and private upon which the moral and political fabric of the nation depended. Yet never in this process of transformation into an "American" community would Helmuth or any German need to reject his German or Lutheran traditions. America was the final step in Luther's reformation. The new utopia accepted and transcended all sects and ethnicities to create God's intended realm on earth.

Helmuth maintained a tradition connected to European intellectualism and American Federalism. As a result, Helmuth's educational methodology struggled with a cultural paradox. Helmuth wanted to preserve German-Lutheran culture in the United States by creating a community consciousness of Lutheran piety and German language, based in schools, and protected from the larger social forces of politics and the English language. The paradox: the pastor's German-language culture was not his parishioners' culture. The agricultural existence and republican lifestyles most Germans assumed in America rejected intellectualism and Federalist politics. A national public sphere containing broad political and philosophical discussion, an ethnic public sphere containing the same discussions in the German language from a German perspective, and a private ethnic-religious sphere of historic traditions and sectarian devotion, all existed; yet each failed to meet Helmuth's expectations. Strikingly, the greatest disjunction between Helmuth's vision and everyday reality lay in the ethnic-religious culture of the private community – not in his grander schemes of a federalized identity.

In the same period that he developed the concepts he hoped would keep German language and culture alive in America, Helmuth oversaw the decline of the German schools, the very institutions he dedicated his American life to developing and preserving. From the mid-1790's, synodical records trace the ever-increasing cases of German students pressing for English in their schools or simply attending English schools. Helmuth assumed the role of standard bearer for those who thought only the German language should emanate from Lutheran pulpits and classrooms. Indeed, Helmuth attributed the 1793 yellow fever epidemic to a visitation from God as punishment for failing German piety and

poor parenting.¹¹³ By 1805, Helmuth proposed strict guidelines for the maintenance of German in Ministerium parishes. As a result, he partook in a strained correspondence with G.H.E. Muhlenberg. The younger Muhlenberg was deeply involved with the more integrative Lancaster schools.

Germans chose to learn and to speak English. When the forty-eighth Convention of the Evangelical Lutheran Ministerium met in 1795, thirteen pastors reported on the state of their schools. Many announced thriving schools, but the pattern was irregular among the congregations. Some only met in winter, and some existed without teachers. Three reports recorded congregational preferences for English schools or just English. Even in Helmuth's home parish and Endreß's schools, "The preference for English" was "very strong."¹¹⁴ The following year, the number increased to six German and English schools and three purely English schools scattered among the Ministerium's parishes. The same convention voted to draft "Reflections on the School Bill." A member conveyed his concerns "that the design of the Assembly of this State, to establish free schools throughout the State would very much injure our German schools." At particular risk was "the religion taught in them."¹¹⁵ Thus, Helmuth found himself on the drafting committee for an alternative to state schools, but no one openly considered that the real threat came from German students themselves.

In 1796, as Helmuth tried to save Pennsylvania's collective soul, John Christopher Hartwick laid out his last will and testament in hope of guiding New York to salvation. The pastor had wandered the American colonies from Maine to Virginia, unable to settle into a given congregation.¹¹⁶ By the Muhlenbergs' accounts he was a difficult and unpleasant man.¹¹⁷ However, he managed to accrue a fortune in land in Otsego,

113. J. Henry C. Helmuth, "A Short Account of the Yellow Fever in Philadelphia for the Reflecting Christian," trans. by Charles Erdmann, (Philadelphia, 1794), Evans 21708.

114. *Documentary History*, 279.

115. *Documentary History*, 283-286.

116. *Documentary History*, 155; "Ministers of the Ministerium of Pennsylvania who served the United Lutheran Synod of New York 1748-1938," in United Lutheran Synod of New York, "Ministerial Registers, 1657-1938" (Typewritten), fV-5, LACP.

117. *Muhlenberg*, I:267-268, 276-278, 401, 403-4, 466, 470, 512, 517-519, 565, 652; *Muhlenberg*, II:58, 75, 85, 94-99, 126; *Muhlenberg*, III:177, 272-273, 291, 294, 315, 431, 453, 455, 720-1, 729, 734; F.A. Muhlenberg to his brother, probably G.H.E. Muhlenberg, 20 February, 1782, PM92/Z1, LACP; and Alan Taylor, *William Cooper's Town: Power and Persuasion on the Frontier of the Early American Republic* (New York, 1996), 40-44.

New York and planned to use it to found a seminary for “such of the Ignorant ungosplized part of Mankind of whatsoever State Colour or Complexion... to be instructed in the Christian Religion...”¹¹⁸ Both Helmuth and Hartwick feared heathenism in America. As America became increasingly polarized over issues of race, the pastors stayed firmly focused upon religion. Hartwick proposed a far less ecumenical institution than Franklin College. His “Seminarium Theologiaum[sic.]” aspired to “the enabling preparing and qualifying [of] proper persons in respect to their Age [,] Constitution of their Bodies and Minds [,] and Attainments in Learning or knowledge.” Hartwick implied that English would be the language of instruction by proposing as subject matter “the Instrumental Literature such as generally are Taught in American Colledges.” Less stringent on language, perhaps unavoidably so near the trilingual Mohawk valley, Hartwick remained dogmatic about theology and the students’ “Morals and principals.” He demanded that “they should come there without a Mind warped and deformed by every heretical Sectarian Philosophical opinion.” Such notions “if early imbibed unqualifieth Men for the pure and simple religion of the Gospel such as the Gentiles should be taught.”¹¹⁹

Hartwick designed a consciously American institution. He wished to Christianize both Indians and “Black Heathens” but considered missionizing counter productive. With so many different sects represented, Indians “are not able to discern which party is in the right and which is in a wrong opinion and are tempted to think that they are or may be both wrong.” Indian traders, “intent to take advantage of the ignorance of the Indians would hardly fail to Insinuate” the same opinion. This nexus of contradiction and disbelief created “a great Reason that the Natives are not yet Christianized and therefore yet in a State of Barbarity & Thorns to our eyes & Pricks to our sides.”¹²⁰ In his attempt to assure confessional purity, Hartwick stepped away from the humanist tradition in Lutheran pedagogy. If a student proved capable of moving beyond “Catechetical instruction,” then “Providence should provide Sufficient Means also to Classcle[sic] Learning but no Heathen Authors shall ever be allowed to be taught in this Institution to stain the mind

118. “The last will and testament of the Reverend Mr. John Christopher Hartwick, deceased.” PK96/Z3, LACP, 49-50.

119. Hartwick, 51.

120. Hartwick, 51.

of Youth.”¹²¹ As another striking adjustment to the new nation, Hartwick wrote that “the Government” of the seminary should “be Republican Similar to the form of the Civil Government to wit.” As in the Federal government, the college would have three branches: “a President which may be the Director of the Doctrinal apartment of the Institute which last also shall constitute the upper House and oeconomical Officers” joined by “the Lower House who are to make the Lawes and choose the Officers & appoint them who are to execute them.”¹²² Reverend Kunze, president of the newly formed New York Ministerium, received the task of bringing Hartwick’s frontier legacy to fruition from his position in New York City. Hartwick’s vision floundered for nearly two decades as clerics debated the value of a college in the wilderness, but in 1815 Hartwick Academy became the first Lutheran Seminary in the United States of America.¹²³

In 1800, German-Americans largely supported Jefferson’s successful bid for President. By doing so they implicitly rejected Helmuth’s particular brand of Federalism. Before Helmuth’s broad system could encourage the best students to devote themselves to intellectualism, he first needed to entice children from a non-intellectual background into the educational process. In 1786, Reverend Melsheimer reported “craftsmen and day-laborers, and among this class” were the people who withstood corruption and offered “the minister a warm hand.”¹²⁴ Ironically, Kunze had included “useful knowledge” in the name of the organization to support his seminary. The Ministerium, however, never incorporated knowledge that would be “useful” to farmers, laborers, and tradesmen into its curricula.

The Philadelphia Ministerium’s educational endeavors tell a story of cultural definition. Between 1748 and 1800, Americans won two wars, ratified a constitution, and defined an American nation. When Henry Melchior Muhlenberg arrived in Pennsylvania, the changes Lutherans experienced in America were already apparent. Second generation children wanted to learn English and, with their first generation parents,

121. Hartwick, 52

122. Hartwick, 56.

123. It is particularly ironic that Hartwick, who never adapted to living in America himself, managed to outline and endow the first successful Lutheran Seminary in the United States. For more see Taylor, *William Cooper’s Town*, 40-44, 214-16; and Harry J. Kreider, *History of The United Lutheran Synod of New York and New England*, vol. 1, 1786-1860 (Philadelphia, 1954), 38-40

124. Friedrich Valentine Melsheimer to Ministerium, 2 January 1786 (est.).

125. Kreider, 31-7.

flout authority that seemed too reminiscent of European repression. Beginning in the 1750s, "Newlanders" from southern Germany took their own cultural tradition, added English, and practiced their newly integrated culture more vibrantly than would have been possible in the Rhineland. The pastors sent to preach to these unruly flocks found themselves in a reactive role. If the clergy hoped to effect a change in behavior, their adaptations had to be creative.

In progression, H.M. Muhlenberg, Kunze, G.H.E. Muhlenberg, Helmuth, Hartwick and their colleagues developed adaptive new traditions for the Philadelphia Ministerium. Henry Muhlenberg learned to juggle alliances to keep his flocks together. Religion came before all else in congregations populated by German, Dutch, Swedish, English, and even African souls. Kunze heeded his father-in-law's lessons, but the Revolution prevented a Lutheran Seminary from reaching its potential. The Revolution changed the place of religion in Lutheran educational schemes. After the war, German ethnicity became the dominant identifier of Lutheran pedagogical projects in Pennsylvania. Franklin tried to eradicate Germanness with charity schools in the 1750s. In the 1780s, Lutherans began to think of Germanness as the object of their schools. Hartwick's academy ignored this trend away from confessionalism. Strikingly, Helmuth refused to be involved with the project although he was asked to manage the trust with Kunze. The academy could have been a joint venture of the Pennsylvania and New York Ministeriums. Instead, Kunze and his New York Ministerium, which possessed far greater openness towards English, guided the academy on their own.¹²⁵ The Hartwick Academy's ultimate success could be construed as a deferred triumph for Kunze's Philadelphia Seminary and a condemnation of Helmuth's turn towards ethno-linguistic centrism.

Through their treacherous transformation from confessionalism to pluralism, the Halle preachers maintained their fundamental interest in creating an earthly utopia. From the shared traditions of England and Franckean Halle, the pastors retained a staunch attachment to classical learning and charity schools. Kunze integrated Lutheran piety, aspects of Francke's Paedagogium, German literary training, necessary English instruction, and the classical cannon to provide German-American students with enough knowledge to become the vanguards of German language, religion, and culture in the New World. Helmuth placed the institution of the parish school at the center of his interpretation of an American tradition but banned English from the classroom and the

chancel. To Helmuth, European intellectual hierarchy seemed necessary for the preservation of American democracy. The pastor insisted that individuals could maintain their identities as German Lutherans and as Americans, but this layered identity demanded the presence of church-run German schools to instruct individuals negotiating between their roles as German souls and American citizens. Once educated by activist ministers, good Lutherans would understand the need for enlightened, religious, governmental leadership – the Federalist party.

Congregations accepted the separation between private-community and public-politics. Indeed, John Fries and rural Republican farmers craved an even greater division between the private and the political, but Helmuth failed to define their mutual community in terms farmers would accept or could, quite literally, understand. While the integrated cultural tradition Helmuth eloquently defended spoke directly to the pastor's American experience, it failed to capture his parishioners' American transformations. Philadelphia's Lutheran pastors hoped to maintain an ethnic-religious community founded foremost in the German language and Franckean ideas of social responsibility. The Ministerium never provided the sort of practical skills that Francke endorsed and their parishioners desired. In this sense, all of the Hallensians fell short as cultural mediators. Henry Melchior Muhlenberg possessed a missionary's zeal to maintain his flocks at any cost. The Lutheran patriarch created cultural institutions and symbols capable of enclosing his scattered sheep. Despite Kunze's and the younger Muhlenberg's focus upon higher learning, they too recognized the importance of teaching English in German language schools if they were to maintain cultural agency. However, Helmuth severed this final tie with the daily life of bilingual American Lutherans. Thus, the pastor who devotedly represented his community to other Americans and defended its place within a plural society found himself unable to communicate these public goals within his own private sphere.