

The Men From Michigan

Geoffrey A. Kieta

Senior Church History Thesis
Professor John M. Brenner
C.H.373 Lutheranism in America
April 23, 1993

Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary Library
11851 N. Seminary Drive. 65W
Madison, Wisconsin

The Men From Michigan

Contents

Introduction.	
I.	Sources of the Pastors.....p. 3
	A. The Wuerttemberg Men.....p. 4
	Basel.....p. 5
	St. Chrischona.....p. 16
	B. The General Council Men.....p. 24
	C. The American Lutherans.....p. 38
	D. A Comment on the Unknown Men.....p. 44
II.	Efforts to Maintain Confessionalism.....p. 46
	A. The Examination Process.....p. 49
	B. The Colloquy Process.....p. 51
	C. Discipline.....p. 54
	E. Conference Papers.....p. 58
	F. Retention.....p. 59
III.	Evaluating the Ministry.....p. 62
	A. The Wuerttemberg Influence.....p. 62
	B. The "Revolving Door".....p. 66
	C. The Work of the Synod Presidents.....p. 69
	D. The Seminary Question.....p. 70
	E. Closing Observations.....p. 74
IV.	Endnotes.....p. 77
V.	Appendices
	A. Pastors of the Michigan Synod, 1866-1889.....p. 80
	B. Distribution of the Ministerium by Source.....p. 82
	C. Distribution of the Ministerium by Longevity.....p. 84
	D. Pastors Recruited by the German Home Mission Committee, 1882-1888.....p. 85
	E. Conference Papers of the Michigan Synod.....p. 86
	F. Retention of the Ministerium.....p. 87
	G. Officers of the Michigan Synod, 1866-1889.....p. 88
	H. The Behrens Letter.....p. 89
VI.	Bibliography.....p. 90

The Men From Michigan

The early history of the Michigan Synod is a history of a church body struggling to survive. It is the story of a dedicated group of pastors and laymen who were full of mission zeal and had a burning desire to preach the gospel. But it is also a story of frustration and disappointment. The evaluation which appears in the fiftieth anniversary history of the synod has been repeated again and again: "Woher kam dies traurige Resultat so fleissiger

und hingebender Arbeit? Das bringt uns gleich auf das groesste Versaeumnis und die folgenschwersten Fehler, den die Synode beging. Sie suchte wohl die zerstreuten Glaubensgenossen zu sammeln, aber sie hatte keine Pastoren, welche die gesammelt Haeuflein alsdann mit den Gnadenmitteln versorgen konnten." (*Kurzgefasste Geschichte*, pp.11-12)

[Where did this sad result of such industrious and self-sacrificing work come from? This brings us to the greatest neglect and gravest error which the synod committed. It fervently sought to gather its scattered fellow believers, but it had no pastors who could then provide the gathered little flock with the means of grace.]¹

This evaluation has appeared, almost verbatim, in every attempt to trace the history of the Michigan Synod (see, for example, *Michigan District History*, p.2; *Michigan Memories*, p. 166). The unanimous verdict of history is that Michigan's problems stemmed directly from a lack of a reliable source of pastors. This lack affected nearly the entire history of the Michigan Synod. A quick glance at the proceedings of the Michigan District of the Missouri Synod from 1860-1889 will demonstrate that there were other confessional Lutherans in Michigan at this time. Nor were they the only Lutherans present in the state of Michigan. But the Michigan Synod was never able to become a large, established church body even in the state of Michigan, let alone the dominant Lutheran synod in

that state.

The argument could be advanced that all of the subsequent history of the Michigan Synod was dominated (or at least strongly influenced) by the struggles of the synod during their early years. As we shall see, the search for a reliable source of confessional Lutheran pastors was the reason for joining the General Council, and it prolonged their "restive membership" (Fredrich, *The Wisconsin Synod Lutherans*, p. 94) in that body. The solution that they finally reached (establishing their own seminary) ultimately resulted in the schism of 1896. Even their limited representation in the federation of 1892 was a result of their relative size -- again, attributable to the shortage of workers they experienced.

This paper will explore the attempts of the Michigan Synod to secure workers from 1866 through 1889. We will examine the sources of pastors available to the synod and how she utilized them. We will evaluate the synod's attempts to maintain confessionalism in the men that came to her. We will attempt to draw conclusions from the information available.

The limitation of the years considered is largely due to the limitations of the primary sources available. Much of the information in this paper is the result of pouring over the proceedings of the conventions of the synod from 1866 through 1889. To my knowledge, there are no extent copies to the proceedings from 1860 through 1865. It is possible that the first printed proceedings were in 1866. One could surmise that the proceedings were printed that year because the synod constitution was appended

to the 1866 proceedings (MI-'67 pp.13-16).²

The sample ends in 1889 because that was the year that the first graduates of what eventually became known as Michigan Lutheran Seminary began their ministry, ~~that year~~ (MI-'88,p.19).

I. The Sources of Pastors.

The Michigan Synod made use of nearly every resource available to them to obtain pastors. The sources can be divided into three broad categories. The first category is the Wuerttemberg men. This would include men trained at the mission schools in Basel and at St. Chrischona. The second category is the men supplied by the General Council. Included in this group are the men recruited by the German Home Mission Committee directly from Germany, men trained at the seminary in Philadelphia and also men who entered the ministerium of the Michigan Synod from fields of labor in the other constituent synods (or "district-synods" as they are consistently referred to in the proceedings) of the General Council. The third broad category could be called "the American Lutherans" because they entered the Michigan Synod through a colloquy process from other American Lutheran church bodies which were not members of the General Council.

From 1866 until 1889, a total of seventy-five men served in the pastoral ministry of the Michigan Synod (see Appendix A). Of the group, at least nineteen were drawn from the Wuerttemberg mission houses -- and as many as twelve more may have been trained there. Even discounting all of those who are questionable,

Wuerttemberg was the largest source of pastoral candidates during this period. Also worthy of note is the length of service that these men had. Of the seventy-five men in question, twenty-one served more than twenty years in the Michigan Synod (see Appendix C). Fourteen of those definitely were trained in Wuerttemberg, and two more may have been.

A. The Wuerttemberg Men

Since the work of the Michigan Synod is so closely connected to the work of the Wuerttemberg mission houses, I will summarize the history of the institutions at Basel and at St. Chrischona. The purpose is to attempt to understand the background that so many of the Michigan pastors came from. In connection with each institution, we will note the men supplied by that institution, and we will examine the reasons for including some of the questionable men under these institutions. We will also look at the influence of the graduates of each institution in some detail. Since both institutions share some a common history, we will look at the contributions of Christian Friedrich Spittler and the spirit of the Wuerttemberg church first of all.

Christian Friedrich Spittler (1782-1867) was the son of a pastor in Wuerttemberg (Martin Liedholz, in *Wenn Gottes Liebe Kreise zieht*, p.8). The church in Wuerttemberg had come under a strong pietistic influence through the work of Johannes Albrecht Bengel (1687-1752). The St. Chrischona anniversary *Festschrift* comments, "Nirgends wurde eine Kirche so tief und bleibend vom

Pietismus gepraegt wie dort." Bengel's influence spread into Basel as well (Liedholz p.7). In Basel, Dr. Johann August Urlsperger founded (in 1780) the *Christentumsgesellschaft* to which Spittler eventually belonged.

Although Spittler was not theologically trained himself, he became the secretary of the organization in 1801 (Liedholz, p.8). He was a man of boundless energy and mission zeal. During his life, he founded more than fifty "christliche Werke" -- Christian societies of one type or another (Behrens, letter, pp. 1,2).

One of Spittler's greatest concerns eventually had a direct tie-in to the type of work that both the *Chrischonabrueder* and the men from Basel would eventually be doing in America. Spittler was deeply concerned with the spirituality of the people living in nominally Christian Europe. He felt that a mission was necessary to reach out to the "de-christianized Europeans." He wrote, "Wenn

es des Herrn gnaediger Wille ist, dass die Heiden durch das Evangelium Christen werden, so muss es ebenso, ja noch mehr sein Wille sein, dass Christen, die das Evangelium haben, keine Heiden werden. Deswegen ist die Mission unter der Christenheit, besonders angesichts der Zeit geistes, eine so wichtige." (in Liedholz, p.9)

[If it is the Lord's gracious will that the heathen become Christians through the gospel, then it must even so, indeed even more be his will that Christians who have the gospel, not become heathens. For this reason, the mission to Christianity, especially in view of the spirit of the times, is so important.]

Basel

The first mission house that must be considered when discussing the Michigan Synod has to be the *Baseler Missionsgesellschaft* (Liedholz, p.9). This organization, which was founded

in 1815, was also known as the *Baseler Mission* (J.P. Koehler *History of the Wisconsin Synod*, p.21; Behrens, letter, p.1). It was founded privately by Spittler, because the *Christentumsgesellschaft* considered it a risky undertaking. Behrens calls it a "klassischen Mission," (*loc. sit.*), because it was intended to provide a relatively high quality education. Koehler elaborates on the specifics in his *History* (*loc. sit.*).

Basel had a tremendous impact on the infant Michigan Synod. The work of Friedrich Schmid is well documented (Koehler pp.26-7, 35, 39, 43, 175; *Michigan Memories* pp. 1-162; *Michigan District History* pp. 1-2; Fredrich pp. 3-4,7,18-19,271). He arrived in Michigan in 1833 as the first Lutheran pastor in the state of Michigan. His mission zeal and his desire to form a viable Lutheran church in Michigan are (in a strictly human sense) one of the primary reasons the Michigan Synod came into being. It is ironic that his lack of confessionalism ended his association with the Franconian colonies and the first Michigan Synod. The repercussions of the break with Loehe continued during the time of the second Michigan Synod as well. The Franconians wound up in the Missouri Synod and the Michigan Synod struggled for the remainder of its existence. Nevertheless, the Michigan Synod owes a debt to Schmid. Not only did he found and organize the Synod, but he served as its president until 1867 (MI-'66 p.6; MI-'67 p.7). He also endeavored to supply the infant synod with trained pastors. His extent letters record repeated appeals to the director of the Basel Mission House (*Michigan Memories*, pp. 120, 122, 135, 142,

144, 146, 149, 150, 151-2) for more workers in the field, beginning already in 1843 and extending until at least 1862. The *Kurzgefasste Geschichte* notes that he also trained men himself, wherever that was possible (pp.5-6).

Despite Schmid's close connections to the Basel *Missionsgesellschaft*, the relationship became progressively less beneficial to the Michigan Synod. Schmid's president's report in 1866 lists four workers who left the synod for "einer unirten Synode" during the previous year: Werner, Worth, Furrer and Hildner (MI-'66, pp.5-6).³ Schmid's letters mention Hildner as coming from Basel in 1859 (Schmid, in *Michigan Memories*, p.145). The other three were Basel men who apparently came between the founding of the synod in 1860 and 1866, as the *Kurzgefasste Geschichte* seems to indicate (p.12).

Fredrich Schmid continued in office for another year after the loss of these men. It would be easy to condemn him for his luke warm confessionalism, but his contemporaries of the second Michigan Synod held him in high regard. He is consistently referred to after his retirement from the presidency (and later from the active ministry) in the most respectful of terms: "Pfarrer Schmid" (when everyone else was called "Pastor"), "Vater Schmid," and "der Ehrw. Senior des Synode." Indeed, after his formal retirement, Schmid made a special visit to the synod convention of 1872 in Ann Arbor. The men there actually shortened an afternoon session so that he could attend. After the evening session that day, they gathered in the garden of the house and sang for him. The proceedings record

that this visit was conducted "zur herzlichen Freude und Erquickung fuer die schwergeprueften Bruder, der jedoch zur Freude aller Synodalen immer einige Stunden unsern Sitzungen beiwohnen konnte" (MI-'72 p.21 -- footnote).

[to the heartfelt joy and refreshing for the hard-pressed brother,⁴ who nevertheless could be present for a few more hours at our sessions to the joy of all the members of the synod]

Clearly, his contemporaries held him in great esteem. These men were struggling to be confessional as we shall see. It is a testimony to the evangelical spirit of the man that he did not interfere with the confessionalism of the new leaders of the Michigan Synod, even though there is ample evidence that he did not agree with their point of view (cf. *Michigan Memories* pp. 150-156 *passim*.)

Before we look at that new leadership, it is worthwhile to take note of the eight men who founded the second Michigan Synod in Detroit in 1860. They were Schmid, Stephan Klingmann, Christoph Eberhardt, H. Steinneke, F.I. Hennicke, P. Mueller, C. Mutschel, and C. Volz. In 1866, Mueller, Mutschel and Volz were gone. After studying the *Parochial-Berichte* during these years, I have come to the conclusion that the men were listed in the proceedings roughly in order of seniority. The 1866 proceedings list (in order) Schmid, Volz, Hennicke, Stiennicke, Klingmann, Eberhardt, Markscheffel, Haas, and Deininger (p.11). Schmid tells us that Deininger was a teacher who was trained in Wuerttemberg whom they pressed into service as a pastor (p.150). Volz' background is unclear, perhaps he came out of the Ohio Synod. Markscheffel's

training is also unknown, but he was apparently a rationalist who was later excommunicated by the synod (MI-'69 p.7; the *Workman*, Oct. 24, 1888. In the WELS Archives). In 1871, Steinnicke returned to Germany (MI-'71 p.15), and the wording of the announcement makes it possible that he came from Neuendettelsau.⁵ The rest of the men, except for Hennicke, definitely came from Basel. The evidence that is available indicates that the synod depended primarily on one specific source during different periods in their early history -- that is before 1866 Basel was primary. After 1866, St. Chrischona became primary, etc. It would therefore seem likely to assume that Hennicke, who left in 1872 (MI-'72 p.19) was also a Basel man.

Klingmann, Eberhardt and Haas were three of Basel's best contributions to the ministry of the Lutheran Church in the United States. Klingmann and Eberhardt were two of the three Basel men who served as president of the Synod (the third was, of course, C.F. Boehner). They arrived together from Basel in 1860 and Klingmann immediately put them to work. Klingmann was assigned to a new congregation in Allegan while Eberhardt became a tireless *Reiseprediger*. Because of the tremendous impact these two men had on the synod, it is worthwhile to briefly sketch their lives.

Klingmann (1833-1891) was, in his youth, a member of the *Junglingsverein* in Karlsruhe. Presumably, this was related to the *Junglingsverein* that Spittler started in Basel. He studied at the teacher's seminary in Karlsruhe before he went to the *Baseler Mission*, where he became friends with Eberhardt. In 1860, he was

commissioned to go to Michigan in answer to a plea from Schmid. He and Eberhardt were both ordained before they left Wuerttemberg (*Synodal-Freund* 4:6, p.69).⁶ Klingmann spent most of his ministry (23 and a half years) in Scio at the congregation founded there by Schmid. From there he administered the affairs of the synod for fourteen years, from 1867 until 1881. He served as vice-president under both Schmid and Eberhardt (Cf. Appendix G).

Klingmann had a deep and abiding love for the work of the church. His efforts were complicated by poor health that began already while he was a student (SF 4:10 p.117). His commitment to the ministry can, however, be seen from his efforts to supply the synod with qualified candidates. In addition to his son Julius, Klingmann actually paid the theological training of two young men from Scio (SF 4:7 p.80). Although their names are not given to us, we do know that Huber belonged to his congregation (*Lutheran Standard*, Jan. 24th, 1948, p.14) and that Schaible was from Ann Arbor (*Philadelphia Seminary Biographical Record*, p.66). These would be the most likely candidates.

The life of Eberhardt is closely intertwined with that of Klingmann. In fact, Eberhardt's biographer in *Synodal-Freund* stated that the strong confessional paragraph contained in the synod's first constitution was "hauptsaechlich" the result of Klingmann and Eberhardt's efforts (SF 6:6 p.68). Eberhardt (1831-1893) always wanted to serve in the ministry. He went to the *Baseler Mission* in 1856 and came with Klingmann to Michigan in 1860, where he served as a *Reiseprediger* operating from a base in

Hopkins (SF 6:6 pp. 66-7). Throughout most of Klingmann's presidency, the proceedings list Eberhardt as vice-president (Cf. Appendix G). He took over as acting president mid-way through 1881 and was elected in 1882. He remained in office until 1890. Besides the duties that Klingmann performed, Eberhardt is best remembered as the father of Michigan Lutheran Seminary. *Synodal-Freund* attributes the planning and the financial support to him (6:6 pp.69-70). Like Klingmann, he appears to have served in the ministry right up until his death.

Another early contribution to the Michigan Synod made by Basel was J. Haas. He came to Michigan in 1861 (*Michigan District History*, p.221) after serving for five years in Africa on the Gold Coast. He left that field only when his health would no longer stand the climate (SF 23:7 pp.81-2). As Appendix G shows, he held a variety of offices within the synod, filling in on numerous occasions. He served a number of congregations until he left the ministry in 1881. There are repeated references in the proceedings from these years to difficulties that he experienced in his ministry. When he left the ministry, he joined a Missouri Synod congregation. He also wrote a number of very confessional essays, as can be seen from Appendix E. It is possible that his problems were due to a greater level of confessionalism than his people were prepared to stomach. He may also have lacked the interpersonal skills necessary to tactfully steer a congregation in a scriptural direction.

Appendix A shows the three other men were supplied to the

synod by Basel. W. Reuther served from 1867 until 1890. His name appears a number of times in Appendix E (conference papers), as well as occasionally in Appendix G (officers of the synod). C. Gebauer also entered the synod in 1867. He left in 1873.

The last Basel man, C.F. Boehner, deserves a little more comment. He had originally served the Wisconsin Synod in Beaver Dam. After he left there (under questionable circumstances, according to Koehler), he served as an Episcopalian missionary to China (Koehler pp.94-5). He came to the Michigan Synod in 1873. During the Eberhardt years, he seems to have been quite prominent as his papers (cf Appendix E) and the offices he held show (Appendix G). Koehler's evaluation of Boehner's presidency need not be repeated here. He left the synod in ¹⁹⁰²1802.

As far as can be determined, after 1867 no more men came from Basel to the Michigan Synod, except Boehner, who came in 1873. But, as was noted above, Boehner did not come directly from Basel, but had served in the Wisconsin Synod as well as serving overseas. While it is possible that some of the men whose training cannot be determined may have come from Basel, it seems more likely that no more men came directly from Basel to the Michigan Synod after 1867. The *Kurzgefasste Geschichte* states, "von Basel hatte sie sich 1866 abgewendt" (p.28). No doubt the authors have in mind a resolution in the 1866 proceedings that reads: "... Da wir uns auf Predigern

von Basel nicht verlassen koennen, und ueberdiess in der letzten Zeit an mehreren von dort ausgegangenen Predigern betruerende Erfahrung erleben mussten, erachtet die Committee fuer zweckmaessig und nothwendig:

1. Dass sich unsere Synode an die neue projektirte ev.

luth. General-Synode [actually, the General Council is meant] anschliesse
2. Dass sich an das ev. luth. Prediger-Seminar in Philadelphia, Pa., um Prediger wende ..." (pp.7-9)

[Since we cannot depend on Basel for pastors, and more than this, since in recent times we have had to pass through a troubling experience with the majority of the preachers sent out from there, the committee considers it practical and necessary:

1. That our synod join the projected, new General Synod {see note above}
2. That it turn to the ev. luth. pastors seminary in Philadelphia for preachers...]

This resolution came in the same convention that reported the loss of the four Basel men referred to above. In view of this resolution and the loss of these men, the *Kurzgefasste Geschichte* makes the following evaluation of the ministry of the Basel men:

"Mit den sich dararbeitenden [i.e. Basel] Pastoren machte die Synode grossenteils boese Erfahrung: Es waren untreue und untuechtige Menschen darunter, die durch Leben und Lehre der Synode Schande und grosse Schanden bereiteten, da durch dass sie den Namen der Synode in Verruf brachten, ihr Wachstum aufhielten oder ihr Gemeinden und Felder abwenden machten." (p. 12)

[With the pastors who did their work there {i.e. Basel}, the synod had, for the most part, evil experience. The men there were unfaithful and incapable, who through life and teaching brought shame and greater shame upon the synod, since through this they brought the name of the synod into disrepute, they abandoned their watch or they alienated their congregations and fields.]

While it may be true that many of the unknown Basel men were unfaithful to either their call or the confessions (as Hildner and company certainly were), the conclusion of the *Kurzgefasste Geschichte* is perhaps overstated. It doesn't take into account the long and faithful service of Klingmann and Eberhardt (whose confessionalism the *Geschichte* certainly recognizes). It also

fails to recognize the years of service that Haas and Reuther provided. Perhaps also the problems that Boehner caused were still very fresh in the minds of the men who wrote in 1910. It seems that the authors placed a heavy emphasis on the resolution that was passed in 1866, which did clearly indicate serious frustration and disappointment with the *Baseler Mission* as well as real problems with many of the candidates that were supplied. The context of the resolution provides a statement that may help us to better understand the frustration the synod felt in 1866.

"[Floor committee number three] wurden the folgende Briefe uebergeben: ... II. Ein Brief von Hrn. Inspektor Josenhans aus Basel, welcher eine ungewisse Zusage enthaelt in Betreff der Sendung eines Predigers aus dem Missionshause daselbst ..."
(p.7)

"[Floor committee number three] would like to pass on the following letters ... II. A letter from Inspector Josenhans from Basel, which contains a dubious promise in regard to the sending of a pastor from the mission house itself..."

Clearly the committee was frustrated with its efforts and hence they recommended that the synod break with Basel.

Thus the break with Basel was accomplished. It is also notable that this occurred during the final year of Schmid's presidency (and not during the presidency of Klingmann as is often reported, see, for example, Fredrich, p. 4). However the synod had a major problem -- where to turn for pastors. The resolution of 1866 included an appeal to the Philadelphia Seminary for pastors and a recommendation to join what would soon be known as the General Council, but that was not the only avenue pursued. Fredrich reports that the *Pilgermission* in St. Chrischona "replaced

Basel as the chief source of new pastors after Klingmann succeeded Schmid in the presidency ..."(loc. sit.).

Appendix B shows a year by year breakdown of the ministerium of the Michigan Synod during the years in question. The total number of pastors serving in each year is given at the bottom of the column. The total number of men supplied by each available source is given in the last column. Next to number of pastors supplied by each institution during any given year is the percentage of pastors serving in the synod which that number represents. Included in these numbers are only those men who were definitely supplied by that source. The figures in italics represent the breakdown, if one considers all candidates who have a reasonable likelihood of having been supplied by that source. The years given are those years in which the man in question is listed in the Synodical *Parochial-Bericht*.⁷

If you survey this chart, you will immediately notice that the Basel contingent is extremely stable in terms of total men supplied. This is partially due to the fact that most of the Basel defections occurred before the sample began (before 1866). In 1866, there were six Basel men serving in the Michigan Synod. In 1889, there were four. The percentage has sharply decreased because the total number of pastors serving in the synod has grown from eleven to thirty-five. Appendix C (longevity of the ministerium) demonstrates the high level of commitment that these men had to their call in Michigan.

St. Chrischona

One of the first references to St. Chrischona in the extant records of the Michigan Synod is actually in a letter from Fredrich Schmid to Inspector Josenhans in Basel, dated October 14th, 1862. He asks for permission to "apply to Mr. Spittler" for workers in Michigan. "Perhaps we could get help from Chrischona," he wrote (p.152). In his president's report in 1866, Schmid indicates that the synod was already dealing directly with St. Chrischona, and had requested workers from them, probably since the preceding convention (MI-66 p.6).

The *Pilgermission St. Chrischona* was founded by Spittler in 1840. His purpose in founding the *Pilgermission* was to provide an alternative to the so-called "klassichen Mission" in Basel. He wished to give theological training to common laborers who lacked a university caliber education (Behrens, letter, pp.1-2). In 1827, the *Pilgermission* had its first beginning. Spittler sent young men from the *Baseler Junglingsverein* out on mission journeys to Austria, France and Belgium. They founded a number of local organizations, but many of them wound up in prison (Liedholz, p.9). Among these men was Johann Meuhlheuser, who later became the first president of the Wisconsin Synod (Koehler p. 22).

The St. Chrischona *Missionsanstalt* came into being as a recognition of the reality that the men of the *Pilgermission* needed theological training if their undertaking was to have any success (Liedholz, p.9). Already in 1834, Spittler was considering trying to acquire the *Chrischonagut* near Bettingen. The building there

had been erected in 1504, but had been abandoned since the Reformation came to Basel in 1529. On the 8th of March, 1840, twenty years before the second Michigan Synod came into existence, Spittler founded the *Chrischona Pilgeranstalt* (Liedholz pp.9-10).

Behrens notes that Spittler began to send men to America already in 1850, and that the last *Chrischonabrueder* left for the United States in 1905 (letter, p. 2). During that time, around 250 graduates of St. Chrischona came to the United States. The largest group went to work in the state of Texas (Behrens, in *Wenn Gottes Liebe Kreise zieht*, p. 107). However, the Wisconsin Synod received a few graduates, and the Minnesota Synod received as many as sixteen graduates, including synod president and founder of her seminary (now Doctor Martin Luther College) C. J. Albrecht (Fredrich p.23).

Initially, Spittler envisioned a sort of "*Freikorps*" in which the graduates would find whatever work was available and do their church work in addition to that (Liedholz, p. 11). That, however, was not the experience in America, nor does it appear to have been the experience in many of the other fields in which they worked. In 1867, the year that the first two Chrischona men arrived in the Michigan Synod, Spittler died. In 1868, Pastor Immanuel Voelter, the Inspector of the institution, left his post there for another position. He was replaced by Carl Heinrich Rappard, who improved the education offered at the *Anstalt* and also gave the school a strong emphasis on missions, which its graduates took with them into the mission field. Rappard himself was an alumnus of St.

Chrischona and had served in her mission in Northern Africa (Liedholz, p.13).

The mission endeavors of the Chrischona *Pilgermission* reached five continents. One of their most important endeavors was the "Apostelstrasse" in Africa. The *Pilgermission* had mission stations in Ethiopia (dealing primarily with the copts) and Jerusalem (primarily targeting a Jewish group known as the "Falaschas"). They attempted to link these two fields with a series of twelve outposts, each named for an apostle in 1860. Only four stations were actually established, because the men were plagued by disease (Behrens, in *Kreise*, pp.108-9). One of the stations, Cairo, supplied the Michigan Synod with J. Raible (SF 2:1, p.8).

The arrangement between St. Chrischona and the Michigan Synod was cemented in 1867. In that year, the following report was made to the synod convention: "Ihre Committee hat ueber Folgendes zu

berichten: ... V. Ein Brief von Hrn. Inspektor Voelter von St. Chrischona mit der Anzeige, dass die *Pilgermission* jetzt und in Zukunft uns Predigtamts-Candidaten zusende wolle, jedoch mit dem Wunsche, auch von der Synode Unterstuetzung fuer ihr Seminar zu erhalten. Vorschlag: 1) Der *Pilgermission* unsern Dank fuer ihr Anerbeiten auszusenden und 2) Ihr das Versprechen zu geben, sie nach Kraeften zu unterstuetzen." (8th, '67 pp.14-15).

[Your committee has to report concerning the following ... V. A letter from Inspector Voelter from St. Chrischona with the notice that the *Pilgermission* now and in the future will supply us with pastoral candidates, however with the wish also to receive from the synod {financial} support for their seminary. Recommendation: 1) To send to the *Pilgermission* our thanks for their proposal and 2) to give them our promise to support them {financially} according to our ability.]

The report of the committee was accepted in its entirety. The Michigan Synod honored its part of the relationship. For years it

sent funds to St. Chrischona to support the work there. Likewise, Chrischona supplied workers to fill many vacant Michigan pulpits.

Although the list of Chrischona men who served the Michigan Synod does not contain prominent names like Klingmann and Eberhardt, its contribution during the first decades of the Michigan Synod cannot be overlooked. Numerically, this was the single largest source of men supplied to the synod. As can readily be seen in Appendix A, no less than twelve men were trained by Chrischona (Gangnuss, Kramer, Baumann, Wilhelm, Raible, Wuerthner, Eipperle, Stamm, Metzger, Lederer, Moussa and Motzkus).⁸ Another, Schlenker, received his initial training there and completed it at the Philadelphia Seminary (*Philadelphia Seminary Biographical Record*, p.66). Aside from this, the *Kurzgefasste Geschichte* states that "in der 70er Jahren erheilt sie eine ganze Reihe Arbeiter von der Pilgermission in Chrischona" (pp.28-9). It is unclear to whom this comment refers. A "Reihe" of Chrischona men came from 1867 - 1869 (Lutz? Gangnuss, Kramer, Baumann, Wilhelm, and Raible). Another smaller "Reihe" could be the men who begin in 1869 with Wuerthner and go through Metzger in 1873 (including possibly H. Ruether and Schoenberg, and definitely including Eipperle, and Stamm). A third possibility is that the series of men who include Schmolz, Mueller, Stein, Fontaine, Deckinger, Rein, Mayer, and Wuest, all of whose origins are unknown to us, are Chrischona men. They came between 1873 and 1878. If they are added to the previous list, and to them Lederer and Moussa (who definitely were Chrischona men) are added at the end, we have

a long "Reihe" indeed. There are some indications that a number of these men do belong to the Chrischona contingent. H. Reuther came "aus Brazilien" to serve in the Michigan Synod (MI-'71 p.14). At this time, St. Chrischona was operating a mission in Brazil (Behrens, in *Kreise*, p.108). Additionally, at least two men are specifically called "candidates" (Fr. Mueller and F.L.A. Stein) (MI-'75, p. 13), as was Schoenberg (MI-'72 p.19). This would make it more likely that they were sent by St. Chrischona in accord with the agreement of 1867. During those years, we have examples of other men, like Metzger, who are indicated in the same way in the proceedings, but whose obituaries state they were trained at St. Chrischona. Finally, Schmolz is called a "Feld und Lazereth Prediger" (MI-'72 p.19). While I'm not certain what that designation implies, it certainly sounds like the kind of thing that Spittler may have envisioned.

The list of men who made up the Chrischona contribution to the synod is too long to treat in detail. However, a number of them were experienced missionaries, like Raible, Lederer, and Moussa. Just to get a feel for the kind of experience those men brought to the synod, we will take a moment to look at the life of Albert Moussa.

According to his obituary, Albert Moussa was born in Jerusalem. His father was a Greek Orthodox priest, but his parents died while he was still quite young. His older brother sent him to the protestant school run by a bishop named Gobert. His grandfather made him attend a Greek orthodox high school (run by monks)

intending that he follow in his father's footsteps. At the age of sixteen, he experienced a real crisis of conscience. He delved into the scriptures and became convinced that he could not enter the priesthood of the Greek Orthodox church, so he ran away to Haifa. He spent several years travelling alone in the orient. He eventually served in a Turkish regiment and visited Constantinople.

Moussa attended the *Pilgeranstalt* from 1874-1877. When the Russo-Turkish War began, he served the Russian side as a translator. After the war, he returned to Basel. He got involved with a London missionary society which sent him to the Sorbonne to further his linguistic studies. Finally, he accepted a call to the U.S. In 1878, he reported to Pastor Wischan (of the Pennsylvania Ministerium) in New Jersey who directed him to Klingmann. Moussa served in the Michigan district until 1904, when he accepted a call to Burlington, Wisconsin (GBL 42:9, p.69).

Moussa was a man of education and ability. He served his Lord faithfully. There are similar accounts of the work of other Chrischona men in our possession. They indicate that the men who stayed with the synod were worthy of the offices they held.

The influence of the Chrischona men can be measured chiefly in two ways: numerically and by the synodical offices they held. A quick glance at Appendix A reveals the "Reihe" of Chrischona men. It also shows that Chrischona was replaced at the end of the 1870's as the primary source of pastors for the synod. Throughout the early 1880's, the German Home Mission Committee of the General Council and the other American Lutheran synods came to the fore.

Appendix B shows a steady rise in the number of Chrischona men serving in the Michigan Synod beginning already in 1867 and continuing, even if we discount the questionable men, through 1884, when it peaked at eleven (definitely serving). In 1866, when no Chrischona men were present, the synod had eleven pastors in the field. In 1884, when the Chrischona contingent was at its greatest, the synod had twenty-seven pastors serving in the field. The difference (numerically speaking only) was the Chrischona contingent. Clearly, many other men came and left during this time, and equally clearly some Chrischona men left during this period, but undeniably much of the growth the Michigan Synod experienced at this time, both in congregations and pastors, was due to the influx of suitable candidates from the St. Chrischona *Pilgermission*.

The men definitely trained at St. Chrischona show a great propensity to remain at their posts in the Michigan Synod. (Although it must be conceded that the record of the men who *may* have come from St. Chrischona displays a lesser degree of commitment.) As the comment under Appendix F indicates, two of the men who did leave, left Michigan to serve Wisconsin or Missouri. This could possibly be explained in a variety of ways, but the simplest explanation seems to be a real commitment to the work of the ministry to which they had been called. The percentage of pastors definitely trained by St. Chrischona ranged from thirteen percent to forty-five percent (in 1873). In a church body whose numbers ranged from sixteen to twenty-seven, an influx of this many

men from a common background and training must have influenced the ministerium as a whole. This is magnified by the figures in Appendix C. This table shows that eleven of the twelve men who definitely came from Chrischona served for more than ten years in the Michigan Synod. Seven (and quite possibly nine) served for over twenty.

The second means available to us of measuring the influence of the Chrischona men on the Michigan Synod is to refer to the offices they held. In contrast to the three presidents supplied by Basel, Chrischona produced only one president (Lederer) (cf. Appendix G, Officers of the Michigan Synod). However, a number of other influential positions were held by Chrischona men. Raible served as mission treasurer (not to be confused with synod treasurer, which was held by a layman) from 1871 until 1884. Stamm and Moussa both served stints as secretary and vice secretary. Lederer also served many years in both of those capacities before he became synod president.

Motzkus was the last Chrischona man to enter the ministry of the Michigan Synod within the period of my sample. He arrived in 1884 and left fifteen years later to serve for fourteen years in the Wisconsin Synod. The proceedings give no clear indication why the flow suddenly stopped. A large number of Chrischona men continued to serve in the synod for many years to come. But at least three possible explanations do present themselves. The first is the unabashed pietism of the Wuerttemberg mission houses. If we allow that the men I have indicated as probably coming from St.

Chrischona did come from there, then there definitely were problems in doctrine and practice to be dealt with. In a synod that was struggling with its membership in the General Council (and indeed which left the Council only four years after the last Motzkus arrived), it is very conceivable that the synod felt that the difficulties in screening and retaining the Chrischona men simply outweighed the benefits of continued reliance on St. Chrischona. The second fact is the ongoing efforts of the German Home Mission Committee of the General Council, which we will look at in detail in a moment. A third possibility also presents itself. St. Chrischona may have simply felt that the field in Texas was a more fruitful field on which to expend its energies. Texas is the only field in the United States mentioned by name in St. Chrischona's anniversary *Festschrift* (Behrens, p. 107).

B. The General Council

As was noted above, in 1866 the Michigan Synod in convention resolved to enter the "neue projektirte ev. luth. General-Synode." This organization took the rather unwieldy title of the General Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in North America. It was initially known in the German proceedings as the *Allgemeine Kirchenversammlung*. We know it better as the General Council. The synod was represented at the 1866 organizational meeting by Klingmann and a layman, Casimir Walldorf (GC-'66 p.7). In 1866, Michigan resolved to send a delegation to the 1867 constituting convention of that organization (MI-'67 pp.8-9). Klingmann and

Walldorf, were chosen as the Michigan delegates. It is clear from the resolution, with its accompanying appeal to the Philadelphia Seminary, that the main purpose in joining the General Council was to obtain pastors to fill the synod's chronically vacant pulpits (MI-'66 pp.6-9).

The Michigan Synod remained a member of the General Council from 1867 until 1888. During that twenty-one years, the synod received pastors from the Council by three means. One group of men came directly from the Philadelphia Seminary. This was numerically the smallest group (three men were supplied). Another group of men were already serving parishes in other member synods (seven men came by this means). The third group consisted of men recruited (primarily from Germany) by the German Home Mission Committee of the General Council (ten men were supplied).

The Philadelphia Seminary never supplied a large contingent of pastors to the synod. This must have been a serious disappointment to Klingmann and the rest of the leadership of the Michigan Synod, especially in view of their appeal to that organization. In fact, the immediate response of the seminary was to send Caspar Nussbaum in 1867. Nussbaum is called a *studiosus* in the 1867 Michigan proceedings (MI-67, p.6). He is not listed among the alumni of the seminary in the *Philadelphia Seminary Biographical Record*. He only served for four years before leaving the synod for a union church (MI-'71 p.15). Aside from him, Philadelphia supplied only two other men. One was C. Schlenker, who had actually studied at St. Chrischona before attending the seminary at Philadelphia

(*Biographical Record*, p.66). The other was M. Schaible. Schlenker, who was actually ordained by the Pennsylvania Ministerium in 1866, served for seven years, from 1867 until 1873. His membership in the Michigan Synod appears to have never been more than tentative, however. His efforts were concentrated in Pennsylvania, especially in Wilkes-Barre. In fact, the *Philadelphia Seminary Biographical Record* lists him as a German home missionary for the Pennsylvania Synod throughout this period (p.66). He left the synod in 1874 (MI-'74 pp.26-7). He served the Pennsylvania Ministerium until his death in 1883 (*Biographical Record*, p.66). As the *Record* indicates, Schaible only served for two years, 1878 and 1879. His service was cut short by his untimely death (*loc.sit.*).

The Michigan Synod had looked to Philadelphia to provide a steady, confessional supply of pastors. It failed on both accounts, providing only three men. The reason appears to be that they simply didn't have the men to send. In 1867, the year after the Michigan appeal was sent, the seminary graduated its first eight men who had completed the prescribed three year course (*Philadelphia Seminary Biographical Record*, p. 11). In 1891, two years after my sample ends, the seminary graduated 27 men (*op. sit.* p.14). But it took nearly twenty-five years to reach that level. Since the New York Ministerium and the Pennsylvania Ministerium were much larger bodies (with a serious need for pastors themselves), it is not surprising that they had few men to send to Michigan.

The *Biographical Record* notes that the original charter specified that "instruction should be in English and in German" (p.10). This was in 1864. A study conducted in 1897 indicated that 51% of the graduates preached exclusively in English, 46% preached partly in German and 10% preached exclusively in German (*op. cit.* p.16). This may give us an indication why the German Home Missions Committee found it necessary to recruit directly from Germany. The larger "district-synods" were becoming increasingly Americanized. It was becoming more and more difficult to find men who were native German speakers.

The member synods of the General Council did provide the Michigan Synod with a number of workers, however, during their mutual association. In addition to Schlenker, the Pennsylvania Ministerium provided L. Zuber in 1873 (who is not listed in the *Philadelphia Seminary Biographical Record*) (MI-'73 pp. 21, 36-7). He had left the synod by 1877, however (MI-77 p.34). In 1880, J. Fritz came from the Pittsburg Synod and served the Michigan Synod until 1893 (MI-'80 p.6; MI-'93 p.13). He only left then because Michigan's vacancy problem had been finally solved and there was no "fitting position" for him to fill. In 1880, G.H. Schoemperlein came from the Canada Synod to serve in Michigan (MI-'80 p.6). He left in 1886 (MI-'86 p.28).

The New York Ministerium supplied four pastors to the Michigan Synod. The first was G. Voss in 1870 (MI-'70 p.10; MI-'71 p.14). He left in 1872 apparently for the Pennsylvania Ministerium (MI-'72 p.19). C.F. Haussman entered the ministry of the Michigan Synod in

1875 (MI-'75 pp. 21-2). He remained until 1893, when he was suspended from the synod (MI-'93 p.13). R. Hoeck, who was trained in Heidelberg (SF 3:70-1), entered the service of the synod in 1878 (MI-'78 p.11), but he was not formally accepted until 1880 (MI-'80 p.6). He died in 1890 (MI-'90 p.21). The last pastor from the New York Ministerium to enter the synod was G. Stern. He began serving in 1888. He took a call to the Wisconsin Synod in 1897 (GBL 54:25, p. 411).

The "district synods" of the General Council provided Michigan with eight workers. Only one of those not coming from the New York Ministerium, J. Fritz, served for more than six years in the synod. Only two of the New York men could be said to have given extended faithful service. Their influence was minimal. Clearly, the General Council failed to supply Michigan's needs in this manner as well.

It is possible that some of the men whose origins are unknown may have come from the other church bodies within the General Council. However, none of the men whose origins I cannot determine are listed in the *Philadelphia Seminary Biographical Record*. It seems more likely that they came from the Wuerttemberg mission houses, since a number of them were listed as "candidates" when they came and were then examined by a committee of pastors before being ordained.

The third group supplied by the General Council is the most significant. These are the men supplied through the efforts of the German Home Mission Committee. In order to understand the training

and background of these men, it is necessary to trace the history of the committee and its work on behalf of the German-speaking synods of the General Council.

One of the reasons for the formation of the General Council in 1867 was to coordinate efforts at home missions (GC-'66 p.9). For that reason, an Executive Committee on Home Missions was formed in 1867 (GC-'67 pp.31-2).

In 1880, the General Council in convention undertook a revision of its approach to Home Missions. The reasons cited were the lack of money from the district-synods, an increase in local mission work and a lack of manpower. The study committee recognized that this last problem, the lack of manpower, had created what we today might call a "vicious circle." There were no men to serve the congregations, so there was no money, so there was no way to recruit new men (GC-'80 pp.21-2). The solution that was eventually adopted placed responsibility for home missions back onto the individual district-synods. Fields where the General Council had no one working were assigned to the larger bodies. Significantly, Texas was assigned to the Pennsylvania Ministerium (*op. sit.* p.44).

This plan proved to be a disaster, as the Home Missions committee reported in 1881, "In the German Synods of Michigan, Canada and Texas, the mission work is not only at a standstill, but one congregation after another is being lost for want of ministers to supply them ..." (GC-'81 pp. 45-6). The committee recommended a completely new approach to home missions within the General

Council. They suggested replacing the Home Mission Committee with three independent committees: the English Home Mission Committee, the German Home Mission Committee and the Swedish Home Mission Committee. The Swedish Committee was to be the Home Missions Committee of the Augustana Synod, while the German and the English Committees were to be elected by the Council. The German Committee was to be headquartered in Philadelphia and specifically given "the authority to establish a preparatory school to prepare candidates for the Theological Seminary" (*op. cit.* pp. 59-60). This plan was adopted by the Council, with one additional point: "Resolved, That

this committee [the German committee] be instructed to consider whether any connection with educational institutions in Europe, or the establishment of any additional institutions or department in an existing institution in this country is necessary to meet the special wants of the church..." (*op. cit.* pp. 61)

This step specifically addressed the long standing needs of the Michigan Synod -- indeed Michigan was specifically mentioned as one of the "district synods" sorely in need of this assistance. Eberhardt reported this step with no little enthusiasm: "Zur

grossen Freude ... gereichte die neue Einrichtung, dass eine deutsche Committee fuer das Werk der Einheimischen-Mission unter der deutschen Glaubensgenossen erwählt ... wuerde ..." (MI-'82, p.17).

[The new direction, that a German committee for the work of home missions among our fellow believers is chosen ..., will bring great joy ...]

At last it seemed as if the Michigan Synod's longstanding quest for a reliable source of pastors was at its end.

The 1881 General Council convention appointed a nominating committee to present candidates for the German Home Mission

Committee. Eberhardt served on that nominating committee. The first German Home Missions Committee consisted of the following men:

Rev. F. Wischan	Pennsylvania Ministerium
Rev. J.H. Baden	New York Ministerium
Dr. E.F. Moldehnke	New York Ministerium
Rev. J.J. Kundig	Pennsylvania Ministerium
Rev. F.W. Weiskotten	Pennsylvania Ministerium
Mr. J. Born	Pennsylvania Ministerium
Mr. J.C. File	Unknown
Mr. T.H. Diehl	Pennsylvania Ministerium
Mr. H. Bendel	Pennsylvania Ministerium
F.A. Stohlman	Unknown

(GC-'81 pp.3-5, 73)

Immediately noticeable is that the committee is dominated by men from New York and Pennsylvania. In defense of this action, it would have been very difficult for Eberhardt or another pastor from Michigan to attend meetings in Philadelphia on a regular basis in the 1880's. However, it would not have been impossible. Representatives of the various "district synods" managed to meet annually for the General Council convention.

The 1881 Convention also authorized the German Home Missions Committee to start a periodical, which they called *Siloah*,⁹ to call attention to home mission work among the German speaking synods (GC-'81 p. 73). The first issue appeared in January 1882 (GC-'82 p. 34). Eberhardt encouraged his members to subscribe to *Siloah* (MI-'83 p. 17). It was a rousing success. The profits from the periodical were used to pay workers called by the committee itself and to defray the travel expenses of men coming from Europe.

The committee went to work immediately and with great enthusiasm. The committee report to the 1882 convention of the

General Council reported that they had organized before the delegates had even left Rochester (the site of the 1881 convention). They saw their work as "naturally divided ... into

two parts. First of all relief was demanded for the want existing within the bounds of the Synods connected with the General Council; and secondly, the pioneer work in the Great West had to be undertaken without unnecessary delay" (GC-'82 p.33 emphasis in the original).

Their first course of action was to issue an "Appeal to our Brethren in the Faith in the Dear Old Fatherland." The committee reported that the "Appeal" was widely circulated in Germany, especially through the efforts of Inspector Groening of the Brecklam mission house in Holstein and Inspector Voelter¹⁰ of the mission house in Gross Ingersheim, Wuerttemberg. The committee reported that the "Appeal" was published in nearly every church paper in Germany¹¹ (GC-'82 p.34).

The committee's purpose in sending out the "Appeal" was "to secure men already fully educated in Germany, who upon their arrival here could at once enter the holy ministry and our field of labor" (*ibid.*) The committee reported that "a universal interest

in the Germans of this country ... was awakened by our appeal... It is surprising to note what a commotion has been produced in every nook and corner of the dear land of our Fathers, and how ready and willing all are to render assistance" (GC-'82 p.34).

The committee drew men from a variety of sources. In the course of its work, the mission houses at Hermannsberg^u, Brecklam, Gross Ingersheim and even Neuendettelsau all provided men to serve in the German missions fields in North America. But the most long lasting and effective source of pastors for the North American

fields came from the *Missionanstalt* established at Kropp.

In 1882, the committee reported, "At Kropp, in Schleswig, an institution was at once opened for the scientific and theological training of young men willing to labor in the Lutheran Church in America. Over a hundred anxious to devote themselves to the cause, applied for admission to this one institution alone. Of those but fourteen could be received" (GC-'82 p.34)

The Kropp *Missionanstalt*, which was to become known as *Eben'ezer*, was the direct result of the "Appeal" of the German Home Mission Committee. This institution was distinguished by its commitment from the very beginning to "the scientific and theological training" of its candidates. This was no *Pilgermission*. It was a seminary caliber training center with a commitment to producing qualified candidates to serve the German speaking Lutherans in North America. Koehler noted the "superior caliber of the Kropp contingent" (Koehler, p.192).

Eben'ezer was founded and operated by Rev. Paulsen. Before the 1882 convention, he visited the United States "for the purpose of becoming acquainted with our wants and necessities..." (GC-'82 p.35). The first graduates of the Kropp institution were not available until 1885 (GC-'85 p.18). Nevertheless, in 1883, the German Home Missions Committee "entered into a union with Pastor Paulsen." By that time there were already thirty-one students studying at the seminary there (GC-'83 pp.67-8). In 1884, there were 43 (GC-'84 pp. 62-3). In 1885, a total of seven men entered the ministry of the Lutheran Church in North America. That year there were fifty students enrolled in the seminary (GC-'85 *loc.*

sit.). None of those first seven graduates ever saw service in the Michigan Synod.

The status of the General Council's relationship to the Kropp seminary raised a number of questions on the floor of the General Council convention in 1887. In response, the German Home Missions Committee clarified their relationship with Kropp. Although the Committee often referred to the Kropp Seminary as "our" seminary, in fact it had no legal right or obligation to the institution, at least not during the period of my sample. However, Rev. Paulsen had founded the institution in response to the "Appeal" from the committee (and thus from Michigan as well), and he not only raised the funds and recruited the men and faculty for the institution, but he also provided all of his services at his own expense. (GC-'87 pp. 50-1)

The Kropp Seminary did eventually provide a number of candidates for service in the Michigan Synod. Only four of them entered her service during the period that I surveyed. However, at least three others, Soll, Bast and Riemers, were serving at the time of the Boehner presidency (Koehler, p. 192). The four who entered the service of the synod during the years of my survey were M. Kionka, P. Kionka, M. Bode and Fr. Kock. M. Kionka joined the synod in 1888 (MI-'88, p.27), the others in 1889 (MI-'89, p.21). Any men who arrived after this would not have come through the offices of the German Home Mission Committee of the General Council, because the Michigan Synod withdrew from the Council in 1888. It appears, in fact, that P. Kionka came on his own to serve

with his brother (MI-'89, p.21). Ironically, M. Kionka left for Minnesota in 1893 (MI '93-p.13), while his brother remained in the synod until 1902, when he took a call to the Wisconsin Synod (DS-'02, p.13). Bode served at least until 1907. Kock was ordained and installed in a Michigan Synod congregation in Minnesota in 1889 and never heard from again.

The German Home Mission Committee drew candidates from several other sources as well, especially between 1882 and 1885, when the first Kropp graduates arrived in North America. In 1882, the committee made a significant contribution to the Michigan Synod by providing either four or five pastoral candidates to them (GC-'83 pp. 35-6; MI-'82 p.17). Two, Abelmann and Menke, were from Hermannsburg and spent their entire ministries in the service of the Michigan Synod. A third man, Merz, came from Gross Ingersheim and served into the 1890's. A fourth man, J.G. Bleibtrau came from Brecklam, but he left to avoid discipline in 1884 (MI-'84 pp. 10, 22-3). The fifth candidate, G. Wenning (or Wening) came from Neuendettelsau and served as a vicar initially. In 1885 he was ordained (MI-'85 pp. 14, 25-6), but he left the synod the next year (MI-'86 p.28).

Interestingly, the Michigan Synod proceedings in both 1882 (*loc. cit.*) and 1883 (MI-'83 p.24) claim that the German Home Mission Committee had nothing to do with Merz' coming to Michigan - they insist that he came from Gross Ingersheim as a result of their private dealings with Inspector Voelter. If this is the same Voelter who was serving as inspector of St. Chrischona fifteen

years earlier, then there may be some validity to their claim. The German Home Mission Committee may have felt that their "Appeal" was the cause of his coming, even if they had not specifically recruited him.¹² However, an indication of the validity of the Michigan position is the fact that Voelter also supplied Michigan with four students for her seminary in 1887 (MI-'87 p.27). They were K.A. Hauer, K.J.A. Binhammer, W.G. Bodamer and C.G. Wagner (MI-'88 p.19).

After 1883, no new workers were supplied until K. Mueller, who had actually come to the United States in 1882 with a group of sixteen students who had done their pre-seminary work in Germany and who were sent to the U.S. to complete their studies here (GC-'82 p. 36). Mueller had been privately instructed by a pastor in New Brunswick, NJ along with six others (GC-'82 p.101). He came to Michigan in 1885 (MI-85 p.25). He left to serve the New York Ministerium in 1887 (MI-'87 p. 28), possibly due Michigan's withdrawal from the General Council.

In 1886, the Committee supplied a new candidate to the Michigan Synod (GC-'86, p. 21). H. Lemster's training is unknown, but he remained in the synod until 1891, when he left for doctrinal reasons (MI-'91). In 1887, the Committee supplied R. Praetorius (GC-87 p. 11), from Hermannsburg, who began his ministry in 1888 (MI-'87 p.27). He was suspended from the ministry in 1893 (MI-'93 p.13).

In all, the German Committee for Home Missions supplied eight men (ten if we count those who came in 1888-9). Some of these men

provided valuable and faithful service to the synod. Several did not. But clearly, this was the General Council's most enduring contribution to the Michigan Synod, especially if we consider the men supplied by Voelter (including the seminary students) as at least a by-product of the synod's connection with the General Council.

This was a most auspicious beginning for the Committee. The Michigan Synod had greatly benefitted from their work. But once again, the General Council would disappoint the Synod. Appendix D shows the distribution of the men recruited by the German Home Mission Committee from 1882 until 1888.¹³ Between 1882 and 1888, 72 candidates arrived from Germany to serve in the Lutheran Church in North America, but only ten were ever assigned to work in the Michigan Synod. It seems more than coincidental that the work in Texas received the largest contingent, 17, since the Pennsylvania Ministerium had had a direct involvement in the development of that field. Nor was the situation in Michigan unknown to the Committee. The General Council proceedings reported in 1882 that the work in Michigan had almost stopped (*loc. cit.*) and in 1884 that the synod had lost four congregations because it could not supply them with pastors and -- significantly -- that one or two men should be sent there at once (GC-'84 p.59). Additionally, the synod urgently requested workers in 1883 (MI-'83 p.12) and 1884 (MI-'84 p.10). These requests went unanswered, however.

When you combine the 17 men sent to Texas with the seven who served directly in the Pennsylvania Ministerium, the result is

nearly one third of the men recruited by the General Council German Home Mission Committee served the needs of the district-synod with the largest representation of the committee. The second largest group went directly to serve the New York Ministerium, the only other district-synod definitely represented on the committee. The Michigan Synod received consideration only after the Canada Synod, which received eleven men. More telling is the distribution. Michigan received an immediate influx in 1882, but after that only sporadic help. Canada, New York, Texas and Pennsylvania all received more or less consistent help. One has to wonder if Michigan's testimony concerning the Four Points did not affect the priority the committee assigned to her needs.

Measuring the influence of the General Council men who served in the Michigan Synod is really quite difficult. However, it seems safe to say that they had a strong tendency to serve for short periods and then to leave. Not surprisingly, the few men who did stay in the Michigan Synod did not hold any significant offices or present many papers during the period of my sample. I imagine a more extensive work would reveal greater influence at a later period in their lives.

C. The American Lutherans

The third major source of pastors available to the Michigan Synod was the other American Lutheran church bodies. These men are classified as "American Lutherans" only in the sense that they were already in America serving Lutherans (and not necessarily in the

sense of the Definite Platform). In many cases, I have no idea where these men actually received their training. We do have definite examples of men who were trained in places like St. Chrischona or Basel coming to the Michigan Synod after serving in another American Lutheran church body. In other cases, we do know that the men in question were trained in America at the synod's seminary.

The synods that concern us are the Ohio Synod, the Iowa Synod, and the Buffalo Synod. The largest supplier of men from this category is the Ohio Synod. This is not terribly surprising, since the Ohio Synod had churches in Michigan at this time, and since the Michigan Synod had churches in Ohio at this time. There was also a historic connection. After the collapse of the first Michigan Synod, Fredrich Schmid served for a time in the Ohio Synod (*Michigan Memories*, p. 161). Finally, the Ohio Synod was a confessional body at this time. It did not join the General Council and it was a member of the Synodical Conference from 1872 until 1881 (Nelson, *The Lutherans in North America*, pp. 251, 319). It was natural that men who were serving a confessional body would be comfortable in a synod like Michigan that was striving to be confessional and was trying to lead the General Council into a more confessional position as well (Koehler p.176).

The first man that we know came from the Ohio Synod was A. Tuerk, who came with his congregation in 1873. He actually applied for membership in 1872, but he had no *Entlassungzeugniss* from the Ohio Synod, so his application was refused (MI-'72 pp.34-5). He

was finally accepted in 1873 (MI-'73 pp.36-7). Apparently his relations with the synod were somewhat strained, however, because he left in 1882, and took his congregation with him. Eberhardt is extremely sharp in his comments in the 1882 Proceedings regarding Tuerk and his ministry (MI-'82 p.23). Tuerk seems to have made peace, however, because he applied for and was accepted back into membership of the Michigan Synod in 1886 (MI-'⁸76 pp. 34-5,40). He remained a member in good standing until his death in 1904. His obituary in *Synodal-Freund* is extremely brief, noting only that poor health had forced his retirement some years before (SF 17:9 p.106).

Unless one of the unknown men from the middle to late 1870's was in reality an Ohio Synod man, the next member of that synod to join the Michigan Synod was F. Huber in 1882 (MI-'82 p.21). Huber had in fact been a member of the Scio congregation during Klingmann's pastorate there, but had attended Concordia College, Ft. Wayne during his prep years. He graduated from Capitol University, (the Ohio Synod's seminary) and was ordained in 1881. Beginning in 1889 (MI-'89,p.15), when he was still quite young, he served as president of MLS and remained there until 1898. After he left the Michigan Synod he served an Ohio Synod congregation in Racine for more than forty years (*The Lutheran Standard*, Jan. 24, 1948, p.14). Koehler is extremely critical of Huber, laying much of the blame for the split in the Michigan Synod in 1896 at his feet (along with Boehner, Merz and Linsenmann). He describes him as being "in no wise equal" to the position he had attained and as

being unfit to teach Sexta, while attempting to teach theology (p. 192). At this late date, it is difficult to evaluate Koehler's judgement of the man. He certainly contributed both to the instruction at MLS and helped to found *Synodal-Freund* in 1888 (MI-'88 p.31) The 1889 proceedings list him as teaching Old Testament, New Testament exegesis, introductory and intermediate Greek, Latin and English (pp. 15-6). I wonder if Huber's responsibility in the schism didn't color Koehler's views of the man's academic abilities.

In 1885, two more Ohio men, R. Weise and A.P. Mueller, joined the Michigan Synod (MI-'85 p.15). R. Weise left the next year, but stated that he would have gladly stayed if ^{there} they had been a suitable place for him to serve (MI-'86 p.28) Mueller died in 1888. That year also brought the last two Ohio Synod men, J Buerkle and W. Linsenmann (MI-'88 p.29). Fredrich maintains that Linsenmann was trained at St. Chrischona (p.4).¹⁴ He also points out that Linsenmann headed MLS from 1892-1902. *Synodal-Freund* published a notice that he was no longer a member of the synod in 1903 (SF 16:33,56).

R. Conrad, who entered the synod in 1870, was a Pastor in Lansing who applied for membership in the Michigan Synod (MI-'70 p.15). In all probability, his congregation was originally affiliated with either the Missouri or the Ohio Synod, the two largest Lutheran bodies in Michigan. Since we have no indisputable case of a Missouri man serving in the Michigan Synod, I think it is most likely that he was an Ohio Synod man. His ministry in

Michigan was brief. He left for Minnesota in 1873 (MI-'73 p.21)

J.J. Buechsenstein also came to the synod from another church body. He had to go through the colloquy process in 1882. The recommendation of the floor committee specifically stated the concern "ueber seinen luth. Standpunkt" (MI-'82, p.29), but this *may* have simply been the formal way of stating the requirement for a colloquy. The fact that he went to the Ohio Synod in 1885 (MI-'85 p.26) would lead me to believe that he probably came from there originally.

The Ohio Synod provided a total of five (and possibly eight) men to the Michigan Synod during these years. Of those five, three (Tuerk, Huber and Linsenmann) provided extensive service. The ministry of all three was, however, marred by controversy. Tuerk's defection and return may be the reason that his obituary is so limited -- no one wanted to dig up the past. Linsenmann and Huber both served as director of the synod's seminary -- always an influential post. But their involvement in the 1896 split in the Michigan Synod permanently marred their reputations in our circles and made it impossible for them to continue to serve in the church body that had repudiated Boehner's leadership and was slowly moving toward reconciliation with the Michigan District-Synod, and thus with the Joint Synod and the Synodical Conference.

Huber also was a co-founder of *Synodal-Freund*. However, during the late 1890's, nearly every issue of that publication carried an article attacking the Wisconsin Synod over its role in the MLS controversy. Clearly, that point of view did not prevail.

Whatever influence Huber may have exercised through that periodical seems to have ended with his involvement in an unpopular controversy.

It is not surprising that the Ohio Synod did not supply more or better men to serve the Michigan Synod. Although their relations appear to have been quite cordial, they were never in fellowship with one another. Ohio had no obligation to serve as the source of Michigan's pastors.

The Iowa Synod and the Buffalo Synod each provided one pastor to Michigan. G.H. Brecht came to Michigan from Iowa in 1869 (MI-'68 p. 7). He was released in 1871 (MI-'71 p.15). A. Lange came in 1885 from Buffalo (MI-'84 pp.27-30) where he was a member of the faculty of Martin Luther College. He offered to train students for the ministry and his offer was accepted by the synod (MI-'85 pp.14,16). He left in 1888 (MI-'88, p.63). The German Ev. Lutheran Synod of New York (which appears to be a different body from the New York Ministerium) provided P. Matschat in 1872, but he it may have been a temporary arrangement to fill a vacancy (MI-'72 p.18)

A final group of men fall into the category of American Lutherans. This group consists of the first two men to graduate from MLS. They are included here because they really don't fit anywhere else. H. Luetjen and J. Henning began their ministries in 1889, the last year of my sample (MI-'88 p. 19). Their appearance marks the end of my sample. They provide an interesting comment on the state of theological education at the end of the nineteenth century. Luetjen left the synod in 1893 and took his congregation

with him (MI-'93, p.13). Henning was kicked out in 1911 (MI-'11, pp.70,78).

D. A Comment on the Unknown Men

If you refer to Appendix A, you will notice a large number of men whose origin cannot be certainly determined. They are indicated either with the classification "unknown" or by having their probable source placed in parentheses. Seventy-five is a rather small sample in any event, and to have to eliminate some twenty leaves me with a rather uncomfortable feeling that any conclusions I might like to draw are of extremely limited value. I certainly cannot contest that this would be a far better study if I could determine more of the information that is lacking. However, some statements can be made. As was noted previously, Hennicke most likely came from Basel and Steinnicke may have come from Neuendettlesau.

Lutz is more problematic. He appears to have given faithful service, but he died before the synod began publishing *Synodal-Freund* (MI-'77 p.15), so we have no detailed obituary. Since he entered the synod in 1867, Chrischona or Basel would seem to be good guesses, but he could also have come from another Lutheran church body. The 1867 Proceedings give no indication of where he came from, they simply list him with the other pastors, between Schlenker and Gangnuss, both of whom arrived in 1867.

As was noted above, Conrad seems most likely to have come out of the Ohio Synod. Schoenberg was probably a St. Chrischona man,

as were also Schmolz, Mueller, Stein, Fontaine, Deckinger, Rein, Mayer and Wuest. My reasons for holding this view are set forth in the section on St. Chrischona. Part of the difficulty in determining the truth of this belief lies in the fact that H. Reuther, who was probably also a Chrischona man, was the synod secretary from 1871 to 1874. He was temporarily succeeded by Haas (1875) and then Haussmann (1876-77). None of these men left particularly detailed minutes. In 1878 Stamm took over and continued until 1881. He appears to have begun to more carefully annotate where these men came from.

W. Asall is another problematic case. He was examined and ordained already in 1881, (MI-'81, p. 9) although he does not appear on the synodical roles until 1882. He definitely did not come from either the General Council's German Home Mission Committee or from the Philadelphia Seminary, but he did come as a candidate. Again, he may have come from St. Chrischona, but he would be somewhat late for that. He was also Stephen Klingmann's son-in-law for a short time (his wife died). He resigned from the district-synod in 1887 (DS-'87, p.8).

In 1885, Tessmer (MI-'85 pp.13-14, 25-6) joined the synod (through a colloquy) as did Renz in 1886 (MI-'86 p. 27), but neither stayed long. Tessmer left the Lutheran church in 1889 to serve a Protestant *Waisenhaus* in St. Louis (MI-91). Renz left the Michigan Synod in 1888.

It is possible to make educated guesses about the origin of nearly all the men who served in the synod. However, even if we

confine ourselves to dealing only with those men whose origins can definitely be traced, we can use this sample to draw some conclusions. Appendix B shows the percentage of men whose origin was unknown in every year of the sample. The largest percentages are recorded at the beginning, when the synod was much smaller, and in the mid- to late seventies, when that large group of unknown men entered the synod. Otherwise, the percentages, and the actual numbers, are quite small for most of the years.

As Appendix C demonstrates, the low annual percentages are due to the fact that these men did not remain in the synod for extended periods of time. Only two (Schoenberg and Mayer) of the men who served for twenty or more years fall into the "unknown" category. Even of those who served for ten or more years, only one more (Lutz) can be classified as "unknown." Of twenty admittedly difficult to place men, seventeen served less than ten years in the synod.

II. Efforts to Maintain Confessionalism

In 1888, a Pittsburg newspaper known as the *Workman* published an article in response to the withdrawal of the Michigan Synod from the General Council. The article was quite critical of the synod for its failure to become a large and viable body even in the state of Michigan. It ridiculed Michigan's confessionalism and predicted that Michigan could not stand alone, but must be absorbed by another, larger body. The article contained the following statements: "One of these [actions that were an embarrassment to

the General Council] was the reception into the Michigan Synod of a Mr. Marksheffel, pastor of a church in Toledo O. [sic] -- a man of questionable character and known to many as a vulgar rationalist! Another was the undue endurance by the Synod of a minister of openly intemperate habits and shameless life at Monroe, Mich. ... Happily, the pressure from without led to the removal of these scandals, and the mantle of charity covered these and other evidences of a faith but imperfectly realized. Until quite recently, the support of the United Seminaries at Basle [sic] and Chrischona was openly maintained ..." (The *Workman*, ~~op~~ sit)

106

While there is no evidence available to my knowledge that anyone in the General Council exerted any "pressure from without" to deal with discipline problems within the Michigan Synod, the fact that Michigan drew her workers from so many sources did leave the synod open to charges of a lack of confessional commitment. Such ideas persisted in the Joint Synod (and even in the WELS) for many years to come. Without a doubt, Michigan sprang from a unionistic and pietistic root. Therefore it is essential to a study of Michigan's efforts to obtain pastors to evaluate Michigan's efforts to maintain and enforce her confessional stand among those candidates who came to her. We will review Michigan's

practices in four areas: the public examination of candidates, the colloquy and recommendation process for men already in the ministry, the discipline efforts and the conference papers produced and studied by the ministerium of the synod. We will then take a brief look at the level of retention among Michigan Synod pastors.¹⁵

Already by the 1866 convention, the synod had adopted the practice of charging one of its floor committees with the task of reviewing the credentials of all the applicants for service in the synod and making recommendations to the body at large (MI-'67 p.7). This practice continued as long as the synod remained an independent body. In some instances the committee recommended immediate acceptance. In others, they recommended examinations or colloquies. At times, they recommended that the person not be admitted for service in the synod.

The report of this floor committee appears in the proceedings of every convention in which detailed reports of the floor committees are recorded (within the confines of my sample). This reflects a commitment from early on to screening candidates for service in the synod.

Most of the time, the men in question presented themselves to the synod at some time during the year, rather than at the synod convention. This was in keeping with the synod constitution. This also enabled the synod president to discharge another duty specifically charged to him by the synod constitution of 1866. Paragraph 7,A,c of the 1866 constitution reads: "[The president]

hat im Namen der Synode predigerlosen Gemeinden auf ihr Ansuchen hin, Kandidaten und Pastoren vorzuschlagen, oder ihr

Wahl zu bestaetigen ..." (MI-'66 p.15).

[{the president} is, in the name of the synod, to recommend candidates and pastors to vacant congregations or to verify their election ...]

Naturally, this made the synod president responsible on a practical level for screening the candidates. Klingmann and Eberhardt especially took this responsibility seriously. Reading through the proceedings of their presidencies indicates great attention to their responsibility in this regard.

A. The Examination Process.

At least since 1867, the Michigan Synod adopted the practice of examining new candidates who came to work within her fellowship. In that year, C. Nussbaum, a student from the Philadelphia Seminary came to the synod and was assigned "nach einem wohlbestandenen Examen." (MI-'67 p.6). The format for this particular "Examen" is unclear, but the reason for it is not. The synod had experienced no end of difficulties with untrained and unconfessional men. It was not unusual at this time for a seminary student to receive a call into the ministry before he actually finished his studies. No doubt both these factors led the ministerium (and especially the officers) of the synod to institute a formal examination process.

It is also clear that this was not a mere formality, at least at this time. In the same year that Nussbaum passed his examination, another candidate, C.A. Reinert, presented himself to the synod for call. At that convention, the synod held a *Ministerial-Sitzung* and examined him. Unfortunately, Candidate

Reinert did not perform satisfactorily. The Examinations Committee reported that Reinert was adept at the *Real-Fachen* (equivalent to our P.T.), but that he needed at least another year of study "auf das Fach der Theologie." (MI-'67 pp.9-10) Not surprisingly, there is no indication that Reinert ever applied again to the Michigan Synod. What is noteworthy however, is the fact that Schmid, in his president's report, noted that the congregations in Genoa (Brighton), Sebewaing and Sturgis, could not be served. If the Michigan Synod were only interested in filling pulpits, a man like Reinert who was apparently well versed in practical theology would have sufficed. But the synod had a greater interest than that.

Unfortunately, no first hand account or record of any examination has come into my possession. Clearly Reinert's examination was conducted at the *Ministerial-Sitzung*. There are other occasions in which the examination was handled at the convention or at the general pastors conference in the spring or (at a somewhat later date) at the district conferences.¹⁶ Occasionally, the examination was conducted as a part of a public worship service.

In addition to the requirement that the men pass an examination, the synod also required a letter of recommendation from the candidates' educational institution. Again this seems to reflect the bad experiences the synod had had. In perusing the proceedings, one often finds the comment that the floor committee has in its hands a letter from St. Chrischona, for example, recommending the candidate for ordination.¹⁷

It is also interesting to note that *Synodal-Freund* reports, in each year in which the Michigan Seminary produced candidates, the successful examinations of those candidates. The custom remained at least until the Michigan Synod rejoined the federation in 1910. Perhaps by that time it had become a mere formality, since the synod was training its own men. It seems likely that the practice was probably discontinued by the time of the amalgamation in 1917. But I have no seen no indication of when it was actually discontinued.

B. The Colloquy Process

It is not surprising that a body like the Michigan Synod that was endeavoring to maintain its confessional moorings also required some evidence of confessional commitment and faithfulness from experienced pastors who came to serve in her midst. However, like today, the background and experience of the men who came varied greatly. These men appear to have been dealt with on a case by case basis. In general, however, the synod required a letter of recommendation (the *Entlassungszeugniss* or *Emphfehlungszeugniss*) from the president of the body that the man was leaving and the successful participation in a formal colloquy. The colloquy, unlike the examination of the candidates, never appears to have been public, but rather was generally conducted by a committee at a conference or convention. The committee then reported back to the body. The final decision, however, rested with the synod in convention. At times, there seems to have been quite a bit of

discussion over the findings of the committee.

The primary issue often seems to have been confessionalism. As evidence of this, I would like to look in some detail at three specific instances in a little more detail. The first is the case of J. Raible. As was stated earlier, Raible was a Chrischona man who served in Cairo on the "Apostelsstrasse" before coming to America in 1869. Even though the floor committee of the 1868 convention had agreed to Raible's coming (p.10), Klingmann still appears to have had some reservations. So he had Raible, who was already an experienced missionary, serve as his vicar and during that time he had him study the confessions. Klingmann reported:

"Waehrend seines neunwoechentlichen Aufenthalts bei uns studierte er mit unermuedlichem Fleiss die Bekenntnisschriften unserer ev. luth. Kirche und vikairte bei mir und den benachbarten Amtsbruedern. Nachdem er mit freudige Ueberzeugung die Erklarung abgegeben, dass er ganz unsern konfessionellen Standpunkt einnehme und wir hinlaenglich von seiner Tuechtigkeit zum hl. Predigtsamt ueberzeugt waren, wurde er .. von mir ordinirt." (MI-'69 p.7)

[During his nine-week long residence with us, he studied with untiring industry the confessional writings of our ev. luth. church and he served as a vicar for me and the nearby brothers in the office. After he had, with joyful conviction, given his explanation that he completely accepted our confessional position and we were witness of his adequate competence for the holy ministry, he was ... ordained by me.]

The result of this level of attention to confessionalism was a thoroughly confessional Lutheran pastor. Raible served the Lord in the Michigan Synod until his death. Significantly, he was nominated for the synod presidency in 1870 (MI-'70 p.11).

The second instance is somewhat similar to that of Raible. It is the entrance of the H. Reuther in 1871. This Reuther may also

have been a Chrischona man. He had been serving in Brazil and he came to Klingmann looking for a place to serve in the Michigan Synod. Klingmann recommended him to the dual parish at Plymouth and Ypsilanti "nachdem er Rechenschaft [an account] ueber seinen Glaubens- und Bekenntnissgrund gegeben [hat]." This man, however, only remained in the synod until 1876. No mention is given in the president's report of his departure, however. His name merely ceases to appear in the *Parochial-Bericht*.¹⁸

The third instance differs from the other two in that the man under consideration came from what the men at that time would have considered a basically confessional Lutheran church body (although they were not in fellowship with them). G.H. Brecht came from the Iowa Synod in 1869. Klingmann installed him in Marshall without a formal colloquy on the strength of the "ehrenvolles Entlassungszeugniss" he received from Pastor Grossman, the president of the Iowa Synod (MI-'69 p.7). This instance demonstrates the importance that the Michigan presidents put on the official recommendation of the pastor's previous church body. Occasionally, General Council pastors were simply admitted on the strength of that recommendation. Without it however, the synod would not even hold a colloquy. G. Tuerk, who served the synod for many years, was refused membership in 1872, because he did not have the recommendation of his parent church body, the Ohio Synod (MI-'72 p.35). Because they took this document so seriously, whenever a man left under questionable circumstances, Klingmann and Eberhardt refused to issue such a recommendation, even if it was requested.

In order to demonstrate that this process was more than just a formality, it is necessary to show a few negative instances. There are actually a number of instances in which men were refused membership in the synod, even though they had served or were serving as pastors in other Lutheran bodies. Tuerk was cited above. Other examples would include A. Pfister in 1867, who was urged to remain in the Iowa Synod (MI-'67, pp. 12-13) and a Pastor Hahn in 1874 who was judged to be unworthy of service to the church (MI-'74, pp. 26-7).

C. Discipline

No confessional church body can exist without a vigorous exercise of church discipline. The men from Michigan recognized that fact as did even the author of the attack printed in the *Workman*. That periodical accused the synod of permitting "a vulgar rationalist" and a man whose life brought disrepute to the ministry to remain in the synod. It also alleges that these problems were only dealt with as a result of pressure from outside the synod. Therefore, it is worthwhile to use these two instances to examine the disciplinary proceedings with the Michigan Synod during its membership in the General Council.¹⁹

The *Workman* alleged that "the undue endurance by the synod of a minister of openly intemperate habits and shameless life at Monroe, Mich." was evidence of "a faith but imperfectly realized" (*loc. cit.*). Since the unknown author doesn't name the pastor in question, we will have to make a guess. Zion, Monroe (which was

the only Michigan Synod congregation in Monroe at that time) was served by Karl Mutschel from 1858-65, by Stephen Klingmann from 1865-67, by Frederick Lutz from 1867-76 and by Wilhem Fontaine from 1876-1881 (*Michigan District History*, p. 192). Mutschel can probably be eliminated, since he was gone before the synod joined the General Council. Klingmann, likewise, can be eliminated because the author's case would have been even more damning if it had involved the president of the synod. There would be no good reason to fail to mention that fact, if Klingmann were the culprit. Also, Klingmann was many years in Scio, while only two in Monroe. Lutz was certainly in the congregation long enough to have been accused, but he is an unlikely candidate, because he was not removed from office; he died in 1876. Wilhelm Fontaine, however, is probably the man in question.

Fontaine is difficult to pin down. He was accepted by the pastors conference on the spring of 1876 (MI '76 p. 7). In 1877, Klingmann reported that he was serving in Monroe (MI-'77 p.15). There is no further mention of Fontaine by Klingmann until his last presidential report in 1881. There Klingmann reports that Fontaine's congregation brought charges against him to the ministerium late in 1880. Klingmann reported that a commission was formed, consisting of himself, Eberhardt and Wuest to try and deal with him. Klingmann accused Fontaine of "agitation" (*Hetzerei*) and "subterfuge" (*Wuehlerei*) and reported that Fontaine used every means at his disposal to frustrate the efforts of the commission. Fontaine refused to meet with the commission, so the synodical

)
pastoral conference suspended him. Eberhardt, in his first official report (given that same year) reported that the congregation in Monroe suspended Fontaine from his office and that he would receive no *Entlassungszeugnis* (MI-'81 pp. 9-12).

It would appear that some error in judgment was made in admitting Fontaine into the synod. Since there is little information about him available to us, it is difficult to make an evaluation. However, the problem emerged on a synodical level in 1880, when the congregation brought charges to the synod. By 1881, Fontaine had been suspended from the ministry. Even if his problems began as soon as he came to Monroe in 1876, and even if Klingmann knew about them already then, the entire episode lasted less than five years. That hardly seems an undue amount of time. Further, it was the congregation itself, not any outside influence, that brought about the disciplinary action.

—
The other case, that of Markscheffel, also demonstrates a willingness to exercise proper discipline. Markscheffel was a member of the synod in 1866. In 1869, Klingmann informed Markscheffel that the southern district of the synod had adopted a "gefassten" (either "prepared" or "written") resolution concerning him (MI-'69 p.7). Klingmann did not elaborate. However, the third floor committee reported that it had a letter from him and the minutes of the southern conference's meeting. The conference had taken place in conjunction with a free conference sponsored by the Ohio Synod regarding the Lord's Supper. Markscheffel had spoken against the Lutheran understanding of the sacrament. His

resignation was accepted (*loc. cit.*, pp.17-8). It is worthwhile to note that the conference took place in May (p.7) and Markscheffel was dealt with by the time of the synod convention in October. Even if Markscheffel's rationalistic views were known earlier, Klingmann had only been in office since 1867. By 1869, the issue was resolved.

The Michigan Synod did attempt to exercise doctrinal discipline. Like many conservative church bodies, they often had the experience that an unfit pastor would leave before they had the opportunity to expel them. In these cases, the only option left to them was to withhold the *Entlassungszeugniss*, which they frequently did.

There are other instances of discipline that we could discuss. It also is worthy of note that both Klingmann and Eberhardt report every year that they conducted congregational visitations. In many instances they were addressing problems, but there are also reports that nothing was amiss; they were being what we today might term "pro-active." This is another indication of the commitment of the synodical officials to confessional lutheranism and their efforts to make that a reality in the synod at large. Doubtless, their job was made infinitely more complicated by the total lack of uniformity of education of the men who came to serve their church body, and doubtless their efforts made the Michigan Synod an unpopular place to serve in some circles, but it was the only recourse available to them during the early years of the synod's existence.

D. Conference Papers

One final area of note in evaluating the confessional forces at work in the Michigan Synod is the production of conference papers by the members of the synod. Appendix E gives a partial listing of the conference papers given by the members of the synod during the period that I studied. Several items are worthy of note. First, the specifically Lutheran nature of the topics under consideration. This is extremely important in view of the large number of pastors who came from Wuerttemberg and stayed in the synod. These men needed to study sound Lutheran doctrine. Also worthy of note is the fact that the Four Points are treated already in 1868. The result of those essays, which were printed along with the 1868 convention proceedings, was a strong confessional statement rejecting chiliasm, the lodge and unionistic fellowship relations (MI-'69 p. 13ff). After that, those issues were settled within the synod and witnessed to outside of the synod. Finally, the conference papers, especially those that were printed, indicate a strong confessional influence. Men like Eberhardt and W. Reuther from Basel consistently presented strongly Lutheran themes, as did especially Kramer from St. Chrischona. The influence is telling. What pastors study together, they take with them into the ministry. Given the "revolving door" that seemed to exist in the Michigan Synod, it seems likely that the men who stayed, stayed because they were comfortable with this approach to ministry.

E. Retention in the Ministry

There is one final aspect of the service of the pastors in the Michigan Synod that deserves examination. That is the area of retention. The specific point of interest is why men left the synod. Appendix H lists all the sources which supplied pastors to the synod during the years in question. The reasons for leaving the synod are outlined at the top. A pastor might have left for one of five reasons: he died, he retired, he left his congregation to serve in another Lutheran church body, he deserted his congregation (which would include serving in a union church or simply leaving without informing the congregation/synod as to why), or he was removed from office. A sixth category is "unknown" -- that is, no reason is given in the proceedings, he simply no longer appears in the *Parochial-Bericht*. Note also the men supplied by the German Home Mission Committee of the General Council are listed separately at the bottom. In reality, these men appear twice on the chart. Once under the institution that trained them and once by the separate entry for the German Home Mission Committee. They are only counted once in the total, however.

The data is somewhat artificially weighted in favor of the positive reasons for leaving the ministry due to the fact that the resources necessary to follow up on men who remained in the synod are greater. It is quite difficult to track down men who left, especially when the proceedings report only that they have gone. If the proceedings did not indicate where they came from when they joined the synod, ^{then} when they are much more difficult to account for

at this late date.

Keeping in mind that the italicized entries represent men whose background must be surmised, we can draw a few conclusions. The first is that Michigan did experience a "revolving door." Twenty-five of the seventy-five men who served during this period left to serve in another church body. Even allowing that several went to the Wisconsin or the Missouri Synod, this must have been extremely difficult for a small synod like Michigan. To be fair to the men in question, a large number of them went to the Ohio Synod (probably at least as many as came from there), which was quite a confessional church body at this time as well. Most of the rest went to General Council member churches. Although time did not permit the kind of detailed study of this phenomenon I would have liked to conduct, it seems that the Michigan's dealings with the General Council and the other American Lutheran church bodies actually siphoned more workers out of the Michigan Synod than it supplied them with. At least five (and maybe eight) Württemberg¹¹ men left the synod to serve other Lutheran church bodies in the United States.

Another seventeen pastors abandoned their congregations and, in some cases, the Lutheran church altogether. Again, this was a larger group of men than any single source provided to the synod. It is understandable why they would feel the need for a seminary so strongly. The fact that they actually were forced to remove seven men from the ministry in less than thirty years also helps us to understand the difficulties that faced the synod during this

period.

The difficulties the synod faced in retention must have made the first two columns of Appendix F that much more encouraging. There was a large group of dedicated men who served nearly their entire ministries in the state. Certainly, a few of the nine men who died actually died quite young, but nine of the men who served during this period eventually retired. The men who died in office generally served for ten or more years as well. Five of the nine who died in office and five of the nine who retired were supplied by the Wuerttemberg mission houses.

III. Evaluating the Ministry.

Any section with a name like "Evaluating the Ministry" automatically runs the risk of being rejected. By its very nature, ministry is difficult to evaluate under the best of circumstances. In this instance, the information that has come down to us is limited, so any conclusions that are drawn must be made very cautiously. Nevertheless, the amount of research undertaken in this paper demands that some conclusion be drawn, since evaluation seems to be the distinction between merely collating facts and history.

My conclusions focus on four areas: the Wuerttemberg influence on the history of the synod, the effects of the retention problems on the synod, the efforts of the synod presidents and the seminary question in light of my research.

A. The Wuerttemberg Influence.

The influence of the Wuerttemberg men upon the history of the Michigan Synod is tremendous. That influence can be felt in every measure that I was able to devise. Numerically, they were the largest and most stable group, with the most years of service and the most men overall who stayed in the synod, as was discussed in the preceding two sections. They also were solidly confessional men, as can be seen by their conference papers, their commitment to discipline, and their careful screening of candidates. They were extremely influential in their own day. The men trained in Basel and St. Chrischona dominated the offices of the synod, as can be

seen in Appendix G.

Of course, the Wuerttemberg men exercised influence in at least one other way. The early difficulties that they experienced with Basel forced them to chose early which way they would go. The ongoing difficulties with the unidentified group (many of whom probably did come from St. Chrischona) and with the General Council forced them to stick by their choice. The *Workman* maintained that the synod ultimately belonged in the Union Church. That shows just how little they understood of the history of the synod. The men from Michigan in some ways were like the children of Israel when Joshua left them -- they had to chose whether they would follow the pietistic influences of their roots, which would have easily blended into the so-called "American Lutheranism" of the General Synod, or whether they would cling to their orthodox Lutheran heritage. At least from the time of Klingmann's presidency, and already before that, the synod was strongly moving in a confessional direction. But it is the irony of the situation that the very source of men who would eventually move Michigan into the Synodical Conference, was also the source of much of their difficulty in getting there. Clearly, in 1866, the synod no longer trusted the Basel Mission House. Just as notable is the fact that no more men come directly from St. Chrischona after the establishment of the General Council's German Home Mission Committee. Even though the leadership of the synod had all come from Wuerttemberg, they knew that there had to be a better source of confessional pastors -- the simply hadn't found it yet.

The Wuerttemberg contingent is a remarkably diverse group. There are some characteristics that seem to have been common to almost all of them. They shared the mission zeal of Friedrich Schmid. Eberhardt was a *Reiseprediger*, Raible served for years as mission treasurer, just to name a few. Many of them had served in other foreign mission fields. The proceedings mention Africa, the Middle East, Europe, South America, China and the orient. They had a genuine concern to gather up the scattered flock that lived in Michigan during the late nineteenth century. No doubt this spirit was born in Basel and St. Chrischona. It is no coincidence that Spittler was driven by a desire to mount a mission to "de-christianized Europe" and that the men who came out of his mission society and mission house spent most of their time gathering scattered German Christians into congregations where there were none. Wuerttemberg was thoroughly pietistic, but that meant that its people believed that their faith must express itself in actions. While we would have no desire to return to the doctrinal laxity that marked the efforts of Schmid and the Wuerttemberg mission houses, we must be careful not to condemn the real fruits that the Holy Spirit worked through them, even as we note the inevitable contradictions that arise from a lack of vigorous doctrinal discipline.

The men from Wuerttemberg kept the mission zeal of Spittler and Wuerttemberg alive in the Michigan Synod. The fact that the synod remained a small and, in some people's minds, insignificant church body was not due to a lack of mission zeal, it was due to a

commitment to confessionalism -- again, led by the Wuerttemberg men. There were definitely men who were willing to serve Michigan's vacant pulpits at this time. But the synod would not have them. We noted several examples of the synod refusing to accept candidates and experienced pastors, despite the fact that congregations were defecting to church bodies with a more secure source of pastors. The Wuerttemberg men, as a group, remained and served. Clearly, the confessional spirit of Eberhardt, Klingmann, Haas, Raible, Wuerthner, Stamm, Metzger, Kramer, Baumann and Reuther had to infect a body that never had more than thirty pastors serving at one time. That spirit had to have had its consequences. How many experienced missionaries would have been willing to serve (as Raible did) as a vicar and to study the confessions for several weeks under the supervision of another pastor before receiving a call? There were other places to go and other churches to serve. No doubt men with less confessional fortitude found them.

The burning question in my mind is: where did this commitment to the Lutheran confessions come from? To my knowledge, this is an unanswerable question. Certainly, the pietism of Basel and St. Chrischona considered itself to be the true heir of Luther, but history has shown that pietism's commitment to the orthodoxy of the Formula of Concord has been weak at best. Yet the synod's 1866 constitution's second paragraph subscribes to the "saemmtlichen symbolischen Buechern unserer ev. luth. Kirche, als der richtigen Auffassung der h. Schrift" (MI-'66 p.13). The history of the synod

shows that this was indeed a sincere statement.

It seems likely that the Michigan Synod experienced some of the same forces of confessional awakening that led to the formation of the General Council in 1867. Certainly, they did not live in a vacuum. But it seems most probable that the early leaders of Michigan's confessional movement reached their convictions as the result of their own study of Scripture and the confessions. Without doubt, personal Bible study was strongly encouraged in the mission houses. Another contributing factor would, no doubt, have been the presence in Michigan of both confessional Lutherans and union churches. As the synod, under Klingmann and Eberhardt struggled with the issues of the Four Points and the efforts to be truly Lutheran, they were driven back into the Scriptures again and again, and they maintained a truly Lutheran understanding by maintaining truly Scriptural roots.

B. Michigan's "Revolving Door"

Another aspect of the Michigan Synod history that requires some evaluation is the impact of what I have referred to as its "revolving door." This is my attempt to describe the study influx and outflow of pastors into and out of the synod. As Appendix F demonstrates, the overwhelming majority of the men who came from other synods left again. As Appendix C shows, of the twenty-seven men who served more than fifteen years in the Michigan Synod, at least sixteen (and maybe eighteen) were from Basel or St. Chrischona, two were from Hermannsburg, two were from Kropp and one

was supplied by Michigan's new seminary. Only three were from the other American Lutheran churches. Yet at least eighteen pastors from other Lutheran churches served in Michigan.

One effect that must have had was to frustrate the men who stayed, especially the leadership of the synod (as their sometimes sharp comments betray). Yet it also seems likely that a certain *esprit d'corps* would probably have been built up in the men who stayed as well.

On a more practical note, the question exists, were the other Lutheran men better or worse trained, as a group, than the Michigan men were? If they were better grounded in the Scriptures and the confessions, their instability was a devastating blow to the struggling synod. But I wonder if it they actually were. After all, the confessionalism of the General Council ultimately failed because they lacked a clear understanding of the scriptural principles of church fellowship. Many of the men who left went to General Council churches or to the Ohio Synod. Perhaps their formal training was better than the Michigan men as a whole could claim, but the essays that have survived indicate a well-developed understanding of the scriptures and the teachings of the Lutheran church. Their records indicate to me a real and well-intentioned effort to put those principles into practice. I question whether we should too confidently assert that Michigan lacked men who were capable in any field of theology. Perhaps they were not seminary professors, but they knew what they believed and they struggled valiantly to hold their ground.

A more tenable proposition is that the men from other synods might have lent a stabilizing influence through their maturity, rather than through their education. Klingmann graduated from the Basel in 1860. In 1866, he was already vice-president of the synod and in 1867, he was president, while his classmate was vice-president. Clearly, the other men in the synod had real confidence in their abilities, but I don't think I would be ready to assume that level of responsibility so soon after my graduation ^{from} ~~form~~ the seminary, no matter how small the synod might be. If the men who came from the other church bodies were quality men (a debatable proposition), perhaps their age would have helped Michigan to deal with some issues in a more mature fashion. It seems more likely, however, that many of the men came to Michigan because they were unhappy in their own church body, and that they left because they were no more satisfied in Michigan. It is quite possible that these men did irreparable harm to the Michigan Synod by constantly diverting the attention of the leadership of the synod to whatever issues they brought with them from their own church body. To be sure, the presidium devoted a great deal of time and effort to screening these men, corresponding with their synod presidents, conducting and reporting colloquies, recommending them to congregations and then trying to cover their vacancies when they turned around and left within a few years. Michigan might have done better without them entirely.

C. The Synod Presidents

The role the synod presidents played really was determinative for the synod's subsequent history. Without Schmid and Eberhardt, where would the mission zeal of Michigan been? To this day we speak of "the Michigan spirit." It seems likely that much of that spirit was inherited from these early pastors.

There were more concrete contributions, however. Klingmann and his wife Karoline opened their home to the many pastoral candidates that would soon be coming to them from Germany. The author of his obituary commented: "Da die Synode keine eigene

Anstalt zur Erziehung von Predigern befasst, sondern Kandidaten aus Deutschland kommen liess, so oeffnete er bereitwilligst diesen seines Hauses Thuer, nahm sie vaerterlich auf und behielt Manche Wochen, ja Monate lang unentgeldlich bei sich."
(SF 4:7 p.79)

[Since the synod had no institution of its own for the education of pastors, but rather let candidates come from Germany, he most readily opened the door to his home to these men, in a fatherly manner he took them in and he maintained them for weeks, indeed months, without asking for money.]

The effect of this really cannot be underestimated. Klingmann had the opportunity to personally meet these men, if only for a short time, and assess their temperaments and abilities. It seems quite likely that he may have also let them preach and do other work in Scio, either while he was attending to his duties as synod president, or in the nearby congregations that he served.²⁰ No doubt, the relationship he established with them there enabled him to deal with them more effectively during his visitations later. It also seems likely that many of the Chrischona men who stayed,

) must have gotten their first taste of Michigan Synod confessionalism at this time. It seems that Eberhardt conducted a somewhat similar practice during his ministry. His contributions to Michigan's confessionalism are the subject of a senior church history thesis in the seminary library.

D. The Seminary Question

The *Kurzgefasste Geschichte* states that the reason that the Michigan Synod failed to become the dominant church body in the state of Michigan is that she waited so long to start her own seminary (pp.11-12). That evaluation has been repeated and echoed again and again. No doubt, there is an element of truth to it. Michigan sponsored numerous mission trips by several different *Reisepredigers* throughout her early existence. Yet, she continued to lose congregations because the synod simply could not fill the pulpits of the congregations that the *Reisepredigers* gathered. But does it necessarily follow that Michigan's "greatest neglect and gravest error" was its failure to found a seminary? I am not so sure. In the first place, the founding of seminaries had not yet become the accepted practice of the day in the 1860's and 70's. Indeed, the 1880 General Council proceedings indicate that many of the member churches were only then in the process of establishing colleges and seminaries, and that with great difficulty. The Philadelphia Seminary didn't come into existence until 1864 and then it only had a handful of students. Certainly, the Pennsylvania Ministerium and New York Ministerium had far greater

resources to devote to that seminary than Michigan could possibly have mustered.

A related consideration is the financial backing necessary to establish a seminary. It is notable that the Michigan seminary really did not get a firm foothold until Eberhardt donated the land on which MLS currently stands. Even then he provided funds that helped to keep it going. In 1866, the synod treasurer reported that the synod had taken in \$79.06 during the last year (MI-'66 p. 12). The synod had eleven pastors and around twenty congregations. It seems unlikely that it could have supported a seminary then. In 1876, the number of pastors had more than doubled, to 23, and there were more than forty congregations (MI-'76 p. 21). Perhaps it would have been possible at this time to begin a seminary. But the synod treasurer reported an income of less than \$150 for synodical purposes (p.18). The missions treasurer reported an income of over twelve hundred dollars for mission work in that year (p.20). Perhaps the synod needed to reorder its priorities. But they were a very mission-oriented church body. I maintain that this is the earliest point at which they could have founded a seminary. It is by no means certain that it would have been a success.

If they had started a seminary, could they have staffed it? This is a question that could occupy an entire paper all by itself. However, the initial impetus to begin instruction in Michigan came from A. Lange, from Buffalo, who offered to begin instructing young men for the seminary. I think that it is significant that the synod immediately took him up on his offer, because it probably

indicates that they were willing to support training themselves, but they did not think that they had the capabilities to do the job themselves. In the end, Lange did not remain with the synod for long. Men like Huber (who had a university level training) and Linsenmann (St. Chrischona) and others, who were already members of the synod, were left to do the training.

If they had started a seminary, it is not clear that they would have had enough students to make it worthwhile. Certainly Voelter's contribution of four students was significant when there were less than ten enrolled in the entire school.

If the synod lost its opportunity to become the dominant Lutheran church body in Michigan, it really lost that opportunity not in the 1860's or '70's -- it lost the opportunity in the 1830's when the Loehe men broke with the first Michigan Synod. The difference was the confessional practice of Friedrich Schmid. The loss was the loss of financial resources from Loehe and a steady stream of called workers who could have been trained and provided a stable, confessional pool of men for the Michigan Synod. From a human point of view, the proceedings of the Michigan District of the Missouri Synod could have easily been the *die Verhandlungen der ev. luth. Synode von Michigan u.a. St.*

Of greater import to me is the effect that the early efforts to obtain and retain competent, confessional pastors had on the subsequent history of the synod. As I have attempted to show, the synod and its leadership expended great amounts of energy to find qualified men and it was often disappointed both by the caliber and

the commitment of the men who served. Again and again, congregations were left with extended vacancies. A large number of them left the synod. New fields could not be exploited. Doctrinal discipline was only enforced with great difficulty. To the men who had lived through these years, the establishment of the seminary must have been a blessing from heaven. It is not surprising that they closed it only with great difficulty. No doubt they felt it was as central to the mission of their church body as we feel our seminary is essential to the mission of our church body. It is not surprising that they got "cold feet" after their initial acceptance of the plan to enter the federation. After all, they had been in the General Council for twenty-one years and had never really had their needs adequately addressed. Once again, they were entering a union of separate church bodies as the smallest body and once again they were making themselves dependent on the word and the efforts of others. Could Wisconsin and Minnesota be trusted to keep Michigan's interests at heart? Their experience had to tell them that the General Council had never seriously addressed their needs. Why should the Joint Synod be any better?

Someone might argue that this attitude would show a serious lack of Christian trust -- and they would no doubt be correct. I am not endorsing it. But it seems unreasonable to think that the men from Michigan could simply turn their backs on their own history. Certainly, the way events unfolded, they were not able to. What is more striking, is the fact that they were able to make peace. I believe that two things probably made the difference, one

was the incessant harping in *Synodal-Freund* against the Wisconsin Synod. I think in the end, they probably alienated more of their own people than they helped. The second is that the seminary simply wasn't viable, even in the 1890's (which seriously calls into question the often repeated assertion that the synod should have founded a seminary sooner). It is a tribute to the pastors of the Michigan Synod that they made peace with each other and recognized the opportunity that God was given them in the newly federated, and eventually amalgamated, Joint Synod of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Michigan and other States.

E. Closing Observations.

Writing a paper like this has been an interesting, but a frustrating experience. Every thread hints at another one. All too often, a thread was pursued for a great deal of time, only to break without really yielding any useful information. Conversely, there are still so many things to research. I found an *Entlassungszeugnisse* in the archives. Doubtless, there are more revealing documents there. Unless you are planing to write a dissertation, you finally have to draw a line and hand in a paper.

But I ^{have} been reminded of an important lesson: our synod today needs a secure source of confessional pastors just as surely as the Michigan Synod needed one in the nineteenth century. We must maintain "a strong and viable worker training system." In this day of budget crunches and hard decisions, a thoughtful look at the heartache and loss that Michigan suffered because she could not

fill her pulpits ought to sober us up a little bit and remind us that the work of the Kingdom must go on. We must maintain our stand on the Scriptures. To do that, we must have confessional Lutheran pastors.

In a similar vein, we cannot abandon our foreign missions. The synod has wisely adopted an "indigenous mission" approach. Eventually, our daughter churches must be able to stand on their own. They must be able to train their own men to serve faithfully in the Kingdom of God. God has given us a daunting task -- knowing how much help to give them without either making them dependent on us on the one hand or cutting them off on the other. A difficult choice. Michigan needed help from Europe in the early years. That help didn't come from Neuendettelsau or Hermannsburg, or any of the traditional centers of Lutheran orthodoxy for the most part. It came from Basel. In the 1860's and 70's, Basel supplied what Michigan couldn't give herself. In the 1880's it was clear that she had grown past the help that Basel had to offer.

God sent Michigan faithful workers to serve in her field. We are the heirs of those men. The greatest lesson of history is the perspective that lets you see God's guiding hand. If Loehe and Schmid had gotten along, would Michigan simply be the Missouri Synod under another name? Only God knows. How did those confessional Lutherans wind up in Switzerland? God provided for the needs of his people.

The second lesson of history is the example of faithful response. Klingmann, Eberhardt, Haas, Stamm, Raible, Stern, Tuerk

and many others rose to the task God gave them. It is striking how many men deserted Michigan. But then, that's what we expect in a sinful world. It is amazing how many remained faithful to their calling in that difficult place and time. TO GOD BE THE GLORY!

Endnotes

1. All the translations of German quotes in this paper were made from the original by the author.

2. Michigan Synod proceedings will be documented with the letters "MI" followed by the year and the page number (i.e. MI-'69, p.2). General Council proceedings will begin with the letters "GC" and Michigan District-Synod proceedings with the letters "DS." For my purposes, men who served in either the district-synod or the synod proper are considered as still being members.

3. Hildner, Werner, Worth and Furrer were gone by 1866, therefore they are not included in the seventy-five men that I focused on in my research.

4. Schmid's health was very bad after his retirement. Nearly every year, in the president's reports, the synod is informed that he is near death.

5. Am 1. Juni stellte ich Pastor H. Steinecke in Frankenmuth ein Entlassungszeugniss aus, da derselbe beabsichtigt, nach Deutschland zurueckzukehren und sich dort um ein entsprechendes Arbeitsfeld zu bewerben. Schmerzlich zu bedauern ist nur, dass der gute Zelote in seiner hyperkritischen, nachsichtslosen Kirchengzuchtstheorie mit seinen zwei Gemeinden reinen Tisch gemacht hat, so dass sich die Parochie voellig aufgeloeest hat.

[On June 1st in Frankenmuth, I gave Pastor H. Steinecke a witness of {honorable} dismissal, since the same intended to return to Germany and to work there in a promised field of labor. It is only sad to note that the good zealot, in his extremely critical, unforebearing theories of church discipline, he has made a clean table of his two congregations {i.e., there is no one left} so that the congregation is completely lost.]

6. *Synodal-Freund* will be abbreviated "SF" throughout the remainder of this paper.

7. It should be noted that in reality, the first and last year may not be the year the man entered or left service in the Michigan Synod. For example, generally men were not listed until they were officially accepted by the synod in convention (which were held in the fall). However, on numerous occasions they began to serve between conventions. They generally left the service of the synod between conventions as well, but they may have submitted a report to the secretary of the convention for that year anyway. Finally, in a few instances, men were absent from the parish due to illness or a return trip to Germany, but were listed as official members of the synod until they returned or it became apparent they would not return.

8. The source of this information is, in most instances, the Michigan Synod proceedings in which the pastor was accepted. In some instances, however, it comes from another source. Those are listed here: Raible SF 2:1, p.8; Wuerthner, NWL 23:5p.77/GBL 71:5 p.76; Eipperle SF 5:1 p.7; Stamm *Lutheran Witness* vol.40:13; Lederer, Fredrich, p.94; Moussa GBL 1907, p.69; Motzkus GBL 51:11.

9. Unfortunately, not a single copy of this periodical, which ran until 1927, is in the possession of the Seminary library or the synod archives. The ELCA Archives in Chicago and the ELCA Region 7 Archives in Philadelphia together could probably put together a complete run, but neither has a complete run by itself. Hence, any information available in this periodical on the work of the Michigan Synod during these years was unavailable to me.

10. Naturally, the question arises whether this is the same Inspector (first name) Voelter who left St. Chrischona in 1868. He would be considerably older by this time, but it would account for the correspondence between him and Eberhardt. Gross Ingersheim is consistently described in both the General Council and the Michigan Proceedings as in Wuertemberg, which might indicate a connection to St. Chrischona or the *Baseler Christentumsgesellschaft*, but I cannot establish this link or locate the city on a map.

11. Unfortunately, I was unable to locate the text of the "Appeal."

12. Although my sympathies lie with Michigan, for the sake of the eighth commandment, I will consider Merz as supplied by the General Council.

13. In 1888, the committee was unable to specify where the men who had arrived that year were serving.

14. Prof. Fredrich was unable to verify his information during a phone interview I conducted with him, however he asserted that he was certain of the statement. It is quite possibly true. However, his statement that Linsenmann was "among the first Chrischona men to come to Michigan" during the Klingmann presidency (p.4) is clearly false, as the 1888 Michigan Synod proceedings indicate.

15. Due to time and space constraints, this portion of the paper will have to be an overview, rather than an in-depth study of this issue. I find this regrettable, to say the very least. However, a line must be drawn somewhere.

16. From very early on, the synod divided itself into a northern and a southern district. By the late 1870's, the southern district had become the southeastern and southwestern districts. These, of course, are preserved in the conferences of the Michigan District today.

17. Unfortunately, the proceedings are quite inconsistent in recording this information. Some secretaries merely report the committee's recommendation that a candidate be accepted or even the mere acceptance of a candidate. However, in most instances where a candidate is accepted in a year that the secretary recorded the specific report of the floor committee, what information the committee had received about the candidate is listed. This of course tells us which institution trained that man. I have found no extent copies of these letters.

18. In at least one other instance (Metzger) that indicates the man in question has died, as is later indicated in *Synodal-Freund*.

19. The *Kurzgefasste Geschichte* states that four men were excommunicated during the years 1867 and 1887. The other two men were probably Haussmann and Deckinger.

20. It would be very interesting to look through the records at Scio (as well as at Freedom, which he served for a number of years as a "Filial" -- SF 4:7 p.80) from this period to confirm this belief, but I have not had the opportunity to do that.