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ABSTRACT

*God's Special Way* examines the relationship between Halle Pietism and the Hohenzollern monarchy in order to discern the nature and effect on Brandenburg-Prussia of that alliance. Halle Pietism was a reform movement within the Lutheran church in 17th and 18th century Germany that believed the establishment church had become too concerned with correct theology, thus they aimed at a revival of intense Biblicism, personal spirituality, and social reform. The Pietists, led by August Hermann Francke (1662-1727), and King Friedrich Wilhelm I (r1713-1740) were partners in an attempt to create a Godly realm in economically strapped and politically divided Brandenburg-Prussia. In large measure the partnership produced Pietist control of Brandenburg-Prussia's pulpits and schoolrooms, despite the opposition of another informal alliance, this between the landed nobility and the establishment Lutheran church, who hoped to maintain their own authority in the religious and political spheres.

The dissertation outlines the relationship and continued independence of these parties through analysis of the correspondence between their leaders, especially that between August Hermann Francke and Friedrich Wilhelm I.
during the period 1713 (Friedrich Wilhelm's succession) to 1727. It measures the impact of their work through a study of Evangelical parish appointments during the 1720s that includes documentary evidence and numerical analysis of various regions of the realm and the military church. It outlines the beliefs of the two leaders in order to place their partnership in the context of their lives, work, and historical circumstances.
This document stems from asking what once appeared to be a relatively straightforward question -- did Luther's words on the responsibilities of a Christian prince have a discernible effect on those princes who came after him? In searching for a test case, I found Friedrich Wilhelm I of Prussia, and in researching his reign, I came to know the remarkable story of his relationship with the Halle Pietists. This cast of characters -- Luther, the "Soldier King," and the Halle Pietists, have been held by later historians to be responsible for a host of changes in Germany, almost all of them bad. In examining their story, though, I found that the support for most of these conclusions was thin indeed, and so it is partially an attempt to clarify the historical record that I intend this document. It also is something of a case study by which one can address several larger issues, though, including several that have been more than a bit problematic for historians -- can the Christian church be a partner to the secular authorities, is there a role for ideology in the day-to-day operation of a church and a government, and, yes, whether Germany, like every other nation in history, might indeed have a "special character." It does not provide the
definitive answer to those questions, but, I believe, it does illustrate something of their complexity and richness, as well as giving a better portrait of a remarkable time of change. And, though the dreams of Friedrich Wilhelm and Francke did not really come to fruition, it is also true that these men deserve more than a bit of our admiration, for rather than governing by opinion poll or "keeping their options open" like our contemporary leaders, they chose their sides and threw themselves into the fray, acting on principle.
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INTRODUCTION

German Lutheran Pietism was an integral part of German social, religious, and national development, and Pietism's intersection with the Prussian state during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries is especially noteworthy. Many of the institutions within the present German welfare state are legacies of the Pietist reformers of this period, and the Pietist influence on German schools, themselves leaders in universal education, is well established. Pietism's influence on German Protestantism also continues to the present, not only through its foundational works but also through such 20th century figures as Jochen Klepper. And, most

---

1 R.A. Dorwart, The Prussian Welfare State Before 1740, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970) is one excellent treatment of the topic. By way of contrast, the bitter struggles among the confessions during the 16th, 17th, and even the 18th century that dominate historical literature affect life in modern Germany relatively little -- witness the relatively comfortable cooperation of Catholics and Evangelicals in the contemporary CDU/CSU political party. See also Koppel Pinson, Modern Germany, (New York: Macmillan & Co., Inc., 1970). Regarding the schools, see especially James Van Horn Melton, Absolutism and the eighteenth-century origins of compulsory schooling in Prussia and Austria (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).

2 In fact, the author attended a worship service at the Schlosskirche of the University of Bonn in April 1995 that featured Pietist hymns and a sermon with which Francke or Spener would have been quite at home.
importantly for this document, early 18th century Halle Pietism and the Prussian king Friedrich Wilhelm I, attempting to create a Godly realm, formed a partnership with wide and measurable impact on the church and on the rise of absolutism in Brandenburg-Prussia.3 Despite these facts, Pietism remains one of the less well-known and least understood aspects of Latin Christendom. That neglect, though, has done little to keep historians from making the most far-reaching, ill-supported, and oversimplified claims about it.

This dissertation, in contrast, makes only two claims. The first, backed by primary documentary research, is that the relationship between the Halle Pietists, especially August Hermann Francke, and the Hohenzollern monarchy of Friedrich Wilhelm I was a close, productive partnership of two parties who maintained their independence, to the point of ignoring or refusing

3 For the purposes of this dissertation, absolutism is defined as a system in which sovereignty rests in a monarch who is responsible only to God. The monarchy is the repository of all legitimate political (which of course included economic, religious, and social components) authority.

Sovereignty, in turn, is a monopoly over the instruments of justice and the use of force, i.e. there exist no competing courts or armies within the ruler's realm.

It is actually more correct to speak of absolutism as a tendency or an ideal rather than a system, since tradition, opponents, and other constraints (especially finances and the absence of efficient bureaucracies for carrying out the ruler's orders) limited all "absolutist" monarchs.
requests of the other. The second, also backed by primary research plus an extensive numerical study, is that this partnership succeeded in placing significant and growing numbers of Halle students in pulpits throughout the realm, where they would have opportunities to further the transformation of Brandenburg-Prussia that both the king and Francke hoped to engender.

* * *

The most widely-known English-language scholars of Prussian and Pietist history, including Koppel Pinson, F. Ernest Stoeffler, and Mary Fulbrook, have written that the Prussian Pietists generally became pliant servants of the Hohenzollern monarchs in general and particularly of Friedrich Wilhelm I (reigned 1713-40). Robert M. Bigler even went so far as to state that the main duty of all Protestant clergy in early 18th-century Prussia was "to carry out the orders of the ruler faithfully and unquestioningly and thus assist him in the task of

strengthening and consolidating the Prussian state. 5 As this dissertation will demonstrate, though, the relationship between Pietism and the crown was actually a good deal more complex and a good deal more balanced. It was a partnership of independent parties with shared goals. This partnership engendered real, measurable change in the realm, especially with respect to pastoral appointments and education, the foundation upon which Friedrich Wilhelm and Francke hoped to build their Godly Prussia.

The Pietists publicly proclaimed an impulse for regeneration of the church and an attempt to complete the Reformation by bringing all of the world to God. Two of the most prominent figures in these efforts were Philipp Jakob Spener and August Hermann Francke. 6 The priorities of Spener, Francke, and the majority of Pietists were Biblical study and societal outreach -- God's glory and neighbor's good. 7 Whether their efforts at bringing a


6 Spener (1635-1705) was a leader in taking the devotional ideas of Johann Arndt (and others) and making them part of Christian life and worship. Francke (1663-1727) was instrumental in building social programs based on those same ideas. See Chapters Two and Three.

7 "zur Ehre Gottes und zum Nutzen des Nächsten." Gary Sattler used this phrase as the title of his biography of Francke. Gary Sattler, God's Glory, Neighbor's Good, (Chicago: Covenant Press, 1982).
new, godly consciousness to German Lutherans reached their goal or instead only brought about the beginnings of an unhealthily obedient German population remains open to debate. Many would view the actions of several of the most widely-known Prussians whom Pietism influenced, such as Bismarck and Schleiermacher, as mixed blessings at best because of their willingness to support a supreme state. Whether for better or worse, however, Prussia Pietism was a movement involved in all facets of society, and it was definitely not the quietistic, legalistic, half-separatistic entity that church historians, such as Albrecht Ritschl, have often claimed it to be.8

Even a brief survey of those sources which reach beneath the surface of Prussian politics suggests the complexity of the situation. One quickly finds evidence that while the Pietists and the king maintained their independence, they simultaneously exerted substantial influence on each other. The relationship that emerged after 1713 was not simply one in which the Pietist leaders in Halle adopted the state's priorities in exchange for continued and even expanded royal protection. Instead, it appears that a complex and dynamic partnership existed between this religious group.

and their ruler based on their shared vision of creating a patriarchal, godly realm. Friedrich Wilhelm himself stated that God's blessings had come to the Hohenzollern house because of its piety and discipline. In their words, writings, and actions, this religiously-minded king and the Halle Pietists each made their passion for reshaping their world clear. Indeed, their common vision of renewal and obedient service to God eventually led them to coordinate their efforts. The Pietists supplied the king with expert advice, trained workers, and most importantly competent and trustworthy pastors, and the king made use of their skills in his new central bureaucracy and in his parishes, where they supervised

9 I use the term patriarchy here not to suggest that Friedrich Wilhelm I and the Pietists intended to create a male-dominated power structure (which clearly already existed) but to suggest that they intended to create a paternalistic realm where the ruler and his government attempted to care for the people by following what they believed was God's design. Friedrich Wilhelm believed he was responsible for making Christians as well as protecting and enriching his lands, and Otto Hintze noted the clear parallel between Friedrich Wilhelm's view of kingship and the patriarchies of Hebrew Scripture. Otto Hintze, "Calvinism and Raison d'Etat in Early Seventeenth-Century Brandenburg," in Felix Gilbert, ed., The Historical Essays of Otto Hintze (New York: Oxford University Press, 1975), pp. 106-9, originally published as "Kalvinismus und Staatsräson in Brandenburg zu Beginn des 17. Jahrhunderts, Historische Zeitschrift 144 (1931), pp. 229-286.

not only worship but education. Together, the king and the Pietists consolidated authority in the king's hands, pushing the Lutheran nobility and the orthodox Lutheran church to the margins of Prussian decision-making and building the state power which Friedrich II used with such effect. Again, it is the thesis of God's Special Way that they remained independent actors working toward a common goal, and that the partnership during the period 1715-30 was a constantly evolving relationship.11 Furthermore, analysis of one of the principal outcomes of that partnership, the placement of Halle students in the pulpits of Brandenburg-Prussia, offers important insights into the nature, and especially the consolidation, of early modern absolutism in Brandenburg-Prussia.

There remains a need for further explication of this topic. Pietism itself is finally attracting more interest from church historians, but their work concentrates largely on the theology of Pietism.12

11 The received view, for example as represented by Fulbrook, is considerably different: "Pietists, in the attempt to achieve the religious reformation and social transformation they desired, became co-opted in the battle of the state to rework the old order into a new, centralised and militarised regime. But the partners in battle were unequal, and Pietist goals were submerged under secular pressures and priorities." Fulbrook, p. 178.

12 Though there are some methodological difficulties with analyzing Pietism in terms of its theology, scholars such as Martin Brecht, Hartmut Lehmann, the late Klaus Deppermann, and others associated
Similarly Friedrich Wilhelm himself, though held by many to be the model of absolutism, remains long overdue for an English-language reassessment that takes into account more dimensions of this king whose work had such influence on Germany's later history. By 1750, formerly sleepy Prussia had become a great power, and its citizens had gained a reputation for diligence, obedience, and efficiency which Germany still possesses. As Rosenberg, Schmoller, Dorwart, and others have outlined, it appears that these changes in Prussia stem from a consolidation of absolutism that in large measure transpired via the developing bureaucracy during this critical half-century. Further, as Richard Gawthrop, James van Horn Melton, and others have illustrated, the Halle Pietists are especially important for Prussia's development, not only for providing administrators but for their role in the development of the Prussian educational system. There is also significant evidence to support the thesis that a

with the journal *Pietismus und Neuzeit* deserve praise for their role in the revival of Pietist studies.

13 H.W. Koch, among others, also adhered to this view: "Actively supported by the dynasty, Pietism permeated all levels of society with an ethos in which all efforts were directed towards maintaining and securing the whole, even if this operated at times at the expense of the individual." Hannsjoachim W. Koch, *A History of Prussia* (London: Longman, 1978), p. 81. As this dissertation will demonstrate, however, it is possible to push this view beyond the limits of the evidence.
shared commitment to a Godly world order lay at the core of the partnership between the energetic Friedrich Wilhelm and the hard-working Pietists. Thus, it appears that the partners combined this commitment with the transformative opportunities available through both the civilian church (which was also responsible for the village schools) and the military church. In other words, Halle Pietism, via the pastors and schools, and the standing army, with its Halle chaplains, appear to have served as twin instruments with which to control the behavior and even the belief system of Prussian society, providing "internal" control through their teachings and "external" control through moral admonitions and even outright intimidation.

But how did this partnership that facilitated Prussia's nearly unbelievable metamorphosis from economically underdeveloped, militarily weak, politically divided backwater of Europe to united military giant and rising economic powerhouse function? What can that partnership tell us about early modern Europe and the limits of absolutism? The answers to these questions are the focus of God's Special Way. A comprehensive understanding of the religious aspects of Prussia's growth will be a powerful analytical tool for European history, addressing not only significant questions about the development of Prussia but also key issues for church
historians with an interest in Pietism or church-government relations. If, as this dissertation presupposes, it is true that the realization of a movement's program determines the movement's lasting consequences for its society and thus makes it worthy of historical study, then the Pietists' relationship with the state deserves intense examination indeed.

* * *

Well-balanced accounts of Pietism that consider the multiple dimensions of the movement are rare in the literature. Equally rare are analyses of this period in Prussian history that portray Friedrich Wilhelm as something other than a one-dimensional drill-sergeant, concerned only with centralizing authority in order to build his army. Indeed, the baggage of 20th century church and political strife weighs particularly heavy on the historiography of both Pietism and Prussia.14 Another difficulty lies in the fact that few scholars have attempted to broaden the focus of their examinations of either topic enough to consider the interaction

14 Consider, for example, the whole "what made Germany such an outlaw nation" genre of historical literature.
between the two. The available literature does point toward some possible avenues for research, though.

Controversy began almost simultaneously with the spread of "Pietist" ideas in Germany. Spener's 1675 *Pia Desideria*, with its proposals for reform of the church and the critique of the established order inherent in those proposals, provoked a vitriolic response from the more scholastic orthodox Lutheran theologians (especially at Wittenberg), who referred to Spener as a Quaker, Rosicrucian, chiliast, and fanatic. These orthodox Lutherans found the idea of small conventicles particularly galling, implying as it did that ministry and learning could occur without the guiding presence of a member of the clergy. They also dismissed the Pietist positions on such issues as the *Wiedergeburt* (new birth) and sanctification as heretical departures from the true doctrine of which they saw themselves as curators. Their views, especially as outlined by Valentin Ernst Löscher, would maintain wide circulation, forcing Spener and both the older and younger Franckes to devote significant time to defending themselves throughout their careers.15

The onset of Aufklärung ideas in Prussia did nothing to improve the situation of Pietists in either the

scholarly literature or the eyes of the government. The Prussian government issued an order in 1826 concerning Pietism that condemned it for encouraging mysticism, anxiety, and individualism, a profound marker of the changes that had occurred in the previous 100 years. Tensions between Pietists and Enlightenment rationalists actually dated back to Francke's lifetime, during which time he was able to convince Friedrich Wilhelm to expel several scholars, most notably Christian Wolff, from Prussian universities for alleged atheistic views. Though later Pietists for the most part ignored the Enlightenment (and indeed the University at Halle actually became a center of rationalist thought), the antipathy continued. The "neo-Pietists" of the late 18th and early 19th centuries used arguments against the Enlightenment similar to those their predecessors had used against Lutheran Orthodoxy -- that it valued reason over revelation and nature against grace. Ironically, these later Pietists found themselves allied with more Orthodox Lutherans in this struggle with rationalism;


17 Regarding later Pietism, see especially Stoeffler, German Pietism, pp. 217ff.
they also found common cause with some of the writers in the *Sturm und Drang* movement.18

The writer who had the most profound effect on later Pietist historiography, however, was Albrecht Ritschl. Ritschl's history, drawn from hymns, sermons and theological writings with little reference to the broader historical impact of the movement, leaves the reader with a one-dimensional view of Pietism.19 As Ritschl caricatured Pietism, it was simply a renewal of medieval mysticism, a Dutch import, a historical dead-end, and a theological regression. His powerful influence led other writers to join him in classifying Pietism as a mystical separatism lying outside the mainstream of history.20

Perhaps as correctives to Ritschl and his allies, Carl Mirbt and (later) Hans Leube have emphasized what they saw as the essentially orthodox (and progressive)

18 It is a further irony that the university in Wittenberg, home of the strongest opponents to Spener and Francke, became the center of neo-Pietist thought after rationalism gained control in Halle.


20 Herbert Stahl, *August Hermann Francke. Einfluss Luthers und Molinos' auf ihn*, Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Geistegeschichte. XVI. (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1939) is one of the more modern works to adopt this approach.
character of Pietism and its reform ideas. Locating the roots of Pietism in a desire to recover the Reformation's emphasis on personal religious experience over against the scholasticism of that era, Mirbt attempted to rehabilitate Pietism's reputation within the church, though neither he nor Leube expanded their focus to include the Pietists' role in society.

Ernst Troeltsch found the origins of Pietism in yet another stream within the flow of Western Christendom, namely Anabaptism by way of England and the Netherlands. He suggested that the Pietists were the descendent of what he saw as the sectarian tendencies within the church, and that they combined a (positive) warm, authentic Christianity with (negative) inclinations toward withdrawal and surreptitious machinations.

---


22 Many of Leube's best-known pieces are included in a recent compilation. Hans Leube, Orthodoxie und Pietismus, Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Pietismus, Band 13, (Bielefeld, Luther-Verlag, 1975).


24 "Er (pietism) zeigt viel echtes, warmes und opferwilliges Christentum, aber auch die ganze Kleinlichkeit geistlicher Gruppen, die für ihre Weltabgeschiedenheit durch einen um so gründlicheren Hochmut sich entschädigen, den scheinbar verschmähten weltlichen Einfluss durch allerhand persönliche
the Pietist contribution to the state would become the standard for most later writers: "Pietism supplies the State with loyal servants, who practice submission as part of the asceticism of their calling; it does not seek to alter existing conditions."25

More recently, Martin Schmidt has emphasized the influence of mysticism and spiritualism on Spener and Zinzendorf through Jacob Böhme and Johann Arndt, though without echoing Ritschl's negativity. The main thrust of Schmidt's work was to establish the center of Spener's theology in the New Birth, an idea notably absent from the Lutheran Orthodoxy of the era.26 Kurt Aland also noted the debt of Lutheran Pietism to the mystics, though with a stronger stress on Pietism's mainstream Lutheran origins. K. James Stein, in his fine English-language biography of Spener, also portrays Pietism as a legitimately Lutheran movement (particularly if one looks to Luther and not the Lutheran scholastics to define

Beziehungen dann doch wieder hinten herum gewinnen wollen und ihre Leidenschaften in allerhand geistlichen Krakeel austoben, genau wie das schon die Schattenseite des Täufertums gebildet hatte." Troeltsch, p. 828.

25 Troeltsch, Wyon trans., p. 719.

"Lutheran"), but one leavened by mysticism as found in Arndt and Tauler.27 Heinrich Bornkamm also explored Pietism's connection to mysticism; like Schmidt and Stein, he did not adopt Ritschl's harsh judgment.28

Two views that run counter to much of the literature are present in much of the work of Erich Beyreuther, including his admiring biography of Francke.29 First, Beyreuther stated Francke did not concern himself exclusively with Germany, and second, he unabashedly claimed that Christians should follow Francke's ideals of service and ecumenism today. Furthermore, Beyreuther's focus is broader than that of most other writers. Gary Cattle also addressed Francke's thought and deeds of the Pietist leader in his biography, though his principal contribution lies in his translations of several of Francke's sermons.30 Those scholars who follow the

30 Sattler. Sattler's work, based heavily on Beyreuther, does not enjoy wide circulation, but is
'Orthodoxy and Pietism' model generally concentrate on theology, eschewing a comprehensive analysis, and while the generally acrimonious literary exchanges between Pietist and Orthodox leaders give an interesting picture of the church in their time and more than a few smiles of amazement, focusing on this vituperative discourse paints the distinction between the two far too sharply and perpetuates the emphasis on the doctrinal side of Pietism that has distorted its historical picture. The work that will surely become the standard reference for the field is Martin Brecht's recent, massive, and wide-ranging survey. With some chapters written by Brecht and the remainder written by other experts and edited by Brecht, it brings the latest scholarship and the classic historiography together in a balanced treatment that addresses the worldwide impact of Pietism without notable as this century's only biography of Francke in English. Sattler focused on the years before 1700, so his treatment of the later evolution of the Halle programs is brief.

31 For example Friedrich Wilhelm Kantzenbach, Orthodoxie und Pietismus, Evangelische Enzyklopädie, Band 11 (Gutersloh, Germany, Gutersloher Verlagshaus, 1966), Martin Greschat, Orthodoxie und Pietismus, Gestalten der Kirchengeschichte Bd. 7, (Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 1982), and to some extent Leube.

32 Martin Brecht, Der Pietismus vom siebzehnten bis zum frühen achtzehnten Jahrhundert, In Zusammenarbeit mit Johannes van den Berg, Klaus Deppermann, Johannes Friedrich Gerhard Goeters und Hans Schneider (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993).
slighting the traditional emphases on theology and Pietism's interaction with orthodoxy.

In sum, with a few laudable exceptions the perspective on Pietism in the most widely-known scholarly literature is excessively narrow. Even those scholars whose opinion of Pietism is favorable have constructed their replies to the critiques of Pietism in the terms of its harshest critics, namely specifics of doctrine. Indeed, the seventeenth-century Wittenberg theologians and their ally Löscher (with a boost from Ritschl) still dominate the scholarly debate by setting the questions and vocabulary, despite the fact that three hundred years have elapsed since the first polemical rounds were exchanged. German Pietism, particularly as practiced in Halle, was a religion as much of the hands as of the head or heart. Narrowing the focus of its study to only its devotional and doctrinal aspects without recognizing and noting the inability of this approach to provide a comprehensive view introduces a serious error into any historical treatment of Pietism. For example, studying only the collegia pietatis, small Bible conventicles, gives one an impression of quietistic separatists, yet the fact that the Halle Pietists founded and operated one of the largest publishing houses of the time, printing nearly 200,000 Bibles and New Testaments by 1719 and nearly 3 million by 1800, shows the magnitude and vigor.
of Pietist attempts to reach others with the Word.33 Similarly, focusing on Francke's admonitions about drink and dancing suggests that he was a legalistic prig who abhorred the more earthy aspects of eighteenth century life, yet he served for years as the pastor of St. George's church in Glaucha, one of the most squalid towns in Brandenburg-Prussia, and focused much of his ministry on the poor and criminal elements of his parish. Thus, approaching the Pietists from the perspective of mainstream church history, which on this topic comes from intellectual and theological history leavened by the early anti-Pietist polemics, does not allow for their full placement in society or in Germany's development.

* * *

A similar narrowness of perspective hinders much of the literature regarding Prussia and the early modern Hohenzollerns. The events of the last century, in particular the three major European wars of the era (including the 1870 Franco-Prussian war) have exacerbated the existing tendency of historians, particularly non-Germans, to begin and end their investigations with political issues. Scholars and politicians searching for

33 Sattler, p. 82.
paradigm with which to analyze these admittedly tragic events have often located their roots in a Prussian "special way" that includes only the militaristic aspects of Prussian society and began in early modern times.34 Actually, as Mme. de Stael wrote as long ago as 1810, Prussia had a "Janus head" nature, one side military and repressive, one philosophical and tolerant.35 Only recently has the literature begun to consider the two sides together, and the process of widening the focus to include both is as yet incomplete.

Leopold von Ranke devoted a considerable number of volumes to this era, and his portrait of Friedrich Wilhelm I did assess the king's faith and relations with

34 Martin Luther also regulary receives beatings in this genre.

35 For a more recent discussion of this paradox, see Klaus Deppermann, "Pietismus und moderner Staat," in Aland, Kurt, Pietismus und moderne Welt (Witten: Luther-Verlag, 1974), p. 75. The tension survived well into this century. For example, General Henning von Tresckow, one of the anti-Hitler conspirators involved in the July 1944 assassination plot, said at his sons' confirmation, "[being Prussian] This brings with it great responsibilities -- the responsibility to tell the truth, to be disciplined, to do your duty always. But you should never think that this exhausts Prussian values. Often Prussianess is misunderstood. Freedom can never be divorced from real Prussian values. Real Prussianess is a synthesis of commitment and freedom, of subordination and command, of pride in yourself and understanding for others, of firmness and compassion. Without this synthesis, there is a danger of sinking into a soulless bureaucracy and arrogance. Only in this synthesis can be found the German and European task of Prussia, the 'prussian dream.'" Bodo Scheurig, Henning von Tresckow (Frankfurt: Ullstein, 1980), p. 154.
what he called the "Spener school," including their impact on education, though in keeping with his times he emphasized the king's military and diplomatic qualities.36 Otto Hintze's titanic 1916 Die Hohenzollern und ihr Werk remains a central work for scholars of specialized Prussian (as opposed to German) political history, a perspective that not only still has adherents but also has a literature devoted to analyzing it.37 Hintze also considered the impact of religion on Prussian history, including in his article discussing Calvinism and the actions of the Hohenzollern monarchs and his piece on the Lutheran church in Prussia.38 S. Fischer-Fabian's recent work, an unabashed apology for a Prussia that the author sees as virtuous, tolerant, and diligent,


38 This article offers an especially insightful analysis of Friedrich Wilhelm's particular religious views and the behind the scenes political machinations that likely were instrumental in their formation. Hintze, "Calvinism and Raison d'Etat in Early Seventeenth-Century Brandenburg," in Gilbert, The Historical Essays of Otto Hintze, pp. 91-156. See also Hintze, "Die Epochen des evangelischen Kirchenregiments in Preußen," Historische Zeitschrift 97 (1906).
appears squarely in the Hintzeian tradition, even seventy years later.39

Otto Busch has considered in great detail what he referred to as the "militarization of Prussia" and in particular its ramifications for Prussian society.40 His key points, that the nobles countenanced their loss of authority in the provincial and national arena to the Hohenzollern monarch in exchange for tight control over the peasantry and that Friedrich Wilhelm's cantonal system of army recruitment bound the peasantry more tightly to the nobility, have gained a wide audience. Rudolf von Thadden has illustrated a link between these hierarchical social structures and the (Lutheran) church in Prussia, a link that is of critical importance for analysis of Pietism.41

A number of writers have chosen to focus their research on the political and bureaucratic foundations of


the modern Prussian state, especially the consolidation of authority in the hands of the elector/king and the establishment of the administrative apparatus that facilitated the exercise of that authority; F.L. Carsten, Hans Rosenberg, and R.A. Dorwart are perhaps the historians of Prussia most familiar to English-language readers. Carsten points especially toward the reign of the Friedrich Wilhelm the Great Elector (1640-88), somewhat paralleling Busch in his view that the subjugation of the Estates through a combination of confirming or even extending some privileges while simultaneously coercing their actions was central for the creation of a modern, viable, but despotic Prussia.42 Rosenberg portrayed this bureaucracy as a particularly tragic creation for Prussia, with the Prussian tradition of obedience preventing any checks on it from below or even above. He also suggested that the origins of the central bureaucracy in the Great Elector's group of war commissars had an influence in creating the distinctively military character of the Hohenzollern state.43


Dorwart also studied the Prussian bureaucracy, concentrating on the reign of Friedrich Wilhelm I.44

Save for Dorwart's work on church structure and governance, however, the otherwise useful and insightful works of all three scholars gloss over religious considerations, an omission that is particularly curious given the unique position of the Hohenzollerns as Calvinist rulers of a Lutheran land.45


45 Dorwart's thoroughness with respect to church governance makes his failure to address the role of the church all the more curious. There are also two recent comparative studies of interest. C.B.A. Behrens, comparing Prussia and France, followed Rosenberg and Carsten in directing her inquiry toward the bureaucracies. Her interesting thesis is that the failure of France's royal bureaucracy to modernize French society (in contrast with the Prussian leaders' success in bringing about change) condemned France to a revolution from which Prussia escaped, but her comparison of Louis XIV with Friedrich Wilhelm I introduces some chronological difficulties. Brian M. Downing's work is perhaps more useful. Downing, who suggests that the strains of the military revolution provided a good deal of the impetus toward the consolidation of absolutism in Prussia (and France), is quite convincing in proposing a two-way causative link between the need of early modern governments to consolidate authority and the need of those regimes with threatening neighbors to build hugely expensive modern armies. C.B.A. Behrens, Society, Government, and the Enlightenment (London, Thames and Hudson, 1985), and Brian M. Downing, The Military Revolution and Political Change: Origins of Democracy and
Thus, as valuable as the works of many of the preceding writers are for students of early modern Prussian history, comprehensive views of this historically rich period remain scarce.46 Ideas more closely associated with our contemporary era, such as tolerance, safe haven for religious refugees, and universal education, existed alongside the worst excesses of militarism, including forced recruiting, torture, and brutal punishments. These seemingly contradictory practices are also visible in the life of Friedrich Wilhelm, a man whose life was full of contradictions. Pious and profane, creative and cruel, the "Soldier King" was much more than the simple-minded drill sergeant that his is often caricatured to be.

Some of this distortion is due to the perspectives of his most familiar early biographers. German writers of the 19th century, such as Johann Gustav Droysen and Friedrich Förster, generally concerned themselves with the same issues as von Ranke, the military and political developments of the Hohenzollerns, though their


perspectives on these developments differed sharply from his.47 This concentration on these topics to the exclusion of others in turn became the motivation for Rudolph Stadelmann's 1878 biography, with its stated aim of a full picture of Friedrich Wilhelm's reign, especially the king's actions within the land.48 Unfortunately, Stadelmann did not extend his purview beyond internal reforms to the church, so the king's relations with the Pietists only appear in passing.

With Frederick the Great as the hero of their works, Thomas Carlyle's and Ernest Lavisse's portraits of Friedrich Wilhelm I highlighted the most sensational and bombastic aspects of the Soldier King's character, especially his admittedly miserable treatment of his

47 Johann Gustav Droysen, Friedrich Wilhelm I. König von Preussen (Leipzig: Veit, 1869), and Friedrich Förster, Friedrich Wilhelm I: König von Preussen, 3 vols. (Potsdam, 1834-5). Droysen concerned himself exclusively with politics; he mentioned religion only when it affected treaties or alliances. Although it lies outside the scope of this study, there was a sharp division between Ranke and his disciples and Droysen and his regarding German history. Von Ranke placed his emphasis on Prussia and its unique state development, while Droysen stressed German nationalism.

48 "Vor allem Leopold von Ranke und J. Gustav Droysen, Letzterer besonders eingehend in seiner grundlegenden Geschichte der preussischen Politik, wiesen die Vorgänge der Regierungstätigkeit des Königs im Zusammenhange nach. . ." Rudolf Stadelmann, Friedrich Wilhelm I in seiner thätigkeit für die Landescultur Preussens (Leipzig: Verlag von S. Herzel, 1878), Foreword. It is interesting to note that Stadelmann's work came just after unification, Droysen and Förster's before.
famous son. The wide circulation that their works achieved helped cement Friedrich Wilhelm's reputation as a cruel, unbalanced boor, and succeeding English-language authors appear to have drawn especially heavily on Carlyle as a source.

Carl Hinrichs, whose importance to the historiography of Prussia and Pietism is undeniable, began the only modern scholarly biography of Friedrich Wilhelm, but completed his work only through his succession to the throne in 1713. Given Hinrichs' comprehensive view of the king's life and especially his views regarding the importance of Pietism, the absence of succeeding volumes is particularly unfortunate. Other recent German biographies are derivatives of earlier research, and the only English-language biography, that of Robert Ergang, is a perfectly serviceable book.


50 Had Gustav Schmoller completed his planned biography of Friedrich Wilhelm the historiography of the next hundred years may have been very different.

51 Carl Hinrichs, Friedrich Wilhelm I., König in Preußen: Eine Biographie, vol. 1 (Hamburg: Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt, 1941). Hinrichs deserves our admiration for writing a biography of Friedrich Wilhelm that stressed the king's religion at a time when the Nazis were emphasizing their racial superiority theories and claiming Friedrich Wilhelm as a great Aryan warrior.
weakened considerably by Ergang's attempt to create a father of Nazism out of Friedrich Wilhelm.52 The political tumult of the 1920s and 1930s influenced German historiography as well, both in the attempts of some to create a Germanic warrior hero out of Friedrich Wilhelm and in responses of other scholars to those efforts.53

Pietism's relationship with the Brandenburg-Prussian state began at the end of the seventeenth century. At the heart of this relationship were the two Hohenzollern princes, Friedrich III(I) and his son Friedrich Wilhelm I, the Pietist leaders Spener and Francke, and intermediaries including Baron Carl Hildebrand von Canstein and General (later Field-Marshal) Gneomar von Natzmer. Despite the historical stature of the individuals involved and the importance of this


53 There was something of a flurry of interest in Friedrich Wilhelm among German writers during the 1930s, mostly laudatory in nature. Some sources suggest that Hinrichs' efforts at establishing the connection between Friedrich Wilhelm and Pietism was a response to the single-minded depiction of the king as "Soldatenkönig" in many of these works.
interaction for Prussian and church history, though, the German-language historiography is limited (and the English-language even more so).

Perhaps the clearest sign of the lack of recent scholarship in this field is the fact that the most useful collections of source materials, those of Gustav Kramer, date back to the mid-19th century.54 Another key work, Wilhelm Stolze's examination of the Pietists and Friedrich Wilhelm, also dates back more than 75 years.55 Stolze, weighing in on a debate which is central to the study of the Pietists and Hohenzollerns, suggested that the pious but hard-living Friedrich Wilhelm never became a Pietist in the Halle sense, but that the king did share the Pietists' passionate religiosity and desire to build the land.56 Karl Wolff agreed that Friedrich Wilhelm never became a Pietist but argued that Stolze erred in

54 Gustav Kramer, Beiträge zur Geschichte August Hermann Franckes, enthaltend den Briefwechsel Franckes und Spencers (Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1861), and Kramer, Neue Beiträge zur Geschichte des August Hermann Francke (Halle, 1875). Kramer, the director of the Pietist archives at Halle during that period, also wrote a comprehensive two-volume biography of Francke that remains one of the standard pieces of secondary literature, despite being more than 100 years old. Gustav Kramer, August Hermann Francke: Ein Lebensbild. 2 vol. Halle: Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1880, 1882.


56 ibid., pp. 177-8, 190.
his suggestion that Friedrich Wilhelm believed God was a stern, punishing deity.57

The two most familiar English-language scholars on the topic are Koppel Pinson and F. Ernest Stoeffler.58 Stoeffler remained in the church history tradition and used theology as the center of his two surveys of Pietism, though he expanded his scope to include limited discussion of the Pietists' role in society, including their missionary zeal, founding of schools, orphanages and publishing houses, and the support of Kings Friedrich I and Friedrich Wilhelm I.59 While Stoeffler noted cooperation between the Pietists and the monarchy, he chose to omit the context of these activities, leaving the reader to wonder why the cooperation occurred.60 To


59 The ruler of Brandenburg was an elector of the empire and as such a subject of the emperor. The Hohenzollerns ruled Brandenburg, Prussia, and a number of other small polities. Elector Friedrich III was able to proclaim himself King in Prussia through an arrangement with the Emperor and the King of Poland, who was his overlord in Prussia. The already clownish Friedrich was a laughingstock for his efforts, but after Friedrich II (the Great) defeated Austria and took Silesia, few laughed at the King of Prussia.

60 His remarks concerning the Pietists in society are surprisingly brief, given the ambitious scope of his books. For example, his discussion of Pietist
Stoeffler, Francke's chief contribution to Pietism lay in setting theological and educational goals. While Stoeffler claimed that Pietism became a religion of the common citizens living in the hinterlands, he glossed over the story of Pietists in the provinces to concentrate on Pietism's theological differences with the academic Enlightenment. His attempt to gather two centuries of Pietism in two volumes is impressive, but careful reading reveals that ultimately he, too, tackled this daunting task on Ritschl and Löscher's theological terms.

Moving in a different direction, Koppel Pinson attempted to tie the growth of German Nationalism to the German Pietists. In sum, his argument is that the concern of Pietist leaders for the common citizen and the cross-class strength of the Pietist message enabled Pietism to supplant Orthodoxy. Pietism, however, fomented a new emotionalism among Germans, but when the educational efforts occupies 2 pages out of 281, especially curious given his statement that Francke's charitable programs are unique in the history of Christianity. Stoeffler, pp. 26-7. Lehmann is even less charitable toward Stoeffler: "... die Arbeiten von Ernest F. Stoeffler (sic) ... mehr verwirren als weiter helfen." Hartmut Lehmann, "Der Pietismus im alten Reich," Historische Zeitschrift 214 (1972), 1, p. 67.

61 Stoeffler, German Pietism, p. 31.
Enlightenment's rationalist attack on religion destroyed their longing for God, the German people's emotional religious energy became a longing for a German nation. To his credit, Pinson did acknowledge that the Pietist programs reached the German people, but two within fifty years seems a remarkably quick rate for two such sweeping transformations of the public's wishes, particularly given the difficulties an academic movement like the Enlightenment would have in capturing the hearts of the Volk.63 Pinson's study does open the way for investigation of such topics as later Pietist support for the more conservative elements in German politics, and the question of long-term results of Pietist views is certainly valid, but his overall thesis remains in question.64

The relationship between Pietism and the absolutist monarchies with respect to education lies at the center of two recent studies. James Van Horn Melton challenged the general view that Pietism necessarily led to

63 In Pinson, Pietism's appearance in German history is approximately forty years, though there was another brief flicker of life for Pietism at the time of Schleiermacher.

64 There are at least two further difficulties with Pinson. First, it appears that his Social Democratic politics had an extremely powerful influence on his perspective. Second, as Mary Fulbrook pointed out, Pinson points to affinities between Pietism and nationalism without outlining any detailed historical links between the two. Fulbrook, p. 15.
obedience and ultimately subservience in his examination of compulsory schooling in Prussia and Austria. According to Melton, the absolutist kings saw compulsory education as a way to strengthen their moral authority by inculcating in their subjects a moral autonomy that would facilitate obedience more effectively than the external forms of coercion of the medieval period. The Pietists, who believed it was possible to reform society through education, were ideal partners for these ventures. The obedience and deference that the rulers hoped to inculcate (and that Pinson and others believe did come about) did not ensue, though, for the students learned to think for themselves. In fact, conservatives within both nations blamed the schoolmasters and their "subversive" ideas for the 1848 revolution, with some justification.

In his recent survey, Richard L. Gawthrop also concluded that Pietist pedagogy became a tool by which an absolutist monarch attempted to increase the values of work, obedience, and thrift among the Prussian people. His examination of the role of the Pietists has led him

65 Melton.
66 Ibid., pp. 236-8.
to conclude that "(the) spectacular increase in Prussian economic and military power cannot be explained except in reference to the Pietist values inculcated by the combined efforts of Frederick William I and the Halle Pietists."68 Gawthrop's work is a welcome addition to the field and an excellent survey of available secondary literature that points toward topics for further investigation, but the amount of stress he places on the coercive nature of Pietism and Prussian culture seems to at least push to the limits of the available evidence.69

A few studies address Pietism in its broader dimensions and outline Pietism's effect on developing German society. One is by Mary Fulbrook, who compared Pietists in England (Puritans), Württemberg, and Prussia in order to investigate their relationships with absolutist regimes.70 Unlike Pinson and Stoeffler, she attempted to treat the religious motivations and principles of the groups without ignoring their social,

68 ibid., p. 342.

69 Gawthrop disagrees with Melton to some extent regarding the possible effectiveness of Pietist educational techniques (which were manipulative, in Gawthrop's view). Gawthrop, Pietism and the Making of Eighteenth-Century Prussia, p. 281. See also Melton's review of Gawthrop in the American Historical Review, vol. 100, No. 2 (April 1995), pp. 539-40.

political, and economic situations, and she also widened the years of her examination.

Fulbrook's treatment of the Prussian Pietists nonetheless disappoints in the end. While she described them as causing major changes in the nature of Prussian social and political processes, she understood these changes to mean that Pietism simply transformed into an ideological and organizational support of Prussian absolutism, trading its priorities for the state's.71 Any partnership that developed was one-sided enough that a word such as servility might better describe the relationship.72 Similarly, the close ties between the Pietists and the state admittedly offered some

71 "...Pietists, in the attempt to achieve the religious reformation and social transformation they desired, became co-opted in the battle of the state to rework the old order into a new, centralised and militarised regime. But the partners in battle were unequal, and Pietist goals were submerged under secular pressures and priorities. The energies and activism of Pietism here came to support absolutism because it seemed to Pietists that this was the only feasible route to achieving their own goals; in the end, these goals were subverted as Pietist energies were employed for quite different mundane ends." Fulbrook, p. 178., see also p. 172. Fulbrook's book is drawn from secondary sources; here her view closely parallels that of Carl Hinrichs (see below).

72 "A partnership developed, asymmetrically biased in the interests of the more powerful partner, the state, which used Pietist organizational ability and activism for its own ends." Fulbrook, p. 9. Depicting the Halle Pietists as strong supporters of absolutism is central to Fulbrook's interesting thesis, but it seems at least open to question whether support means surrender.
opportunity for the unscrupulous to use the church as a way to a government career, but does this fact mean there was a betrayal of principle by the entire movement?73

Fulbrook, like Stoeffler, cited the close working relationship between Friedrich Wilhelm I and the Pietists as evidence that the Pietists compromised themselves. They also noted Friedrich II's personal rejection of Pietism and contrasting interest in Enlightenment thought. The impression that this approach leaves is that the Pietists, having compromised to work with one king, lost all influence when the next succeeded. There are two serious problems with such a view. Friedrich II, despite his personal antipathy toward Christianity, maintained and extended the Pietist social programs of education and care for the poor, even during the period of the Seven Years' War when Prussia's treasury was low, long before such programs were common elsewhere in Europe.74 Moreover, the organized, sustained campaign of the Halle Pietists to win Friedrich III's and Friedrich

73 "The need for Pietist testimonials to obtain positions in church and state led to superficial professions of conversion and regeneration according to the routinised general stages of Pietist experience. Pietism, conceived as a spontaneous religion of the heart, had become rationalised and mechanised as the orthodoxy of the state." Fulbrook, p. 170.

74 As an example, universal education was ordered in Prussia in 1717, in France in 1791, and in England in 1880.
Wilhelm I's support does not leave an impression of weak, compliant men. With these facts in mind, Pietist capitulation to the state appears something less than a firm conclusion.

Three historians whose contributions are indispensable for a more comprehensive understanding are Carl Hinrichs, Hartmut Lehmann, and Klaus Deppermann. The senior of these is Hinrichs, whose body of work dwarfs any other modern contribution in both size and scope. 75 Among his ideas was that Halle Pietism, a movement that sought not only theological but societal reform, underwent three parallel transformations -- from a universal movement into a Prussian religion, from a sect to a mainstream movement, and from an opponent to a supporter of the Hohenzollerns. 76 Furthermore, Hinrichs pointed to the relationship between Pietism and the

75 Many of his best-known pieces were published posthumously in Carl Hinrichs, Preussentum und Pietismus: Der Pietismus in Brandenburg-Preussen als religiösozialer Reformbewegung, (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1971). See especially "Die universalen Zielsetzungen des Halleischen Pietismus" (pp. 1-125), "Pietismus und Militarismus im alten Preußen" (pp. 126-74) and Pietismus und Frühkapitalismus in Preußen" (pp. 301-51). Unfortunately, Hinrichs died before he could finish the work himself, thus there is no general introduction.

76 Hinrichs also held that German Pietism, with its aversion to predistination, provided an impetus for a German socialism that was concerned for others, while English Puritanism and its emphasis on predestination led to self-interested English capitalism. Hinrichs Preußentum, p. 12.
Prussian military as deserving special attention, because the military chaplaincy gave the Pietists opportunity to spread their ideas while simultaneously teaching the troops obedience and service. Hinrichs' works are dense but extraordinarily thorough, and Hartmut Lehmann is undoubtedly correct in stating that Hinrichs (along with Klaus Deppermann, to whom Hinrichs offered assistance) has exhausted the available sources for the early years of the Pietists' relationship with the Hohenzollerns.

Like those of Hinrichs, the works of Deppermann and Lehmann serve as excellent points of departure for further study. In articles that built upon his authoritative study of the Halle Pietists during the reign of Friedrich I Deppermann added important insights regarding Pietism's relationship to the state. First, he suggested that Pietism's contribution to human rights and religious toleration in absolutist Prussia has too often gone overlooked, and second, that Pietists never


became servile state lackeys. Hartmut Lehmann's "Der Pietismus im alten Reich," still the finest introduction to the topic, reviews the situation of the Prussian Pietists during the entire period and points to several areas for further study, including the impact of the historical situation on the thoughts and actions of the Pietists. Though in a later piece he contended that Hinrichs (and, to a lesser extent, Deppermann) erred in tying Pietism to socialism in Germany, his proposition that there should be more recognition of the social reform vision of the Pietists, and especially his emphasis on the energy of Francke, parallels Deppermann. In fact, Lehmann went so far against the prevailing scholarship as to state that the Pietists deserve respect and even admiration.

79 Deppermann, "Pietismus und moderner Staat," pp. 76-84; "Servile Staatslakaien sind die preußischen Pietisten trotz aller Privilgien nicht geworden," "Die politischen Voraussetzungen," p. 52. Unfortunately, he did not develop these thought-provoking pieces further.

80 Lehmann, "Der Pietismus," p. 90.

81 Lehmann, "Pietismus uns Soziale Reform," p. 120.

82 "So zeit- und situationsbedingt denn auch das war, was die hallischen Pietisten zu Reformen in ihren Zeit beitragen, so begrenzt auch die Reichweite ihrer Erfolge und so bedrückend zum Teil die Kompromisse, die sie mit den politischen Mächten schließen mußten, so sehr verdient ihre Leistung doch unseren Respekt, ja, vielleicht mehr noch, unsere Bewunderung." ibid., p. 121. The student of Prussian Pietism would do well to begin with Lehmann's work, which is clearly written and comprehensive.
A source-based study of the relationship between August Hermann Francke and Friedrich Wilhelm I is one way to resolve the remaining questions surrounding the role of their partnership in the consolidation of Prussian absolutism. Neither man needed the other, yet they chose to unite their efforts. Were they perhaps like-thinking men presented with a rare opportunity to act on their thoughts? Friedrich Wilhelm I was one of the most outwardly religious of the Hohenzollern kings. Indeed, his religious enthusiasm was virtually boundless, leading him to preach to his family each afternoon for a time and to attend church 300 times a year. While he maintained his family's Calvinism, he openly expressed his preference for Lutheran Pietist worship, and he admired Francke and would talk of religion with the Pietist pastor. Why would each man devote time and effort to their relationship? Friedrich Wilhelm did not need Francke, for he was king, and one pastor could not

threaten his reign. Francke drew strength from his personal conviction that he was accomplishing God's work. He had confronted Lutheran Orthodoxy in the past, to the point of being forced to depart hastily from both Leipzig and Erfurt. He had faced pressure from the magistrates in Halle as well, and was even barred from Berlin during the latter part of Friedrich I's reign. Francke was also willing to deny Friedrich Wilhelm's requests. For example, Friedrich Wilhelm desired a union between the Reformed and Lutheran churches, and had a 15-point formula for concord. But while the king hoped that Francke would join in his effort, the Pietist leader rebuffed the king's proposal.

What were the possible benefits for each? Friedrich Wilhelm I gained expert aid in building his nation. The Pietists were a useful counter to the alliance of the nobility and Lutheran Orthodoxy that sought to slow or stop his reforms (and the increase in absolutist power that would inevitably result from those reforms). Particularly after uniting the formerly separate arms of the Prussian government in his brilliant General Directory of 1723, Friedrich Wilhelm needed people in

84 The king blamed Francke for the breakdown of the already deranged queen Sophie Luise. See Hinrichs, Friedrich Wilhelm I. pp. 556ff.
government with sure loyalty to the state. Similarly, the parishes, where pastors supervised education as well as worship, were essential arenas for creation of an educated population, one that saw the Christian life as including service to society and crown as well as worship and true doctrine. Francke gained an important ally for his program of reforms and support in his struggle with Orthodoxy. He had a vision of worldwide transformation through converting government leaders to a Pietist understanding of life, faith, and action. Was Friedrich Wilhelm the first such leader he won for Pietism? Did the king simply use the Pietists for their expertise? Or, did these two men have similar motives, similar beliefs, and the opportunity to act upon their wishes? Without systematic investigation it is impossible to evaluate these alternatives.

The role of the bureaucracy in consolidating Prussian absolutism and shaping a modern Prussia is well

---

85 Prior to the General Directory, there were two branches in the Prussian government, civil and military, with separate offices and tax systems. The civil branch descended from the feudal union of government and royal household, and its income was based on feudal land taxes. The military branch was a newer, centralized creation funded by excise taxes that were independent of the nobility. By uniting them, Friedrich Wilhelm took significant power from the nobles. His centralization of power troubled the nobility much as the Pietists troubled Orthodoxy by diminishing Orthodoxy influence. See Dorwart, *The Administrative Reforms of Frederick William I of Prussia*, (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1953).
established, with sources such as the *Acta Borussica* and secondary literature by scholars including Schmoller, Dorwart, and Behrens offering convincing evidence of its importance. Some, most recently Gawthrop, contend that Friedrich Wilhelm used the Pietist-trained bureaucrats and Pietist pastors to foster his vision of God's plan for Prussia through inculcating values of obedience and hard work in the Prussian people. The question arises, however, as to whether the Pietists actually reached a position to accomplish this pedagogical mission -- did they penetrate the parishes in sufficient numbers to support a hypothesis of considerable Pietist influence? A systematic examination of this question, too, is sorely needed. In other words, what was the penetration of Halle Pietism within the church/school bureaucracy of Brandenburg-Prussia, and how much influence did its leaders and King Friedrich Wilhelm I's exert on each

86 This idea is the central contention of Gawthrop's book. "For what happened in Prussia between 1713 and 1740 was more than simply a collaboration between the king and the Halle movement, in which the king gave the Pietists unprecedented and important opportunities for realizing their reform ambitions in society at large. The even greater significance of these Pietist efforts, however, was that they powerfully reinforced and helped legitimate FW I's fundamental restructuring of the administrative, military, and economic life of his kingdom -- a restructuring that was itself based on Pietist concepts of God, self, and vocation." Richard L. Gawthrop, *Pietism & the Making of Eighteenth Century Prussia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), p. 11.
other's decision-making? Were they partners, and did that partnership have measurable results?

The first course of action necessary is to examine the religious-political situation in Brandenburg-Prussia, including an assessment of the accomplishments of and challenges facing both absolutism and Halle Pietism. Following that, there is an assessment of the two principals, Francke and Friedrich Wilhelm, in a comprehensive context, giving special attention to the goals that they professed. These examinations in turn facilitate a study of the relationship between Francke and the king that concentrates on the question of partnership. Letters between these two men and between them and selected colleagues illuminate the character of the relationships between the two principals and also between the developing royal bureaucracy and the Pietists. What can be gained by a study of these

87 As recently as last year, Gawthrop, whose study of the available secondary materials was certainly thorough, noted "the as yet to be done work of chronicling the relationship between Halle Pietism and the Prussian state, especially after 1713." Gawthrop, p. 286.

88 As the following chapters will make clear, the selection of Francke here is not at all arbitrary. During this period he clearly succeeded Spener as the leader of German Lutheran Pietism, and his organizational gifts (which resulted in the nearly unbelievable growth of the Halle institutions) were prodigious. The relative disarray among them that immediately followed his death illustrates both his influence and his organizational skills.
documents? For example, while all correspondents undoubtedly showed deference to the king, the presence or absence of requests by the king for advice, suggestions of new policies by Francke, and disagreements between the parties will be indicators of whether the Halle Pietists remained independent actors or became pliant tools of the king.

The second part of this investigation answers the question of Pietist influence across the realm by assessing the relative number of former Halle students serving in the civil and military pulpits in the different regions of Prussia, noting especially the rates of Halle appointments as well as the number of key positions they held. Not part of any previously published study, this step is intended to determine whether there is support for the thesis of widespread Halle influence in Brandenburg-Prussia, and in conjunction with a careful examination of selected royal orders, will also clarify the Pietists' place in the Prussian bureaucracy. In combination, these steps also permit some assessment of the extent to which these Pietist servants of the king may have acted as a coordinated group, deepening our understanding of Prussia's transition from a pre-modern feudal to a modern absolutist government.
Early eighteenth-century Prussia was a land whose society was changing rapidly, as its people and economy continued to recover from the devastation of the Thirty Years' War. It was a land where the leadership had only recently resolved the question that Theodore Rabb put at the heart of the general crisis of the seventeenth century, that of the location of authority.89 As yet it had neither resolved the critical question of the next several centuries, that of the source of authority, nor had its leaders reached consensus on what shape they wanted society to take. It was into this flux that Friedrich Wilhelm I and August Hermann Francke came, two men firm in their belief that it was from God that authority came and equally firm regarding what principles their society should hold as cardinal.

CHAPTER 1

Pietism's search for pulpits

Maintaining and increasing the welfare of their lands and subjects was the proclaimed goal of the Hohenzollern kings of the late 17th and early 18th centuries. Maintaining and increasing the authority and security of their dynasty was a sometimes unspoken but never forgotten aim as well. The question that faced them and other rulers of their era was how best to accomplish these goals, given their limited authority and means. Success or failure depended not only upon historical circumstance but also upon the drive and creativity of the prince.

Theoretical treatises on successful rulership were relatively uncommon until the mid-17th century. There was the humanist literature of the early 16th century concerned with princely behavior, and Luther of course had written on the proper role of the prince. These works, though, predate absolutism. With the appearance of the writings of Thomas Hobbes, Samuel Pufendorf, and

Christian Thomasius, absolutism itself appeared as a policy prescription, or at least a subject for discussion.2 Viet Ludwig von Seckendorff's *Teutscher Fürstenstaat* also became available during this period.3 The evidence suggests that the latter and the ideas of Luther were of particular import for Friedrich Wilhelm.4 The Hebrew model of patriarchal kingship and the covenantal model established by Bullinger and his colleagues were also likely known to the Hohenzollerns and their colleagues at court, and the medieval idea of a patriarchal government based on personal obligations of subject to ruler and ruler to God would have been familiar as well. Still, there was no well-proven body of knowledge to draw upon (absolutist theory, as Weber notes, "contained an enormous number and variety of


4 See Chapter 3 regarding this issue.
arguments"), circumstances constrained what a ruler could actually attempt, and the unhappy experience of many other monarchs of the era amply illustrates the dangers of simply depending upon court favorites for counsel.5

On the whole the early modern Hohenzollerns, most notably Friedrich Wilhelm the Great Elector and Friedrich Wilhelm I, were energetic and religious if not especially contemplative men. In their attempt to meet their goals for their house and people, they sought practical solutions to the challenges of building a realm surrounded by stronger lands and divided by the continuing struggle for authority among the ruling house, the landed nobility, the towns, and the Lutheran church, practical solutions that were in keeping with their faith. If the responses which the Hohenzollerns selected were not unique, they were uniquely successful in transforming their land from minor to major power and creating a modern state. They devoted themselves to building an army as a bulwark against their neighbors and a bureaucracy as a means of asserting internal authority, all the while maintaining a singularly tolerant religious policy in hopes of quelling confessional tensions that could divide their multi-confessional realm. While the specifics of these twin programs are both well-documented

5 The quoted passage is from Weber, p. 914.
and outside the scope of this examination, an understanding of their nature and the methods by which the Hohenzollerns accomplished them is essential for a comprehensive understanding of the place of Pietism in the consolidation of Prussian absolutism.6

The first element was replacement of the large medieval privy council by a small "cabinet" council in which the king himself made the key decisions, informing those concerned in writing through his secretaries.7 While the administrative organs could make certain decisions and issue orders in the king's name, the trend was toward centralization of decision-making in the person of the king.8 Second, from the time of the Great

6 On the development and nature of the Prussian bureaucracy, see especially Schmoller, Hintze, and Dorwart; regarding the army, see Christopher Duffy, The Army of Frederick the Great (New York: Hippocrene Books, 1974).

7 The displacement of the large privy council by the small cabinet council occurred in France, Castile, and Burgundy during the 16th century, and in England, Austria, and Brandenburg during the 17th. The relative strength of the cabinet council depended upon how strong the monarch's personal rule was, with the council being relatively stronger in England and France but the monarch asserting more authority in Spain and Brandenburg-Prussia. Dorwart, Administrative Reform, p. 17.

8 Speaking of post-1723 Prussia, Walter Dorn noted, "As a matter of practice, however, royal autocracy was carried to such an extreme that all important matters above the level of ordinary routine business were sent to the King for final decision even when the formal document had been issued by the General Directory." Walter Dorn, "The Prussian Bureaucracy in the Eighteenth Century." Political Science Quarterly, 47 (1932), p. 78.
Elector, the prince nominated and confirmed members of the administrative bodies himself, selecting persons whom he believed were not only competent but loyal. Third, Friedrich Wilhelm I, particularly through the General Directory of 1723, completed the work of his father and especially his grandfather by instituting a modern, well-ordered, central administration with well-developed means of accountability. This administration was not only more efficient and modern than those of Brandenburg-Prussia's neighbors, it was a brilliant solution to a troublesome cleavage between the civil and military state that had worsened during the period 1709-23.

---

9 "Die erste Voraussetzung eines festgegliederten monarchischen Staates ist das unbedingte Fürstliche Ernennungsrecht in Bezug für alle Beamtenstellen... Diese unter dem großen Kurfürsten begonnene Richtung erreicht ihren Höhepunkt unter Friedrich Wilhelm. Um schonendsten ist man noch gegenüber den adeligen Guts herrschaften. In Bezug auf die Städte erlaubt sich der König jede Ernennung, die ihm passend und nothwendig erscheint; die Accisebeamten werden ausschließlich von den königlichen Behörden ernannt. Von einem ständlichen Beseßungsrecht der Gerichte ist nicht mehr die Rede." Gustav Schmoller "Der preußische Beamtenstand unter Friedrich Wilhelm I." Preußische Jahrbücher 26 (Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1870), p 158. In addition, the sale of administrative offices was much less the case in Brandenburg-Prussia than in some other realms, though when an applicant was unqualified or there were more than one qualified applicant, a hefty donation to the army's recruiting fund could tip the scales in favor of the giver. See Ergang, pp. 109-110.

10 Dorwart, Administrative Reform, p. 30.

11 Dorwart, Administrative Reform, p. 161. One of the worst parts of this arrangement was the huge number of conflicts of interest that it engendered; the king
assuming the leadership of the General Directory himself, Friedrich Wilhelm maintained and even increased his control over his realm. All in all, the Hohenzollerns generally succeeded in their attempt to create a well-ordered, well-administered, secure, and financially and economically sound state through establishment and consolidation of an absolutist regime.

Prussia's bureaucracy was not simply an administrative device but a tool of national political development, and Friedrich Wilhelm I's reign is particularly important for that evolution. The weak, feudal realm to which the Great Elector had succeeded became the strong and resilient united Prussia of Frederick the Great in large part because the bureaucracy not only administered but united the scattered stated that in the first few years of his rule over a thousand such conflicts had occurred. Ergang, p. 104.

12 This increase in control was no unintended consequence. See Fritz Hartung, Studien zur Geschichte der preußischen Verwaltung, Erster Teil: Vom 16. Jahrhundert vis zum Zusammenbruch des alten Staates im Jahre 1806, (Berlin: Verlag der Akademie der Wissenschaften [Walter de Gruyter], 1942), p. 15. While it is true that the king did not often attend the meetings of the Directory, the facts that he was its titular head and ratified its decisions helped assure his control.

13 Dorwart's opinion on this matter is a representative one; the scholarship is essentially unanimous regarding the overall success of the Hohenzollerns. Dorwart, Administrative Reforms, p. 33.

14 Schmoller, p. 148.
Hohenzollern provinces. Walter Dorn's comment on the importance of Brandenburg-Prussia's bureaucracy and the way it organized its society is especially astute:

In a profounder sense than was true of the army, the Prussian bureaucracy served as the loadstone (sic) which attracted and absorbed into the service of the monarchy the most industrious and intelligent section of the population, thus binding their interests closely to that of the state. Like another Society of Jesus, here was an organization in which military discipline, absolute subordination, and centralization were complete.15

The payoff on this investment was a handsome one. As R.A. Dorwart stated it, "Frederick II could indulge in the luxury of the Enlightenment as a result of the reforms of his father."16 While one might debate whether the Enlightenment was a luxury or not, one point seems beyond contention: Brandenburg-Prussia survived the military adventures of Frederick the Great not only because of the army that his father had created but also due to the bureaucracy, which maintained Prussia as a coherent, functioning nation during the wars while simultaneously providing funds for the army.17

---

15 Dorn, Political Science Quarterly 47, p. 408.

16 Dorwart, Administrative Reform, p. 30.

17 Frederick's generally sound generalship and, in the end, the fortunate death of the Russian Empress Elizabeth also played roles in the survival of the Hohenzollern state. Frederick also had the benefit of some British money for four years after the two nations' Subsidy Convention of 1758.
It is also important to recognize that this was an early modern bureaucracy, not a modern civil service. The king was the ruler and chief administrator, the first servant of the state but also the proprietor. All owed their allegiance to him, and all served at his pleasure. Discipline was harsh for those convicted of malfeasance of office or simple incompetence, and dismissal was often the kindest punishment one could hope to receive. The king's fiscals, or inspectors, were a sort of internal police force accountable only to him, and they were a strong deterrent to those tempted by an illicit

18 Friedrich Wilhelm demanded absolute obedience from his bureaucrats, and was prepared to enforce his orders. See, for example, his response to an unfavorable report regarding his bureaucrats in Prussia: "sie sollen nach meine pfeffe dancen oder der Deuffel hohle mir ich laße hengen und Brahten wie der Zahr und tra[c]tire sie wie Rebeller . . . die herren werden sich verwundern das ich so hart bin und nit [es] meine Männier ist es is meine schuldt bin und nit [es] meine Mannier ist es ist meine schuldt bin und nit [es] meine Mannier ist es ist meine schuldt bin und nit [es] meine Mannier ist es ist meine schuldt bin und nit [es] meine Mannier ist

warn[e]n nit hillfet selber zusprechen nit hilffet was kahn ich den[n] tun als es mus zu execucion kommen oder ich bin nit herr wen[n] ich ein Officier was befehle so werde obediret aber die verfluchte Blägckscheifier wollen was voraus haben und mir nit obdieren ich wil sen gen und Brennen und [als] tirang mit Ihnen verfahren danach hat sich das gennerahll finantzdirectoriumb zu achten" "They shall dance to my music or the devil take me. Like the Tsar I will hang and roast, and treat them as rebels. They will be amazed that I can be so severe. But what can I do? These things must be done or I am no longer master. When I give orders to a military officer, they are obeyed. But these accursed scoundrels think they are better and will not obey me. I have command of my army and shall not have command of these sacramental scoundrels. If I permitted that I would be a cowardly rascal." Friedrich Wilhelm, 3 November 1714. AB II, 130, (Ergang translation: Ergang, p. 112.)
opportunity. Still, the reputation of Prussian bureaucrats for honesty and diligence was so great in comparison to their contemporaries that it seems justified to suggest that factors besides fear of harsh punishment were in play. Indeed, draconian punishments could only offer a short-term solution, for if terror were the only means of control of the bureaucracy, the task of finding recruits to fill its ranks would become nearly insurmountable.

One of those other factors was likely the fact that Friedrich Wilhelm favored appointing commoners to positions of responsibility. Friedrich Wilhelm was willing to use the talents of all orders of his society; indeed, his openness to appointment of a commoner may have been enhanced by an antipathy toward some members of the nobility with whom he still contended for authority. It seems logical that those who owed their

19 The openness of the Brandenburg-Prussian bureaucracy reached its early modern peak during his reign. To some extent his son reversed the trend, though scholars differ on the amount.

20 Schmoller's comment on this issue is instructive for both what it says about Friedrich Wilhelm and about Germany during the 19th century: "Die persönliche Neigung des Königs war dem Adel eher feindlich als günstig. Er liebte in Sitten und Gebräuchen das einfach Bürgerlich; es waren keine adeligen Manieren, wenn er sich zur Arbeit am Schreibtisch eine Schürze und leinene Ueberärmel anband, seinen Tuchrock zu schonen; er verkehrte auch persönlich gerne mit einfachen geraden Naturen; ehrsame Bürger von Potsdam erscheinen zu Zeiten im Tabackskollegium; zu den großen Hoffesten in Berlin wurden auch Kaufleute und andere 'honnete Personen
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rise in social status to the king's favor would be less likely to jeopardize their position through graft or malfeasance. The evidence suggests that the king saw this policy as a successful one, because the numbers of commoners appointed were, in Schmoller's terms, substantial and growing. There is also general agreement that the Soldier King favored former soldiers for many positions, thereby rewarding those who had served, saving on pension costs, and gaining servants who were accustomed to discipline.

The most intriguing possibility, though, is that these Prussian bureaucrats were devoted to honest, diligent service because of their ideology -- Christianity, in this case. As succeeding chapters will

Bürgerlichen Standes nebst ihren Eheliebsten' geladen."
Schmoller, p. 159.

21 For example, of those named Räthe of the General Finance Directory from 1713-23 11 of 20 were bürgerlich, to the Kurmark Kammer 1714-23 18 of 22, and the General Directory of 1723 (apart from the almost exclusively bürgerlich Ministers) had commoners as 8 of its 17 Räthe. Schmoller, p. 162. While records that would make possible a study of the number of Halle Pietists in these positions have as yet not come to light, a possible parallel between Friedrich Wilhelm's policy of promoting Pietist pastors and his bureaucratic appointments is an intriguing avenue for further study.

22 See, for example, Dorwart, Administrative Reform, p. 194, and Dorn, pp. 402ff. It is also worth noting that having a large number of ex-soldiers serving in the bureaucracy could be taken as a favorable circumstance for the furtherance of Pietist views, since the military church was a particular stronghold of Pietism from the 1720s. See below.
illustrate, both Friedrich Wilhelm and the Halle Pietists hoped to generate a religious re-awakening among the people of Brandenburg-Prussia. Both also were firm in their belief that people who were well-educated in both the Christian faith and in practical matters made the best Christians and workers. Friedrich Wilhelm stated that devotion to God was a prerequisite for faithful service. Quite logically, then, placing Pietists in positions of influence became a shared goal, especially regarding those positions where a Pietist could not only faithfully execute the responsibilities of office but shape the conduct of others -- as pastors and teachers.

Why was this so? A prerequisite for the realization of the reforms of both the Halle Pietists and Friedrich Wilhelm was the transformation of individuals on a wholesale scale. Only if the citizens of Brandenburg-Prussia believed that their duty was to serve God by serving others through their vocations would the population have the self-discipline to lead the productive and diligent lives necessary for the plans to come to fruition. External coercion could neither convince people to spread the gospel of rebirth through Christ to their neighbors nor motivate them to accept their often lowly stations in life and serve their king

23 "wer gott nit getreu ist wird viell weniger mir Menschen getreu sein." AB III, p. 311.
willingly. If the perspectives of the people of Brandenburg-Prussia could be shaped in such a way that they performed these tasks freely and even eagerly, however, not only would the need for external controls be diminished but the energy sufficient for a transformation of the realm would be released. Brandenburg-Prussia could become a great power with a population living according to the precepts of true Christianity. God's plan for Prussia could be realized, God's realm on Earth created. In sum, the success or failure of the goals of the king and the Pietists -- in retrospect, nothing less than the creation of modern Prussia -- rested upon the efforts of those who served in the realm's parishes and schools.

His position as head of the churches (Summus Episcopus) in Brandenburg-Prussia gave the king the opportunity to shape these appointments.24 There were a number of administrative bodies for church affairs in Brandenburg-Prussia; the Lutheran Reformation in

24 Regarding the course of the Reformation in Brandenburg-Prussia and especially church governance, see especially R.A. Dorwart, "Church Organization in Brandenburg," Harvard Theological Review XXXI (1938), and Otto Hintze, "Die Epochen des evangelischen Kirchenregiments in Preußen," Historische Zeitschrift 97 (1906).
Brandenburg dated from 1539.25 The first governing document for the Lutheran Church in Brandenburg was a preliminary church order of 1540 that largely followed the 1539 Saxon order.26 An order of 1543 (now lost) governed the working of the Consistorium, made up of both lay and clergy members and serving as the church's administrative and judicial body, with final responsibility for the examination, appointment, and ordination of clergy, as well as adjudication of disputes and disposition of clergy crimes.27 In addition to the members of the Consistorium, General Superintendents served in a supervisory capacity, including examinations, ordinations, and the supervision and teaching of pastors.28 A new church order of 1573, following this

25 The Lutheran Reformation in Prussia dated from 1525, though the Hohenzollern Elector of Brandenburg did not assume control of the territory until 1618.


27 See Dorwart, "Church Organization in Brandenburg," p. 275, regarding the lost order.

28 The institutions of Consistorium and General Superintendancy existed across the provinces, but there were variations in the composition of the Consistorium, number of members, number of churches per Superintendent, etc., across the provinces. See Georges Pariset, L'état et les églises in Prusse, (Paris: Armand Colin & Cie., 1897), pp. 143-4, regarding the makeup of the Consistories. The Consistories worked in tandem with the Regierungs, provincial superior courts, and in fact Friedrich Wilhelm would combine his governing bodies for religion and his courts into the Justizstaatrat at the end of his reign. The judicial situation was at best
pattern and also establishing a College of Visitors, remained in effect throughout Friedrich Wilhelm's reign. New territories each had their own church governing bodies, but though there were a bewilderingly large number of variations across the various provinces, this general pattern of governance held. The conversion of the Hohenzollern house to Calvinism had no marked effect on church structure, though the Electors from that time sought to appoint men to the Consistories and Colleges of Visitors who favored tolerance. As might be expected, the staunchly Lutheran nobles of East Prussia were most strongly opposed to Calvinism and toleration; Reformed churches in East Prussia were actually under Lutheran supervision until Friedrich Wilhelm instituted the Reformed Church Directory in

confused, with overlapping jurisdictions for the Regierungs, Kammergericht, Oberappelgericht, Geheime Justizrat, and other bodies: "Thus, there were seven courts but no one supreme court for the whole state. There was no uniform organization; a hierarchical integration of the courts of the many territories was lacking." Dorwart, Administrative Reform, pp. 79.

29 Sehling, pp. 105-114, also CCM, vol. I, pt. 1, number VII. There are also innumerable special orders regarding visitations, patronage, etc. for specific areas and towns.

30 In 1540 the Brandenburg Consistory was made the superior church-governing body in the realm.

31 Dorwart, Administrative Reform, p. 98. The Great Elector declared parity among the churches and tolerance for sects in 1648.
1713.32 The military church was a separate entity, with responsibility for not only regimental preachers but also the garrison churches, the importance of which would increase under Friedrich Wilhelm I.33 As in other areas, the overarching trend in church governance was toward centralization, and in fact the key church-related offices, such as the presidency of the Brandenburg Consistory, the curatorship of the universities, the spiritual department of the Privy Council, and even the presidency of the Reformed Church Directory, eventually came to be held by one person, including Marquard Ludwig von Printz before 1725, Friedrich Ernst von Knyphausen until 1730, and Samuel von Cocceji thereafter.34

The idea of cooperation between church and prince in the realm of education was not new to Brandenburg-Prussia

32 Other than in East Prussia, the Reformed Churches already were under the supervision of their own governing body, the Commission ecclesiastique.

33 See below regarding the importance of the military churches during the Soldier King’s reign. Regarding the military church as a whole, see especially Hartmut Rudolph, Das evangelische Militärkirchenwesen in Preußen (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973).

34 "This regular transmission of the combined colleges to one person is important in that it consolidated the several members into a single department and made possible an independent ministry for spiritual matters." Dorwart, Administrative Reforms, p. 107. See also Hintze, Die Behördenorganisation und allgemeine Verwaltung in Preußen beim Regierungsantritt Friedrichs II, Acta Borussica, vol. VI, pt. 1 (Berlin 1901), pp. 134-140.
or Germany. Luther had committed himself to a program of compulsory, co-educational schooling and placed education within the realm of the magistrates. The establishment of state schools was a key element in the Reformation's social program, but the church remained a partner in the effort, and the curricula of the era combined Christianity and a classical foundation. Though German schools existed, the emphasis was on those schools which offered Latin. The 1540 church order in Brandenburg instituted weekly religious instruction, though again its main focus was the Latin schools. The 1573 order required children to go to school for Christian instruction and good discipline and called for Latin schools for boys, German schools for girls, and also village schools. The place of the church in education was central -- the pastor was to instruct parishioners to send their children to schools, the Consistoria as a body was responsible for supervision of the schools, and a committee of the town pastor, two magistrates, and two lay parishioners was to inspect the schools on a monthly

35 The combination of Christianity and the classics was largely limited to town schools of the era, and especially to the Latin schools that served the children of the nobles and the more well-to-do. Though Brandenburg-Prussia was a leader in education for all children, when applied to the children of the rural peasantry that education (if it existed at all) more likely took the form of rudimentary reading and writing skills and the Luther's Small Catechism.
basis. In rural areas where there was no teacher, the sacristan was to instruct the village children.36 Yet the reality did not match the programs set forth by the orders -- shortages of teachers, war, poverty, and other factors combined to leave the schools in woeful shape by modern standards.37 Literacy rates were abysmal, and the quality of instruction in many schools so poor that people resorted to sending their children to unfranchised "backstreet schools."38

The sincerity and intensity of the commitment that the Halle Pietists manifested to innovative and wide-ranging educational reform is widely known. Education

36 A 1568 order in East Prussia established much the same system there, with town schools and weekly instruction in the villages, while in Pomerania the church order of 1535 (written by Bugenhagen) established a plan for town schools on Melanchthon's Saxon model but no village schools. Few village schools existed in the rural areas of East Prussia and Pomerania even into the 1700s. Dorwart, Prussian Welfare, p. 170. See also Hellmuth Heyden, Kirchengeschichte Pommerns, 2 vol. (Költn: Verlagsgesellschaft Rudolf Müller, 1957), and Walther Hubatsch, Geschichte der Evangelischen Kirche Ostpreußens, 3 vol. (Göttingen, Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 1968).

37 One measure of the uphill struggle that the king and the Pietists were facing is seen in the repeated orders the king issued that parents were to send their children to school, first in 1717, then on 19 December 1736. Beyreuther, August Hermann Francke, p. 187; CCM I, 2, CXXXIX.

lay at the core of their efforts to transmit Pietist ideals to the people of Brandenburg-Prussia and the world. The remarkable programs at Halle were but one demonstration of this zeal. The Halle Pietists certainly utilized, and likely introduced, such pedagogical techniques as division of the day into class time and recess, taking roll, exercise, and constant supervision; later in the century the Halle-trained pastor Johann Julius Hecker added group instruction and even raising one's hand to be called upon to the list of Pietist innovations. Students were tracked into university preparatory and practical schools, but whatever the school, Christianity was the cornerstone of instruction. External discipline was mild for the day; students were not to be punished for difficulties in learning, and those guilty of disciplinary infractions were to be warned three times before being given the rod. Yet,


40 Melton, pp. 40ff. Hecker's first appointment was to the Potsdam military orphanage, in 1735.

41 Melton, p. 42.
because Francke and his colleagues believed the natural state of humanity to be sinful, they were quite clear in their belief that the sinful former wills of their students needed to be replaced with new, Pietist, inner spirits. Only after the old desires were extinguished could the new person, self-disciplined and eager to serve out of love, be created.42 For this transformation to occur most quickly, students ideally would be completely immersed in the Pietist way of life. The directors of the Halle schools even discouraged trips home, for these presented the danger of re-introducing former bad habits.43

The Pietist leadership was quick to recognize the opportunity to shape people even in lands hundreds of miles from Halle via appointments.44 The structure of Brandenburg-Prussian education gave the pastors great opportunity to shape what was taught and how it was accomplished, since the pastors were responsible for the


43 Melton, p. 44.

44 The Halle leadership also devoted considerable time to the catechism. J.G. Reinbeck, in Berlin, treated this topic frequently in his correspondence with Francke. Staatsbibliothek Preußischer Kulturbesitz Berlin (SPKB), Nachlaß Francke, K 17, 2.
selection and supervision of the teachers.45 Given this circumstance, Pietist leaders made certain that pastors and even theology students were involved in the educational process in parishes across the realm.46 For


46 Friedrich Wilhelm approved a school reform plan of the influential Pietist professors (at Königsberg) Abraham Wolff and George Friedrich Rogall in East Prussia (and ordered the Kammer, Regierung, and Consistorien on 12 Sept 1729 to implement the plan) that offers an instructive look into Pietist thinking on schools. The fact that local conditions and opposition prevented the plan from coming to fruition is also instructive. Their project included: "I. in betreff der Schullehrer:

1) Jeder Prediger hat so viel Schulmeister zu bestellen, als in seinem Kirchspiel Schulen festgesetzt werden, und zwar müssen in den Kirchdörfern studierte Leute angenommen werden, die mit der Zeit in das Predigtamt hineinkommen. Dadurch nur kann Schul- und Predigamt aufgebessert werden; in den andern Dörfern können wohl Handwerker, Schuster, Schneider, Leinweber, Altflicker angenommen werden.

2) Jeder Prediger hat die Schulmeister für die Information vorzubereiten.

3) Die hierin lässigen Prediger werden bestraft, und zwar müssen die Kosten tragen für den Aufenthalt der Schulmeister an dem Orte des Erzpriessters, wenn derselbe sie zur Vorbereitung auf den Unterricht zu sich bestellt.

4) Sollten einige Erzpriester nicht ernstlich für die Schulen ihrer Diözese sorgen, so sollte ein benachbarter Erzpriester oder ein tüchtiger Feldprediger beauftragt werden, die Schulmeister der betreffenden Diözese jährlich zusammenzurufen und zu examinieren."

(The plan continues with detailed rules for school times, pay rates, etc.) A. Keil, "Das Volksschulwesen in Preußen
example, in far-away East Prussia, theology students from Königsberg often served as teachers. The Halle-trained Pietist F.A. Shultz, who replaced the deceased Pietist Abraham Wolff as a professor at Königsberg in 1732 and also served as pastor at the Königsberg-Altstadt church, included in his school ordinance of 1734 the requirement that pastors take responsibility for the success of the schools in their parishes, using their skills to augment those of the frequently ill-trained teachers especially in the area of catechism. Francke and his allies also recognized early on how helpful royal support could be for their efforts at placing their pastoral candidates. Francke's fruitless 1704 plan for reorganizing the church would have greatly increased the king's authority in this and other church matters.

47 August Skalweit, Die ostpreußische Domänenverwaltung unter Friedrich Wilhelm I. und das Retablissement Litauens (Leipzig, 1906), pp. 240-1. The University of Königsberg was only partially under the influence of Pietist professors (including Wolff, Schultz, and Rogall) during this period, somewhat complicating analysis of the East Prussian situation. See below.


49 It was certainly simpler to gain one person as an ally rather than thousands of patrons, and given the antipathy of many of the Estates toward the Halle Pietists, more likely as well.

50 Deppermann, Der hallesche Pietismus, pp. 148-50
Having trusted people in the local parishes was also critical for the success of Friedrich Wilhelm's plans to create an educated and Christian populace.51 His comments about all being for nothing if he made no Christians were not idle chatter -- the notoriously frugal Friedrich Wilhelm I backed his talk with thalers, including the 50,000 thalers he allocated for the Mons Pietatis school-building program of the 1730s.52 He advised his successor of the importance of churches and schools for the realm, noting that God would bless such efforts 10,000 fold.53 He also made certain that the children of the soldiers in his growing army had access to an education by building garrison schools wherever he

51 Gawthrop contends that the appointments here were even more important than in some other parts of the bureaucracy: "The energy and independence of these pastors was particularly crucial for the realization of the king's plans because, constitutionally, the latter's direct administrative control over the personnel of local church and school networks was not nearly comparable to that which he could exert over the members of the war- and-domain boards." Gawthrop, p. 253.

52 Regarding the Mons Pietatis, see Hubatsch and Ferdinand Vollmer, Friedrich Wilhelm I und die Volksschule (Göttingen: Vandenhoek and Ruprecht, 1909).

stationed his regiments. The school ordinances of 1713 (for Reformed schools) and 1715 (for Lutheran) emphasized the need to teach religion, reading, and writing; the latter two had not always been taught. The 1715 ordinance also charged the church superintendents and inspectors in Brandenburg with responsibility for assuring the competence and also the incomes of teachers. The visitation they conducted was not heartening, and his 28 September 1717 edict requiring school attendance resulted. Friedrich Wilhelm was certainly aware that his churches and schools could help consolidate his authority as king; for example, he issued instructions that the pastors instill in his subjects respect for and obedience to their king through their preaching and teaching. Even given their responsibilities for fulfilling orders such as these, though, it would appear premature to classify the pastors

54 Dorwart, Prussian Welfare, p. 175.

55 CCM I, 1, XC.

56 Regarding the debate surrounding this edict, which has been variously cited as historic and meaningless, see Dorwart, Prussian Welfare, pp. 182-83, and Melton, p. 46. Melton refers to it as "an exercise in wishful thinking."

57 See, for example, the 28 August 1722 order to the Prussian Regierung and Consistoria regarding the duty of the preachers to inculcate (einschärften) obedience and loyalty (Gehorsam und Treue) in subjects toward their King. AB III, p. 523.
and teachers as full members of the king's civil service during the reign of Friedrich Wilhelm, a contrast with later in the century when they became what one scholar has referred to as "police in robes."  

Overall, scholars generally consider this partnership to have had marked results for the future of the realm in an era when educational opportunities were uneven at best for most of the children of Europe. R.A. Dorwart's comments on this issue are representative, but not unique:  

There was one powerful source of influence which did, however, have a practical, direct, and immediate impact on all levels of schools and upon education in general. This was Pietism, and particularly the ideas of August Hermann Francke. The influence of Pietism on education was felt most in the Hohenzollern territories of Brandenburg-Prussia, and manifested itself in the schools established at Halle by Francke. This influence was not effective until the end of the seventeenth century, and then, through the model schools at Halle and the graduates of the new University of Halle, it was the single most powerful influence on Prussian schools and education throughout the eighteenth century. Pietism did more for the development of the Prussian Volksschule than all previous admonitions about the need for elementary schools. That it achieved enormous success in the school system of Prussia, shaped the philosophy of education, and contributed to a systematic effort to improve the methods and quality of teaching was due less to anything intrinsic in Pietism than it was.  

58 Terveen, p. 111, regarding Friedrich Wilhelm I's reign, and in contrast Ludwig Lehmann, Bilder aus der Kirchengeschichte der Mark Brandenburg (Berlin: Vaterländische Verlags- und Kunstanstalt, 1924), p. 152, regarding Friedrich II's reign, during which time pastors collected some taxes and implemented parts of the king's agricultural policy.
due to the close alliance between the leaders of Pietism and the first two kings in Prussia. 59

How sound is the justification for further study of the penetration of Pietists into the bureaucracy, especially the pastorates, of Brandenburg-Prussia? It would seem that for such study to be worthwhile, the answer to two questions must be "yes," namely: 1) Can one logically support a claim that additional explication of the issue has the potential to increase our understanding of their era and ours, and 2) Do central questions remain unanswered? In each case, the case for the affirmative is quite strong. As discussed in the introduction, Prussia's key role in German unification and Germany's key role in early modern, modern, and now post-modern Europe make an understanding of Prussia's advance to modernity an essential analytical tool for historians and policymakers, and Pietism played an pivotal role in that advance. Pietism's relationship with the Hohenzollern monarchy also offers important insights for church historians and those with an interest in present-day church matters. The growing interest in the topic demonstrates clearly that scholars in both specialties are again coming to appreciate these issues. Perhaps an even stronger case, though, comes from a slightly different perspective -- the role of Halle Pietism in the

bureaucracy of the Prussian state is important because the leaders of the time believed it to be important. Put another way, the King of Prussia and its most powerful churchman considered this issue consequential enough to devote a great deal of money, effort, and political capital in its behalf. Even if the conclusion were that the long-term impact were to be negligible (a most questionable judgment, based on the evidence), it would seem that their endeavors necessitate study of the matter not only because the undertaking occurred but to discern why their interest was so intense. What does this cooperation tell us about church- and state-building in early modern Europe? As to whether there are matters that the scholarship has not yet resolved, the answer here is clearly yes. A number of scholars have examined the placement of Pietists in key positions and their actions once called to those positions. The question of overall penetration and possible variations in penetration across the realm, has yet to be explored, however.

The simplest and in many respects most accurate comment about how parish appointments came about in early modern Brandenburg-Prussia is "it depended." The various church orders that governed such matters in the realm

60 That in itself is a worthy topic, and a discussion of some key appointments appears in Chapter 6.
were themselves rooted partly in the medieval tradition, and such medieval issues as who held patronage (right of nomination of a candidate for a position) survived not only as matters for the church orders themselves but also for innumerable exceptions and additions to those orders and a multitude of court cases.61 Throughout the era, there was tension between the king who held *jus episcopale* and those people and corporate entities who held *jus patronatus* over the selection and appointment of candidates. Patronage was in fact a property right, not a religious matter, and the holder need not adhere to the same confession as the pulpit in question or even be a subject of the territory in which the pulpit was located. It is nearly impossible to generalize about the multifarious patronage relationships; the king, a noble, the magistrates of a town, or a combination of the former could hold the right to a position. Often a town church might have several positions, with the king as patron of the senior position and the magistrates as patron of the others. The king was patron of roughly one-third of pulpits, making him the foremost patron of the realm, yet private churches still existed on the estates of nobles

---

61 For discussions of how patronage functioned in Brandenburg-Prussia, see especially Pariset, pp. 390 ff., Hintze, "Die Epochen des evangelischen Kirchenregiments," Dorwart, "Church Administration," and of course Schmoller in *Acta Borussica* VI (1).
during the era, and building a church gave one the right of patronage.\textsuperscript{62} It is justified to note that among Lutheran churches, a rural parish would be somewhat more likely to have a member of the landed nobility as its patron, a town church the magistrates or the king, and the senior positions at the largest churches the king, but absent the church books or some other contemporary record one risks stumbling unknowingly into one of the many exceptional cases.

Once a patron located and nominated a candidate, the clergy members of the Consistorium would normally examine the person for competence, though after 1716, the theological faculties were to examine the candidates from their university.\textsuperscript{63} These testimonies generally discussed the student's academic prowess and lifestyle as well, and it was possible for a student to pass the former but fail the latter.\textsuperscript{64} After this examination the king could conceivably intervene against a candidate, and Friedrich Wilhelm not only asserted his right to do so in a 1718 proclamation but on occasion did so in fact.\textsuperscript{65}

The general trend was toward an increase in royal

\textsuperscript{62} Pariset, p. 392.
\textsuperscript{63} Order of 15 Jan 1716. CCM I, 1, XCIII.
\textsuperscript{64} GSPK, Rep, 52, nr. 129, and GSPK, Rep. 52, nr. 159n3(a).
\textsuperscript{65} CCM 1, 2, CXVIII.
authority in church appointments, but royal victory was nowhere near complete. Absolutist he may have been; absolutely powerful Friedrich Wilhelm I was not.

Where did a patron find a candidate? Again, there was no standard method. Especially in rural parishes, the son of the former pastor might well take his deceased father's position; a prospective candidate who was not a member of the pastor's family sometimes found himself marrying a daughter of its former occupant or even the widow herself to obtain the call. Candidates for parish appointments quite often came from church families, and one pastor would establish himself in an area and over time he or his patron would obtain appointments for several sons, brothers, and eventually even nephews or cousins in the region. Patrons, many

66 See for example Terveen regarding Friedrich Wilhelm's difficulties in having three Halle students appointed to parishes in Lithuania in 1724. The Regierung there was able to forestall the appointments on the grounds that the candidates spoke no Lithuanian, and even had they spoken Lithuanian, there were no vacancies. Terveen, pp. 118 ff.

67 A humorous example of this inability to control matters to his liking is seen in the fact that he had to issue his order instructing preachers not to preach for more than an hour twice, on 18 December 1714 and 10 April 1717. CCM I, 1, LXXXIX and XCVI.


69 Perhaps the most notable (or notorious, from Francke's perspective) example of this was the Olearius family of Magdeburg/Brandenburg. In the late 1600s four
of whom would have no reason to be aware of theological students or other pastors, could also inquire about possible candidates from university professors or superintendents. Friedrich Wilhelm regularly took this route when he had a pulpit to fill, and, as succeeding chapters will illustrate, his university professors of choice were those at Halle.70 His 13 November 1725 instruction to the Samländischen (East Prussian) Consistorium regarding the need for pastoral candidates to have the approval of the Pietist Heinrich Lysius and the need for at least one of three candidates to come from Halle is but one documentary example of the king's intent to support Halle candidates even in areas where that support was unpopular.71 Another is his letter to

Olearius brothers (all named Johann!) all held pastorates or professorships. The fact that sons of pastors who were themselves studying to be pastors were exempt from military service, according to the Cantonal Reglement, likely also encouraged the development of clergy families. Ergang, p. 76.

70 Von Fuchs' work at court had gained a preference for preceptors at the Halle Pädagogium in school and parish appointments. This was a limited preference, however, and the Pietists' relationship with the crown generally grew more distant over the next decade. Hinrichs, Preußenitum, pp. 28, 88-90.

71 "wo ich das Jus Patronatus habe und den Ober Marchall befehle ich das er da rauf acht soll haben das an leutte die farren gegenben werden die von Lisius gutte attestata haben und soll der von Printz auch als exempel gracia wen 3 farren vackandt sein sollen zwey farren Preusse haben die 3 soll ein Subjectum der die gantze Zeit zu Halle studieret hat absonderl: zu die Ober Farren FW." Thus at least one of three parishes goes to a Halle
Francke of 2 May 1727, in which the king again noted his desire to support Halle candidates.72

This princely concern with which universities his theology students were attending was certainly not unique to Friedrich Wilhelm I. Friedrich Wilhelm the Great Elector had mandated in 1662 that no one who had attended arch-Lutheran Wittenberg should be promoted into office, and Friedrich Wilhelm I renewed that edict on 8 March 1726.73 On 13 October 1717 he ordered that no pastoral candidate be promoted in East Prussia who had not studied at Halle and could not produce a good recommendation from candidate, and the candidates need a good testimony from the Pietist Lysius. AB IV, 1, 764.

72 "Ins künftige sowohl zu Prediger als Professores solche Leute nach Preußen in Vorschlag zu bringen, die keine Preußen von Geburt, sondern aus meinen hiesigen Provinzen und Landen gebürtig sind und von denen ihr vollkommen versichert, daß sie auf das rechte thätige Christentum gehen, maßen ich nichts mehr wünsche, als das rechte wahre Christentum in meinen preuß. Landen einzuführen und die dortigen Einwohner zur rechten Erkenntnis zu bringen. Die, so Preußen in Geburt, wenn sie bei Euch studirt haben, will ich in meinen hiesigen Provinzen befördern; auch mußt ihr euch angelegen sein lassen, Leute, die zugleich Litthauisch mitlernen, anzuziehen." Keil, p. 126. For a detailed exploration of correspondence pertaining to this topic, see Chapters 5 and 6.

73 CCM, I, 2, LXXIX and CXXII. As early as 1564 Brandenburg citizens were forbidden to study at universities outside the realm, but according to Friedrich Paulsen, that ban was ineffective. Friedrich Paulsen, Geschichte des Gelehrten Unterrichts auf den deutschen Schulen und Universitäten vom ausgang des Mittelalters bis zur Gegenwart. 2 vol. (Leipzig: Viet, 1919-21), V. 1, p. 258.
the faculty there. On 1 November 1727, though, he extended the university restriction to exclude those who had not studied at "einländischen" universities, which in the case of Lutheran students included Halle, Frankfurt a.O., Königsberg, Duisberg, Lingen, or Hamm. Then in 1729 Friedrich Wilhelm took matters further -- on 25 March he extended the 13 October 1717 order across the realm. Similarly, every candidate seeking a pastoral position in Prussia after 31 March 1729 needed to obtain the approval of the Pietist Professors Wolff and Rogall at Königsberg.

This order was altered in October 1732

74 CCM I, 2, CXXVI.

75 This order, of 1 November 1727, was for pulpits in the Mark Brandenburg. CCM I, 2, CXXV. The order for East Prussia dates from 13 October. See D.H. Arnoldt, Kurzgefasste Kirchengeschichte des Königsreiche Preußen (Königsberg, 1769), p. 720. Stolze, "Friedrich Wilhelm I und der Pietismus," suggests that fear of foreign philosophical ideas and especially Enlightenment views is behind the king's policy.

76 "Nachdem Wir allergnädigst resolviret, Unsere wegen Wiederbesetzung derer in Unsern sämtlichen Provintzien und Landen sich eröffnenden Pfarr-Stellen, am 13. October 1717. ergangene Verordnung, Kraft dieses dergestalt zu wiederholen, daß keiner zu einer Evangelisch Lutheranischen Pfarrer vociret und introduciret werden solle, welcher nicht in Halle studiret, und ein gut Testimonium von der dortigen Theologischen Facultat produciren könne; So haben Wir Euch solches, um Euch Eures Ortes darnach allergehorsamst zu achten, hiedurch bekannt machen wollen." CCM I, 2, CXXVI.

77 D.H. Arnoldt, Ausführliche und mit Urkunden versehene Historie der Königsbergischen Universität, (Königsberg, 1746), vol. 4, pp. 39-44. Hartwig Notbohm, Das Evangelische Kirchen- und Schulwesen in Ostpreußen während der Regierung Friedrich des Grossen, Studien zur Geschichte Preußens, Band 5, (Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer,
to the entire theological faculty.78 Friedrich Wilhelm ordered on 18 April 1733 that von Cocceji and his assistant Reichenbach check with the Berlin pastors (and former Halle students) Friedrich Roloff and Johann Gustav Reinbeck regarding all candidates whose names had been forwarded for approval.79 On 9 January 1736, the king ordered that all Lutheran pastoral candidates for all provinces study two years at Halle.80 Therefore during at least the early and middle years of his reign, Friedrich Wilhelm I expressed a clear preference for Pietists of the Halle variety (even if educated via the Halle Pietists on the faculty at Königsberg) in the pulpits of his realm. Here, too, his consolidation of authority is apparent -- the orders progress from excluding one university, to excluding all universities save those in Brandenburg-Prussia, to mandating the candidates' choice of university. Overall, given the central role of the pastor in both church and school

1959), p. 17, differs with Arnoldt and suggests a date of 20 August 1728 for the order.

78 Terveen, p. 127.
79 AB V, 1, p. 511.
80 CCM I, 2, CXXVII. Other writers cite this order as 24 November 1736 without specifying a source. This order was eventually relaxed, first in 1736 for parishes in East Prussia, with responsibility for examinations reverting to the theology faculty there, and then across the entire realm.
matters, the opportunity for Pietist influence across all of Brandenburg-Prussian society was tremendous, if these written preferences truly became the reality. Before turning to that question, however, it is necessary to clarify further the individual and joint goals of the parties involved.
CHAPTER TWO

A tradition of activism

The events and political/religious situation in Germany during the 150 years after Luther's death severely tested the coherence and even the survival of German Lutheranism. The political balance between Catholic and Protestant princes remained of uppermost concern for the Evangelicals. Dependent as they were upon princely support, any number of political or military disasters could conceivably end the Evangelical experiment, at least within a particular realm.1 There

1 John Gagliardo's description of the era is quite apt: "When the first period of military confrontations over religious issues ended at the Peace of Augsburg in 1555, it was entirely consistent with the steady strengthening of the autonomic content of the concept of Landeshoheit that each ruling prince was accorded the right to determine the official religion of his own territory, with correspondingly sweeping rights over ecclesiastical organization, discipline and doctrine, not to mention the lives and consciences of his subjects. Since conversions and reconversions continued to occur after 1555, Germany's confessional map resembled a periodically changing checkerboard into the time of the Thirty Years War; and because no one was sufficiently strong or willing to prevent it, Calvinist territories soon took their place alongside Lutheran and Catholic ones, even though only the latter two had been recognized in imperial law as 'official' alternatives in the Peace of Augsburg." John Gagliardo, Germany under the Old Regime 1600-1790 (London: Longman, 1991), p. 14. The question of whether the potential for disaster was
were at least two religious threats as well. Calvinism was an equally vigorous Protestant faith, its strength proven in battles with Catholicism in the Low Countries, France, and Switzerland and also adaptable to the new economic and political European situation. Calvin's views regarding predestination appear to have encouraged its adherents to work especially vigorously as a way to verify their membership in the elect.2 On the other quarter Lutheranism faced a resurgent Roman Catholic church. Led by the Jesuits, a reinvigorated papacy, and the Habsburg monarchs, it challenged Lutheranism in a way that the Roman church of Luther's era had not -- it now offered a coherent, effective alternative in the parishes backed by skill and influence in the courts. Formulating a single response that addressed both the Calvinist and Catholic challenges, let alone the two religious plus the political challenges, was difficult at best. Able to offer their congregations neither Calvinism's vigor nor Catholicism's comfortable accommodation with the world, the leaders of the Lutheran church attempted to maintain their position and identity by emphasizing their greater from an untimely conversion than a lost battle seems at least worth considering.

2 Friedrich Wilhelm's life certainly offers strong support for this thesis.
doctrinal differences with both Calvinism and the Roman church.

The result of this effort, however, was not particularly helpful for their cause and parishioners, nor should its shortcomings be especially surprising to historians. The German Lutheran church tied itself so firmly to the idea of true doctrine that its resultant emphasis on such texts as Melanchthon's *Loci Communes*, Leonhard Hutterus' *Compendium locorum theologicorum*, and its own confessional documents (especially the *Formula of Concord*) paralleled the late medieval veneration of Aristotle above all other authorities against which Luther himself had rebelled.3 Led by Philipp Melanchthon, Lutheran scholars adopted Aristotelian logic as the central method by which they attempted to prove Catholic and Calvinist doctrines false. Controversy and debate, inherent in the scholastic method, became the focus of the Lutheran leadership. George Calixt and other Lutherans who attempted to find common ground among the confessions also found that the Lutheran leadership attacked them furiously.4 To combat any mysticism or

3 Even Aristotle himself made a comeback in Lutheran thought of this era as theologians, especially in Wittenberg, worked to define Lutheranism as precisely as possible.

4 John Gagliardo described the era colorfully: "Never before had orthodoxy been so narrowly defined or insisted on, or so jealously guarded against interpretational flexibility. Designed partly to protect
subjectivism, orthodox Lutherans came to hold even the individual words of Scripture to be the work of the Holy Spirit. The Scripture itself came to be considered the exclusive source of God's revelation, from which the true doctrine of Lutheranism had been pulled.

Simultaneously, the Lutheran leadership excoriated any ideas that appeared to imply a Pelagian emphasis on good works so thoroughly that many Lutheran laypeople verged on Antinomianism, believing that good works were actually harmful to their salvation.

Finally, the political threat posed by militant Catholicism encouraged church leaders to pursue close ties with their noble patrons, thus advancing the interests of the princes within the landesherrliches Kirchenregiment and further diminishing the independence of the church. For their part, many of the princes were more devoted to aping Louis XIV than to

public order by discouraging the emergence of disruptive religious enthusiasms and lunatic-fringe visionaries, this doctrinal rigidity tended to confine religious warfare to the professionals, the theologians, whose reciprocal slanders only occasionally became so publicly scandalous as to require intervention by the civil authority. Against this backdrop of a puerile and peevish orthodoxy arose the immensely significant movement known as Pietism." Gagliardo, p. 181.


6 One should not overlook the convenient implications of this view for daily life, particularly in the inchoate years of the seventeenth century.
becoming Christian princes in accord with Luther's ideas. To their credit, though, the orthodox Lutheran leaders were able to preserve their church and its core beliefs essentially intact through a difficult era, and their stewardship of the faith was sound enough that the Lutheran church brought forth a number of reform movements. One of these movements was Lutheran Pietism.

When the Pietists coalesced as an informal group within the Lutheran church during the turbulent years after the Thirty Years' War, the more traditional elements within Lutheranism attacked the new group. Not surprisingly, they claimed that the Pietists preached impure doctrine and salvation by works. Given that the Lutheranism of Pietist leaders such as Spener apparently remained pure and their professed intent of reinvigorating their church sincere, it seems likely that the attacks stemmed less from specific Pietist words or actions than from the reality that the world was changing in ways that were not to the traditionalists' liking but were largely out of their hands.

---

7 See Chapters Three and Four.

8 As the debate between the Pietist and Orthodox Lutherns was lively, so has been the scholarly debate on what Pietism and Orthodoxy were during the period. Scholars of a Pietist bent characterize Orthodoxy as cold and unrelated to life, while painting Pietism as a lively faith that held true to Luther's words. Scholars who favor the Orthodox perspective describe the Pietists as legalistic prigs bent on salvation through works and their favored position as true Lutheran doctrine. Both
potential source of change who represented a rejection of
the established order, rising individualism, and
emotionalism, were at least within the traditionalists' reach, and the traditionalists became determined to prevent the Pietists and their reforms from eroding the traditionalists' position any further.9

Though others have on occasion defined Pietism more broadly, this examination limits itself to the Lutheran reform movement in Germany during the last quarter of the seventeenth and first half of the eighteenth century centered around the work of Philipp Jakob Spener, August Hermann Francke, and their colleagues.10 Many scholars refer to this movement as "Halle Pietism," after the university and town that became the location of many of

views are overstatements with elements of truth, but distilling a more evenhanded view from the secondary literature is a challenge.

9 Fulbrook, who approaches this issue from a more sociological perspective, suggests that a fear of any leveling tendencies that might stem from Pietism's attractiveness to the common people (which in turn was driven by the Pietists' willingness to educate the Volk) partly motivated establishment Lutheran dislike of Pietism. She also postulates that a fear of any change in status for clergy and teachers, or even of losing positions to untrained Pietist upstarts, also drove Lutheran orthodoxy's opposition to Pietism. These views seem reasonable, though difficult to support at the evidentiary level. Fulbrook, pp. 93-4.

10 Many accounts extend their discussions of Pietism to roughly contemporary reform-minded movements in Württemburg, England (Puritanism), and even the French Jansenists and British Methodists.
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the Pietist institutions. In virtually every case the
Halle Pietists were firmly Lutheran in their theology,
though they generally emphasized those texts within the
Luther corpus that stressed a personal relationship with
a living God, one that began with a spiritual rebirth and
impelled one to a life of service. Indeed, to define
Pietism by its doctrine is to miss the essential
distinction between Pietism and the Lutheranism of its
time -- Pietism was a movement more of the heart and the
hands than of the head; Orthodox Lutheranism was the
opposite.11 While Francke, Spener, and many other
Pietist leaders were erudite even by the high standards
of their era, they used their academic training to
support their religious and social programs, not simply
to enhance their reputations, destroy their enemies, or
advance the cause of "pure doctrine."12

11 In this respect, Pietism is quite similar to
Anabaptism. Stoeffler outlined the distinction thusly:
"While to his orthodox contemporaries Christianity was
preeminently a matter of assent to received
understandings concerning essential Christian doctrines,
to Francke it was primarily a new state of being
8.

11 For example, Spener enjoyed a literary exchange
with Leibniz. Johannes Wallmann, Philipp Jakob Spener und
die Anfänge des Pietismus (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul
Siebeck], 1970), p. 294. One concrete example of
Francke's erudition was his command not only of Latin and
the Oriental languages (in which he held a professorship
at Halle), but also of French, English, Dutch, Italian,
and Russian. Erich Beyreuther, August Hermann Francke
1663-1727: Zeuge des lebendigen Gottes (Marburg an der
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Lutheran theology, Calvinist-style activism and ethical rigor, and a mystical (especially Arndtian, see below) emphasis on a personal relationship with God came together in Pietism. An intense Biblicism served to tie these three influences together; Holborn suggested, "Pietism carried biblicism to its ultimate conclusion."  

The Bible was their true authority, to be used by the individual layperson, lay study groups, and the pastor as a guide to establishing a personal relationship with God via Jesus, the Holy Spirit, and a new birth; the Bible was also to serve as a guide to conduct in life. The orthodox Lutheran attack on Pietism included the accusation that Pietism's stress on the emotional and personal aspects of the faith led to subjectivism, making faith into a good work and undercutting the authority of the church.  

13 Holborn, p. 139.  

14 The extraordinary lengths to which the Halle Pietists went in order to publish and distribute New Testaments and Bible is a powerful illustration of to their commitment to the Word as guide to life.  

15 See Dale Brown, The Problem of Subjectivism in Pietism (Evanston, Ill., Ph.D. Diss., 1962), for a
and laity departed from the doctrine-oriented norm of the time becomes clear when one considers that Spener rejected calls for an annotated Bible, suggesting instead that individuals should be free to study the Bible to find the will of God for their life.16 That life was to bear witness to the individual's transformation through its moral behavior and vigorous social action. Calvinists may have pushed themselves to ever-higher levels of worldly activity to verify their status among the elect, but the Halle Pietist imperative to action stemmed from their belief that such activity helped guide others toward the salvation that was available to all. While Pietists believed that the individual needed to be ever-vigilant in following God's will, they were generally hopeful that sincere transformations could take place, both of individuals and of society.17 It was no coincidence that Spener was buried in white -- he requested a robe and coffin in that color, rather than

exhaustive discussion of this issue. Brown concluded that while Spener and Francke were not subjectivist themselves, their work and writings did open the door to these tendencies.


17 Indeed, would a group skeptical about the possibility of reform have devoted so much time and effort to its pursuit?
the customary black, to symbolize his hope the church on earth could improve.18

Though Pietist thought drew on many sources, including English devotional writers such as Lewis Bayly and Daniel Dycke, mystics such as Jacob Böhme and Johann Andreä, and Luther himself, the pillar of Pietist thought was Johann Arndt.19 Arndt, one of the most eloquent representatives of a more spiritual crosscurrent in the bitingly intellectual mainstream of the late Reformation, was nonetheless a Lutheran. Arndt's words in True Christianity (actually a compilation of six books written between 1605-20) regarding grace and faith give a clear indication of his Lutheran heritage. He wrote of faith being a trust in God's promise of grace in Christ, bringing forgiveness to a humanity without merit.20


20 "Faith is a deep assent and unhesitating trust in God's grace promised in Christ and in the forgiveness of sins and eternal life. It is ignited by the Word of God and the Holy Spirit. Through this faith we receive forgiveness of sins, in no other way than through pure grace without any of our own merits (Eph 2:8) but only by
least regarding grace, those who would argue that the foundations of Pietism were Pelagian need to look elsewhere.

Yet Arndtian Christianity was not simply a matter of assenting to true doctrine. For Arndt, it entailed a change in all of life that did carry with it an obligation of service. Christians needed to behave as such, always aware that God's call through death was imminent.21 One needs to live in a spirit of repentance in order that God might offer forgiveness. There is no hint in Arndt of what Dietrich Bonhoeffer would call "cheap grace," for one must truly leave one's sins behind and lead a reformed life.22 Neither did Arndt approve of the merits of Christ. For this reason, our faith has a certain ground and is not unsteady. This forgiveness of sins is our righteousness, which is true, continual, and eternal before God. It is not the righteousness of an angel but of the obedience, merit, and blood of Christ and becomes ours through faith. . . . you now see that works cannot make you righteous. First, you must be established in Christ through faith and be righteous in him before you can do any good work. See to it indeed that your righteousness is the grace and gift of God that comes before all your merit." Johann Arndt, True Christianity, Tr. Peter Erb (New York: Paulist Press, 1979), pp. 45-6.

21 "As a man desires to die, so ought he also to live. You do not wish to die as an ungodly man; therefore you ought not to live as an ungodly man. If you wish to die as a Christian you must live as a Christian. That person lives as a Christian who lives as if he would die today. A servant must always be prepared to appear before his master if his master calls him. God calls each man through death." ibid., p. 119.

22 "Although Christ died for our sins and paid for them all perfectly, we will not participate in his merit
the Antinomian tendencies of Lutherans of his era. The Christian life should manifest itself in arenas beyond personal piety, and a Christian is responsible for his or her neighbor, for one's relationship to one's neighbor mirrors God's relationship with the Christian.23

In fact, Arndt asserted that God's love for us is dependent upon our love for our neighbor. This idea, held in tension with the Lutheran beliefs in faith and it will be of no use to us if we do not do penance. Although a man has forgiveness for all his sins through the merit of Christ, yet the forgiveness of sins is not promised to the unrepentant person, but to those who leave their sins. The sins that a man does not wish to leave and does not intend to leave are not forgiven but only those over which a man brings true regret and sorrow." ibid., p. 167. Friedrich Wilhelm would battle throughout his life with this issue, and Francke would continue to admonish him.

23 "We are to treat our fellowman as God treats us. God himself gave nature as an example, that we are to be of the same mind to all men and not to love anyone more or less than another. As he is minded to us, so we are to be minded toward our neighbors, and as we act toward our neighbors, he will act toward us. He testifies in our hearts to convince us how he is minded toward us. We are to be so minded toward our neighbor. The test lies in our heart and conscience. We are to enter there and to ask ourselves how we stand with our neighbor, good or evil. As we find ourselves there, so we will also find ourselves with God. The way in which we act with our neighbor, God will act with us. . . . Although Christ by his death on the cross, once and for all and perfectly, paid and atoned for the sins of the world, and although the eternal King has forgiven us all for our great sins and granted us this forgiveness out of grace, nevertheless, if we hate our brother, do not love him, and do not forgive him, the great merit of Christ will be lost for us and it will be as it earlier was for us before the eternal blessedness was achieved through Christ." ibid., p. 129-30.
through grace, will echo throughout the lives of not only
the Lutheran Pietist Francke but also the Calvinist
monarch Friedrich Wilhelm I. Contrary to our
contemporary image of Pietism and mysticism, Arndt's God
was a stern God whose judgment (for individuals and
society) was certain and painful if one did not follow
God's course. Arndt was clear on this point, and in a
Germany looking for an explanation for its social
disorder, Arndt offered one: humanity's sinfulness.24

Harsh as Arndt's judgments were, they found a wide and
ecuminal audience in seventeenth-century Germany.25 As

the Thirty Years' War continued and conditions

24 'Therefore, each man who is called Christian and
is not converted will have two powerful witnesses against
him at the final judgment: first, his own heart,
conscience, and the law of nature; second, God's revealed
word, which will be directed toward him on that day.
Therefore, a frightful judgment and damnation will follow
as the Lord said [in Mt. 11:24 . . .; 12:42 . . .].
Out of this eternal torment and pain will arise, for God
has created this soul immortal and the conscience in the
soul, which is always and internally directed to God, can
nevermore come to God. This is the greatest and eternal
pain of the soul. . . . As a result [of God's giving
his unrepentant people over to their sins], the most
horrid sins are in motion among Christians as have never
been heard of: devilish pride and pomp, unsatisfiable
covetousness, shameful lust, bestial unchastity, inhuman
deeds that arise out of blindness and the hardness of a
twisted mind." ibid., pp. 53-4. This passage is
especially interesting when one considers Friedrich
Wilhelm's well-known hatred of pomp and admiration of
Arndt.

25 According to Peter Erb, True Christianity went
through 20 editions prior to Arndt's death in 1621 and
over 125 printings by the end of the 18th century. ibid.,
p. 5.
deteriorated, people throughout Europe intensified their search for order and security. As part of the larger movement that Theodore K. Rabb, H.R. Trevor-Roper, and others have named the "General Crisis of the Seventeenth Century," people called their religious suppositions and practices into question as sharply as they did their political systems.26 In fact, Trevor-Roper's model of a new Puritanism in government and society, a Puritanism that was a reaction against the excesses and unresponsiveness of a system whose failures the war had exposed, also fits the changes in Western Christianity of the era quite well.27 Across Western Christianity, lay and clergy alike searched for assurance in a time of uncertainty. Devotional materials such as True Christianity were some of the sources from which they sought assurance; one man who turned to those materials and then attempted to put them into practice was Philip Jakob Spener.

26 The changes in the religious landscape were actually longer-lasting than those in the political situation. Pietism, not only as an idea but in the form of denominations such as Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Brethren, and Methodists, is still with us. The absolutist regimes that grew out of this period are long defunct, though.

Born in 1635 at Rappoltsweiler (near Strasbourg), Philipp Jakob Spener displayed a fervent interest in Christianity even as a boy. Reading not only the Bible but Arndt and English devotional books, he also came in contact with a number of devout, somewhat mystically-inclined adults, including Countess Agatha von Rappoltstein and Rappoltsweiler court preacher Joachim Stoll, who guided his home studies.28 Matriculating at the University of Strasbourg at sixteen, he earned a master's degree at eighteen; he then taught history while he studied theology. Following these studies and the usual Wanderjahre (two, in Spener's case), he wrestled with the question of his future. After declining a call to one parish in Strasbourg, he accepted in 1663 a position as a Freiprediger at the Strasbourg Münster. Equipped with this call, a salary plus a stipend for university lecturing, and free housing from an aunt and uncle, he returned to Strasbourg and began work on his doctorate. In February 1666 he received a call to Frankfurt-am-Main as senior minister of the largest church in the city. Stein notes that while Spener's record in Strasbourg generally was favorable and likely helped in his obtaining this call, some of his harshest

---

28 Stoll would later marry Spener's sister. Regarding Spener's life, see especially Stein and Wallmann, *Philipp Jakob Spener*. 95
criticism in the future would come from the faculty of the university there. 29

It was during Spener's Frankfurt ministry that many of the themes that marked his lifelong work emerged. Indeed, these themes came to be representative of Lutheran Pietism itself. Concerned that the traditional Lutheran concentration on the Gospels did not place enough emphasis on the fruits that resulted from faith, he added an emphasis on preaching from the Epistles. 30 Though others already had begun a revival of catechetical instruction, he put the weight of his office and the tools of his education fully behind it, and he emphasized Biblical study. The most remembered and most controversial of all Spener's Frankfurt ministries, though, was the formation of the collegia pietatis.

These small study and fellowship groups began meeting in 1670, after Spener suggested from the pulpit that groups from within the church should gather outside the normal worship time and discuss either the sermon or another edifying topic, with the pastor guiding them

29 The theological faculty at Strasbourg was lukewarm regarding the collegia pietatis and sharply critical of the Pia Desideria. They apparently felt he was too soft on Calvinism. Stein, p. 75.

through disagreements. Spener's intention at the writing of the *Pia Desideria* (1675) was clearly that these conventicles would exist within the larger church structure. In Frankfurt, though, Spener was unable to prevent his more radical followers in the rapidly growing conventicles from taking two steps with which he disagreed and that were sure to bring controversy. First, they took it upon themselves to judge the worthiness of their pastors, an action which recalled the Donatist heresy and threatened the status of their pastors, and second, they began demanding the sacraments

31 Spener preached a sermon on 3 October 1669 that outlined his proposal. The sermon is translated in Stein, p. 87.

32 "In addition to our customary services with preaching, other assemblies would also be held in the manner in which Paul describes them in 1 Corinthians 14:26-40. One person would not rise to preach (although this practice would be continued at other times), but others who have been blessed with gifts and knowledge would also speak and present their pious opinions on the proposed subject to the judgment of the rest, doing all this in such a way as to avoid disorder and strife. This might conveniently be done by having several ministers (in places where a number of them live in a town) meet together or by having several members of a congregation who have a fair knowledge of God or desire to increase their knowledge meet under the leadership of a minister, take up the Holy Scriptures, read aloud from them, and fraternally discuss each verse in order to discover its simple meaning and whatever may be useful for the edification of all. . . . Any threat of meddlesomeness, quarrelsomeness, self-seeking, or something else of this sort should be guarded against and tactfully cut off especially by the ministers who retain leadership of these meetings." Spener, *Pia Desideria*, ed. Theodore Tappert (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964), pp. 89-90.
at the conventicle meetings, thus elevating the meetings
to the same status as the regular worship.33 Ultimately
a number of people, including some old friends of Spener,
separated from the Lutheran church (against Spener's
wishes) in 1682.34 This episode was personally painful
for Spener as well as damaging to the Pietist cause,
giving ammunition to their enemies' charges that Pietists
were separatists and schismatics.

Many orthodox Lutherans, lay and clergy alike,
considered Spener's collegia pietatis to be a route
toward sectarianism even before the separation of 1682.
In many ways their attacks paralleled those that
Lutherans and others had used against the Anabaptists,
and the parallel was not entirely without foundation.35
While it is unfair and inaccurate to characterize Spener
himself as a sectarian, schismatic, or Schwärmer, the
events offer some support for this accusation if one

33 Stein, p. 92.

34 Among others, Spener's friends Gottfried Arnold,
Johann Wilhelm Petersen and Friedrich Breckling separated
from the Lutheran church. Deppermann, Der hallische
Pietismus, p. 47.

35 Some of the more scurrilous accusations, such as
that the members of the collegia appeared before each
other naked, that members became sick and weak, and that
women denied their families food in order to give it to
fellow collegia members, were of course false. The
parallels with the accusations made against not only
Anabaptists but Christians in Roman times and dissenters
throughout Christian history is quite easy to see.
considers the separatist fringe of the Pietist movement along with its Spenerian middle ground. Spener did not always agree with the actions and beliefs of his more enthusiastic supporters in Frankfurt, particularly regarding the place of the collegia pietatis within the larger church. The conventicles eventually became such a contentious issue, and the controversy surrounding them such a distraction, that authorities in some areas forbade them and Spener did not repeat the conventicles after leaving Frankfurt in 1686. It is ironic, then, to recall that on the issue of the collegia Spener and his fellow Pietists were squarely in the tradition of Luther. Luther even suggested that the sacrament be

36 Those within Lutheran orthodoxy who opposed Spener and his program saw no need to make any distinction between the more and less radical Pietists, since any excesses by any "Pietist" strengthened their case against the whole movement.

37 Luther had referred to home worship as one of the three kinds of divine service (along with the Latin service and the German service) in his preface to his 1526 German Mass and Order of Service. "The third kind of service should be a truly evangelical order and should not be held in a public place for all sorts of people. But those who want to be Christians in earnest and who profess the gospel with hand and mouth should sign their names and meet alone in an house somewhere to pray, to read, to baptize, to receive the sacrament, and to do other Christian works. According to this order, those who do not lead Christian lives could be known, reproved, corrected, cast out, or excommunicated, according to the rule of Christ, Matthew 18 (15-17). Here one could also solicit benevolent gifts to be willingly given and distributed to the poor, according to St. Paul's example, II Corinthians 9. Here would be no need of much and elaborate singing. Here one could set up a brief and neat order for baptism and the sacrament and center
celebrated during these home services, an idea that Spener did not advocate. Despite these Reformation roots, though, -- perhaps the threat to the established order was too great, or the memory of the Anabaptists too painful -- these small groups, whether begun by Spener or others, became a lightning rod for anti-Pietist sentiment.

With the 1675 publication of the *Pia Desideria*, Spener made his ideas available to a much wider audience. In it he lamented the state of the church, being careful to note the responsibility of all groups within society for the situation. Not only persecution by Rome but also concern by the civil authorities with politics over faith, defects in the clergy, and drunkenness among a laity which was not actively responding through a life of faith were causes for the wretched condition of society. His critique of the everything on the Word, prayer, and love. Here one would need a good short catechism on the Creed, the Ten Commandments, and the Our Father." Martin Luther, *The German Mass and Order of Service* (1526), gen. ed. Helmut T. Lehmann, tr. Augustus Steimle, rev. Ulrich S. Leopold, *Luther's Works* vol. 53 (American Edition), (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1962), p. 64.

38 Spener wrote the *Pia Desideria* during a period in which he engaged himself in intense Luther study for a never-published series of Luther Bible commentaries. Wallmann contends, with Stein concurring, that Spener would have not written *Pia* without this Luther study. Wallmann, p. 253, Stein, p. 106.

clergy was particularly sharp, alleging worldly lifestyles, self-interest, and failure to manifest fruits of the faith, i.e. service. He also critiqued scholastic theology in general and controversies in particular, and suggested that his contemporaries obstructed the simple, gold faith as found in Scripture by building "wood, hay, and stubble" over it. Given this critique, the intense opposition Spener received from many orthodox Lutheran pastors and professors is hardly surprising.

Unlike many critics, though, Spener also had a program for rectifying the situation. This program, a further development of the themes found in his Frankfurt ministry, was a practical application of his and Arndt's

40 "I cannot say anything else than that we preachers in our estate need reformation as much as any estate can ever need it... We must confess not only that men are to be found here and there in our estate who are guilty of open scandals but also that there are fewer than may at first appear who do not really understand and practice true Christianity (which consists of more than avoiding manifest vices and living an outwardly moral life). Although, according to the common estimate of men and as seen through eyes captivated by the fashions of the world, they may seem to be blameless, yet their lives reflect (subtly, to be sure, but none the less plainly) a worldly spirit, marked by carnal pleasure, lust of the eye, and arrogant behavior, and so it is evident that they have never taken even the first principle of Christianity seriously, namely, denial of self. Behold how they seek promotions, shift from parish to parish, and engage in all sorts of machinations!"

41 ibid., p. 56.
ideas. Furthermore, the parallels between it and Francke's later Halle programs are striking.42 There are six main points: first, a more extensive use of the Word by lay and clergy beyond the weekly sermon, second, diligent implementation of Luther's spiritual priesthood, third, putting the faith into practice through love of neighbor, fourth, restraint in controversy including a spirit of love for unbelievers and heretics, fifth, a renewed spirit of piety in the training of ministers ("students should have unceasingly impressed upon them that holy is not of less consequence than diligence and study, indeed that study without piety is worthless.")., and sixth, efforts to preach sermons that congregations could understand (not displays of academic erudition) and that aimed at renewing the inner person.43

Spener's Frankfurt ministry continued until 1685, when he accepted a call to be court preacher for Saxon

42 Gawthrop devotes considerable time to differentiating Arndt and Spener based on how central mysticism appears to have been to their faith and differentiating Spener and Francke based on their conversion experience and view of faith in order to explain why Francke pursued social activism (that Gawthrop, too, notes was inherent in the Pia Desideria) more avidly than his predecessors. Given the essential and overwhelming similarities in their beliefs, though, personality and opportunity appear more determinative for their career than any theological distinctions. Gawthrop, pp. 106-112, 142-9.

43 Pia., pp. 87-117. The quoted passage regarding piety and study appears on p. 104.
Elector Johann Georg III in Dresden. This position was certainly a promotion for Spener, but Johann Georg would never display any particular interest in reforming himself, his court, or his land along Spenerian lines. Spener's chiding of members of the court regarding their lavish lifestyles alienated them, and the Saxon clergy and Wittenberg theologians were not particularly welcoming of their old critic, now living and working among them. His departure from Dresden in June 1691 to accept Elector Friedrich III's call to be pastor of St. Nicholas' Church in Berlin may not have been a promotion by most standards, but it offered more opportunity to pursue his ministerial goals in a much more welcoming environment. By this time, Spener had in all likelihood come to a more positive opinion regarding the role of the prince in church matters, and the Berlin court, where a Calvinist Elector had his own troubles with a Lutheran clergy, surely looked to be more supportive than that of Lutheran Saxony. 44

44 In fact, Spener wrote in a passage regarding princes that was eerily prescient of his future career, "Although their power was given to them in order to promote and not to suppress the church, they abuse this power with an irresponsible caesaropapism, and whenever some ministers of the church, moved by God, propose to do something that is good, they arbitrarily obstruct it. It is to be lamented that in some places congregations are better off when they are under a prince of a different religious persuasion than are those who live under a ruler of their own religion but experience more hindrance than help from him." ibid., p. 44.
Throughout his life, Spener enjoyed frequent (if not always harmonious) contact with members of the nobility. From his earliest years in Rappoltsweiler he studied and worked with nobles and their children; the study of heraldry became his hobby. Given this experience and his Lutheranism, his support for the established order of society and his opposition to rebellion are not surprising. As his writings and his work in Dresden illustrate, he was willing to criticize the actions of the nobles, if not their status. His emphases on the spiritual priesthood, education, and love of neighbor were potentially leveling influences on society as well, and Pietism in general played a leading role in welcoming men and women of all strata into full participation.45 Regarding civil authority, his early desire for a relatively independent church along the lines of the Christian church before Constantine and his political criticism became more muted as the years passed and the tensions between Pietism and Lutheran Orthodoxy grew. Faced with vehement opposition from within the structure of the Lutheran church, Spener came to see the temporal

45 In fact, one criticism of the Pietists and especially the collegia was the presence of women, though Spener kept women segregated to deflect criticism. Spener was also concerned that girls be catechized. Stein, pp. 248-9.
authority as a potential ally, or at least protector.46 Politically, his position in Berlin was a most favorable one -- he gained authority from being pastor of a parish with a great tradition, and he was simultaneously independent from the court yet close enough to it to exert substantial influence.47

The support from and prestige at court that Spener enjoyed is also a strong argument against those who then and now would categorize Pietism, at least as practiced by Spener, as a sectarian movement. While some of his early associates manifested separatist tendencies, Spener himself did not.48 Had he done so, would Elector Friedrich III and others at court have supported Spener as firmly as they did?49 A Calvinist elector searching for assistance in implementing his policies in the face of a hostile Lutheran nobility and church would have no use for a schismatic cleric, for supporting such a pastor could only add to the prince's problems. Support for a reformer within the Lutheran church, though, especially one with a concrete program for church, education, and

46 For a full discussion of this topic, see Martin Kruse, *Spener's Kritik am landesherrlichen Kirchenregiment und ihre Vorgeschichte*, (Witten: Luther Verlag, 1971).


48 See above.

49 See Chapter Four.
society, could bring long-term benefits to the crown. Those benefits would of course peak during the rule of Friedrich's successor(s).
CHAPTER THREE

A vision of reform

Recognition of Francke's firm belief in his own rebirth through the Holy Spirit is absolutely central for an understanding of Francke's efforts from that time forward. Francke, like Luther, reached a point of absolute despair with respect to gaining faith in God,


though for Francke it was academic study rather than the monastic life that had failed to help him attain the righteousness he sought. Distraught, he cried out -- and he fervently believed from this day forward that God had heard and answered his cry. He, he was sure, had become a new man through God's "Father Love."2 His response, like Luther's, was to take that joy to others by spreading the Gospel message, as he had come to understand it. As for Luther faith by grace became the key, so became the Wiedergeburt for Francke. His life of action, of spreading that Word, that resulted from this transformation may be the strongest argument against categorizing Francke as a mystic.3 Certainly his faith, as he later described it, had many dimensions, including a contemplative, even emotional side. So, however, did Luther's faith, as did Spener's, as did Arndt's, and to


3 Those who classify Francke as a mystic are using the name as a pejorative implying a self-centered, inactive faith. That definition of mysticism, however, is historically inaccurate, not only with respect to Francke but also with respect to the many mystically-oriented Christians who have worked to serve their communities and the church. Its propriety or impropriety is a side issue here, however.
dismiss any of these men from the Reformation tradition because of that fact is to ignore the historical evidence.

Though Francke's actions, the interactions that affected those actions, and the historical impact of those actions are the focus of this essay, when discussing a historical actor for whom ideology so clearly prompted action an understanding of the ideology itself is an essential tool for its evaluation. In Francke's case, that ideology was of course Christianity, in its Lutheran Pietist variant, but what did that mean to him and his colleagues? How did he see himself and others, especially with respect to God, and what did those ideas lead him to conclude about his world? The large number of Francke's sermons and tracts that survive greatly simplifies the task of obtaining a picture of his understanding of himself and humanity. As he stated it in his Confession of a Christian:

I recognize myself to be a poor and miserable worm who with his original and actual sin has merited God's wrath and displeasure, earthly death, and eternal damnation; but the Son of God, Jesus Christ, gave himself for me, and through his blood reconciled me with his Father, that God may not reckon my sins unto me, but count me as righteous, that I may believe in the name of his only begotten Son. Through such faith I am truly justified and therewith the Holy Spirit has filled my heart. In such, my justification, I have found peace with God, am a child of God, comfort myself joyfully with his grace, and know for certain that I will neither see nor taste death, but rather that I have eternal life and have passed from death to life. (Here Francke
included a passage on the certainty of grace. But his grace does not make me secure; it rather awakens me daily to renew me more and more in the spirit of my soul. For God who works all goodness in us causes a childlike fear to dwell in my heart and a true trembling before his holy majesty which preserves me by grace from sin. He prunes me like a branch, that I may bring forth more and more fruit.

Note especially the last passage, in which Francke proclaimed his belief that grace does not bring security but trembling, not inaction but constant efforts to serve on God's behalf. The call to action was perpetual: never could God's servants say "enough," never could one be absolutely certain with regard to their salvation. The "fruit," the love for neighbor of which Arndt and Spener had also written, was essential for the true Christian life.

Arndt's influence on Francke was not confined to his early years. Francke himself wrote of the importance of Arndt for those who wished to learn of true faith:

"Johann Arndts Bücher aber vom wahren Christenthum mögen nach der H. Schrifft sein sonderlich familiares Buch seyn und es in seinem gantzen Leben bleiben immassen sie ihn auf den rechten Apostolischen Grund der Buße des Glaubens und der wahren Gemeinschaft mit Gott in Christo Jesu weisen und ihm nicht nur zum Anfange sondern auch zum gesegneten Fortgange im Christenthum dienen werden."5

---

4 Translated in Sattler, p. 239.
Francke valued Arndt's wisdom not only in the abstract, but concretely, and he made certain that those who learned under his direction at Halle learned what Arndt had written.6

As a thinker, Francke was what we today might call a practical theologian, focusing his theological thought and study on those topics which applied most directly to his work. His own Christianity combined an intensely personal faith with service to the community, and his theology reflected those themes.7 Stoeffler noted the impact of historical circumstance here:

Francke was preeminently a man of affairs, and insofar as he busied himself with theology it was for reasons of practical concern. This is not difficult to understand if we are aware of the historical situation in which Francke labored. In a relatively short time he found himself to be in a position of intellectual leadership within a rapidly developing movement, the champion of a new and ever more pervasive religious perspective, a reformer both loved and disliked by great numbers of people, and perhaps the most widely consulted educator of his day in Germany.8

6 "The devotional literature used in all of these meetings consisted chiefly of the Bible and Arndt's *Wahres Christentum*, while the instructional literature consisted of the catechism." Stoeffler, *German Pietism*, p. 31, writing regarding Francke's work in Halle.

7 "Theologische Wissenschaft konnte für Francke nach seiner Bekehrung nicht mehr gelehrt Selbstzweck sein. Sie war für ihn immer bezogen auf das Praktische, also auf das persönliche Christentum, die pastorale Aufgabe oder den akademischen Bildungsauftrag. Nicht von ungefähr sind es vergleichsweise einfache, elementare Gedankengänge, die immer wieder neu variiert vorgebracht werden." Brecht, p. 462.

8 Stoeffler, *German Pietism*, p. 7.
One area of Francke's beliefs where the scholarship remains divided is regarding Francke's impact on the idea of conversion in Pietism. On one side are scholars such as Beyreuther and Stoeffler who unequivocally reject the view that Francke was a systematizer of conversion.9 Hinrichs, on the other hand, followed Emmanuel Hirsch and others when he said, "Once and for all, Francke systematized the Pietistic foundation of conversion, making it comprehensible and methodical to reach."10 Considering both arguments and the respective evidence,

9 "The widespread impression the Francke's chief contribution to Pietism was a rigid schematization of the Spenerian insistence upon a conscious conversion is not born out by the facts." Stoeffler, German Pietism, p. 11. Beyreuther's view is similar: "Muß es denn solch plötzliche Bekehrungsstunden in jedem Leben geben? Francke is nicht dieser Meinung. In dem Bericht über seine plötzliche Bekehrung steht der inhaltsschwere Satz, den seine Kritiker immer überlesen haben: 'So groß war seine Vaterliebe, daß er mir nicht nur nach und nach solchen Zweifel und Unruhe des Herzens wieder benehmen wollte, daran mir wohl hätte genügen können, sondern damit ich desto besser überzeugt würde und meine verirrten Vernunft ein Zaum angelegt würde, gegen seine Kraft und Treue nichts einzuwenden, so erhörte er mich plötzlich!' Wir befinden uns in völliger Einheit mit Francke darüber, daß es solcher besonderen Erfahrungen eines Augenblicks nicht bedarf. Es gibt Bekehrungen auch ohne solche datierbaren Studen." Beyreuther, p. 51.

10 "Francke systematisiert zunächst einmal das pietistische Grunderlebnis der Bekehrung, macht es fasslich und methodisch erreichbar." Hinrichs, Preussentum, p. 13. Hinrichs is following Emmanuel Hirsch's view (as outlined in Geschichte der neueren evangelischen Theologie im Zusammenhang mit den allgemeinen Bewegungen des europäischen Denkens) closely at this point.
it appears that while Francke was indeed a systematizer in many areas of life and ministry, neither he nor those who followed him in the Halle tradition set out an absolute formula for religious conversion. As he later wrote in his Lebenslauf, Francke perceived his conversion at Lüneburg to have been the result of God's overwhelming mercy, reaching him in his specific situation. It would have been illogical for Francke to deny that others could experience God's individual blessing by regimenting rebirth, especially considering his view that God offered salvation to all. While Francke certainly came to believe and preach that a rebirth was essential for the Christian, that belief is a timeless theme of Christianity, both pre- and post-Reformation -- witness the rite of baptism. Furthermore, as Stoeffler noted, neither did those who followed in the "Halle school" have specific formulas for how one comes to faith.

11 People certainly can behave illogically where matters of faith are concerned, but would the pragmatic Francke really have dared to regiment the new birth in such a way as to exclude Luther and Spener, who underwent no such quick conversions? The politically astute Francke, keenly aware of his need for support and his need to appear squarely in the Lutheran tradition, would certainly have recognized how exceptionally foolish such a decision would have been.

12 "Yet as in Francke so in Breithaupt, and in Anton, and in Freylinghausen, and in Lange, and in Rambach one looks in vain for the emphasis on a rigid methodology of religious conversion suggested to twentieth century interpreters by the word Busskampf. They are all one in their judgment, of course, that there must be a conscious break between the old and the new
There can, however, be no doubt that the new birth formed the core of Francke's theology. It remained a constant theme in his writing and preaching. People needed to renounce their old sinful way in order to prepare for the rebirth, he stated, and his distinctions between the unreborn and reborn were sharp. Rebirth, with its combination of struggle and acceptance, served to develop simultaneously the self-discipline required for one's vocation and the calmness that enabled one to accept one's station. From whose initiative stemmed that rebirth? Clearly, God's; Francke maintained his guard against Pelagianism on this issue. Humans do not life. There is little attempt, however, at a sharp theological definition of this break, or at pressuring the individual toward a given order of psychological events." Stoeffler also noted here the general unanimity between Francke and the other Pietist theologians regarding virtually all issues. Stoeffler, German Pietism, p. 50.

13 The Wiedergeburt is not baptism, though that remains an important means by which God reaches humanity as well. Peschke, Studien zur Theologie August Hermann Franckes, (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1964), p. 32.


15 See especially Peschke, Studien zur Theologie August Hermann Franckes, pp. 64ff.

16 Melton, p. 30.

17 For example: "Es muß demnach praesupponiret werden regeneratio & iustificatio, daß der Mensch durch den Geist Gottes wiedergeboren, und in Christo gerechtfertiget werde, und also eine wahrhaftige neue Geburt in ihm vorgegangen sey, durch welche er eine neue
initiate or control the gift of grace, but only their response to it.18 "Even when performing his best works, man remains sinful to his very core," Francke wrote.19 The offer of grace was universal; neither the explicit predestinarianism of Calvin nor the implicit of Luther were part of Francke's beliefs. While Francke's heavy stress on the labors that came as a response to God's


19 August Hermann Francke, Catechismus-Predigten (Halle, 1729), p. 213.
grace meant that he emphasized different aspects of the 
Christian life than did Luther, he remained in the 
Reformation tradition of salvation by grace through 
faith.20 

Francke also placed a relatively high amount of 
weight on the conduct required of Christians. Here, in 
particular, his predilections for organizing, 
formulating, and systematizing are apparent. Christians 
were to always act circumspectly, keeping others in mind 
and never speaking highly of themselves or indulging in 
fleshly pleasures. His instructions, circulated widely 
in documents such as his 1695 Schriftmäßige Lebensregeln, 
were each relatively concise. For example:

IX. Wenn du von dir selbst redest/ so siehe zu/ 
daß nicht eigne Liebe drunter sey."
XXIX. Wenn du merckest/ daß die Gesellschaft 
dir nicht nothwendig ist/ oder daß die Ehre deines 
Gottes anderweit besser könne befördert werden/ (24) 
oder daß die liebe dich nicht dringe/ deinem 
Nächsten durch deine Gegenwart zu dienen/ so laß dir 
ja nicht lieb seyn/ bey der Gesellschaft zu bleiben. 
Keinen Augenblick must du dabey sein/ wenn du keinen 
andern Zweck hast/ als du nur die Zeit unnützlich 
paßirest. Das stehten einem Christen übel an/ daß ihm 
mit seinem Gott die Zeit lang wird. Auch fromme 
versehen sich hierinnen manchmahl/ und fallen daher 
in viele unnütze Worte und Wercke/ die darnach ihre 
Seele verunruhigen.
XXX. Siehe/ ob dein Hertz gleich beschaffen 
sey/ es sey in der Einsamkeit oder in Gesellschaft. 
Findest du das nicht/ so hast du grosse Ursache/

20 Francke's views are of course even more similar 
to those of Spener, or for that matter Calvin, who 
stressed the commitment to service even more than did 
Luther. Those similarities were also politically 
helpful.
The scope of these regulations is remarkably comprehensive, nearly unbelievably so to the contemporary reader. Christians were to be pious at all times including in solitude, work consistently, pray sincerely, study the Scripture, keep their bodies according to God's order (a broad term which generally implied "be busy"), and avoid a long list of evils including boredom, fear, wickedness, useless work, frivolous books, foolish plans, vanities, gluttony or excessive concern with food, frivolous clothing, gossip, excessive rest, and idleness. As Peschke stated it, for Francke, "Es gibt keine indifferenten Dinge."  

Life as a Pietist, especially life at the Halle institutions, would seem to have been so tedious and unattractive as to have prevented more than a handful of ascetics from being interested. Given the incredible growth of the Anstalten and the spread of Pietism across the globe, though, that was not the case. How could this be so? While a comprehensive answer to that question is beyond the scope of this investigation, Stoeffler offers


one intriguing possibility, namely that the camaraderie of being part of a group that was performing God's mission helped maintain interest. According to Stoeffler, "The picture of Francke as a stern task-master and spoil-sport for young people has hardly any basis in fact. All accounts seem to indicate that Halle's esprit de corps was excellent, that administrators and teachers lived together in a spirit of mutual appreciation and confidence. Staff and students alike were caught up in Francke's astonishing vision of world renewal, which was thought to be taking concrete form at Halle."23 In addition, while Francke's concrete, absolute, point-by-point arguments may seem stifling to an era that celebrates discourse centered on feelings and impressions, their clarity, sincerity, and Francke's own example offered answers to an age searching to reform itself after the tumult of the seventeenth century.24

23 Stoeffler, *German Pietism*, p. 28.

24 Francke's exemplary life likely spoke to Germans much like Billy Graham's speaks to American Christians today. As time passed and the king's preference for Halle people became apparent, the utility of a Halle education also likely attracted students. Regarding the success of Francke's sermons and publications, Brecht suggests that his style was important: "Der Ton ist meist streng und ernst, dennoch sprachlich reich und religiös sehr vital. Wärme gewinnt die Sprache Franckes am ehesten in den angefügten Gebeten. Jedenfalls wird der Hörer oder Leser nie im unklaren darüber gelassen, um was es geht und was von ihm erwartet wird." Brecht, p. 462
In sum, Francke and his Halle colleagues began as and clearly remained Lutherans, unwilling to forsake their Lutheran theological principles even when it was politically expedient.25 They were Lutherans who were absolutely without any predestinarian beliefs and who refused to decouple behavior and faith, though. As noted above, while their academic credentials were more than sound, theirs was a faith of hands and heart, not mouth and mind. What would Luther himself have thought of them? -- speculation on this topic is intriguing, but there is no ready answer. The earthy Luther may have been reticent to support the more ascetic aspects of their lifestyle, yet he likely would have agreed that they possessed reine Lehre. The differences between Luther and the Pietists, sharp as they appear to us, likely stem from a simple distinction: Luther lived in an age where works righteousness remained the enemy; Halle Pietism lived in an age where no lifestyle change at all was the danger.

While dismissing Francke as a simple Spener clone would be an error, he undoubtedly was Spener's successor and remained within German Lutheran Pietism's Arndtian

25 The consistent refusal by the Pietists to take part in plans for a union of the two Protestant Prussian churches are worth noting here. See Chapter Five.
and Spenerian tradition. In their core beliefs, and in the actions that resulted from those beliefs, the parallels are clear. Having arrived at his adult Pietist faith by a different route than had Spener and having a different personality than Spener, he emphasized different aspects of that faith. He was not simply a preacher and theologian but also an educator with considerable organizational skills. Where the irenic Spener was a diplomat who helped Pietism establish a place at the court of Brandenburg-Prussia, the pragmatic Francke worked to build that court influence into institutions of brick and mortar throughout the world.

26 Brecht, Schmidt, and Stoeffler all consider Francke to have been Spener’s successor. Brecht, p. 440, Schmidt, p. 68, Stoeffler, German Pietism, p. 23.

27 Brecht, while also considering Francke to be the key successor of Spener, suggested that Francke was closer to Arndt than was Spener. "Diese neue Generation von Pietisten war es freilich auch, die Speners Konzeption eines kirchlichen Pietismus mit ihrem Radikalismus zunächst gefährdete und dann zumindest modifizierte. Sie erwies sich als offener für spiritualistische und radikalpietistische Einflüsse als Spener. Sie war keineswegs allein von ihm geprägt. Gerade an Francke wird sichtbar, daß er seine ursprünglichen Wurzeln in der Frömmigkeit Arndts hatte, der sich damit widerum als der Vater des lutherischen Pietismus erweist." Brecht, p. 440.


29 As Schmidt wrote, "Gegenüber dem Denker, Diplomaten und Seelsorger Spener war Francke als Erzieher
As Martin Schmidt has suggested, Francke became for his time and ours the incarnation of Pietism, its lifestyle and its successes:

Francke verlieh, mehr als Spener, dem Pietismus ein scharfes Profil: strenge Zucht, Arbeitsgesinnung, Sparsamkeit und Ernst wurden seine Kennzeichen. Humor und Spiel, Verschwendung von Zeit und Geld waren verbannt. Er verlieh der Bewegung aber auch Selbstbewusstsein und Stolz.30

Yet Francke remained human, too, and scholarly opinion regarding his life remains sharply divided. Richard Gawthrop has suggested that his human weaknesses and doubts rather than a response to grace actually motivated Francke, whose peculiar religiosity demanded ever-greater sacrifices in pursuit of a hopeless, Promethean goal.31
Others, including Erich Beyreuther, see in Francke's life a stirring tribute to the power of the faith which allowed him to carry out his bold plans in confidence. In either case, though, one should not underestimate Francke's agenda and goals, or the energy which his beliefs gave him -- his vision was of a transformation of the whole of creation through Christian service, starting with his neighbors in Glaucha, and he worked endlessly and productively toward that goal.

Francke never wavered in his belief that the Christian had the duty to reform society. The Christian, to Francke, was obligated to follow the life of Christ in all aspects. In one of his sermons on the topic,

---

Spener to Francke would seem to introduce some uncertainty into Gawthrop's thesis (p. 138) that Francke's faith differed fundamentally from Spener's.

---


33 Peschke, Studien zur Theologie August Hermann Franckes, pp. 80ff.
1697's *The Duty to the Poor*, he outlined his view that the Christian life is incomplete without service. It is through prayer that one achieves a God-pleasing walk toward God and neighbor, and that prayer is comprehensive, including not only oral praise of God but tangible service to one's neighbor. Alms are insufficient, for one has the duty to feed, clothe, and give drink to those in need. One cannot claim poverty as a reason to avoid service, for the rich are not only those rich in worldly goods but those rich according to Scripture, thus all are obligated. Similarly, laziness or deceit among the poor does not excuse one from the duty to serve, for God's grace is for all. His reply to those antinomian Lutherans who objected to any suggestion that works are necessary was straightforward and harsh:

> It has come so far with us, we who call ourselves Lutherans, because we have heard so often that the Catholics would be saved through good works but such is denied in Lutheran doctrine, that most think that it is not even their duty to do good.

---


35 One ought also lead a life of example, in order to illuminate the sins of the world. Peschke, *Studien zur Theologie August Hermann Franckes*, p. 77.

36 Sattler, p. 156.

37 ibid., p. 162.

38 ibid., p. 165.
[One can believe works a merit.] But if the Lutheran doctrine brought this, that we should do no good works, may we renounce it forever. For that would surely be as bad a religion as that of the heathen, the Jew, and the Turk. What could be more abominable than to have a religion in which one should not live piously and do good works. (At this point Francke reestablished his Lutheranism by quoting Luther's words in his preface to Romans regarding faith being nothing without works). One shows oneself as a Christian so far as one is a true person of prayer before God and practices love toward neighbors.39

Francke, having thus refused to divide faith from works, offered some incentive to those who might remain unconvinced of the worth of serving the poor. To serve the poor, Francke said, helps the compassionate Christian to conform increasingly to God's image, because to serve is to truly imitate God.40 Still, that service remains not merely a good idea but a duty, to be performed in all aspects of life, including in one's earthly calling.41

39 ibid., p. 158.

40 "Further, the observation of the duty to the poor also has this great blessing, that the obedient and caring person becomes more and more like the image of God, for this is truly to be of God's mind, when one has a loving heart toward the poor. Yea, to do good unto all men, that means truly to imitate the dear God. For this is the will of God. But, on the other hand, to have an uncompassionate, unmerciful soul -- to do good unto one's neighbor reluctantly or not think of them, not to care that good may occur to others as well, but rather care only for yourself -- this is to have a beastly, brutish mind." ibid., p. 177.

41 "In echt lutherischen Weise versteht Francke die Liebe gegen die Nächsten als Dank gegen Gott. Wenn man auf die fruchtbaren Felder schaut und Gottes Barmherzigkeit erkennt, wie könnte man dann hart gegen die Armen sein?" Peschke, Studien zur Theologie August Hermann Franckes, p. 90. "Francke denkt aber nicht nur an einzelne Akte der Liebe. Er versteht den ganzen Beruf
The tasks of one's calling were sacred duties, not to be shirked or taken lightly. If one does not serve, one risks returning to a "beastly, brutish mind," moving further away from the divine image and tempting divine punishment as well. In this aspect Francke's Pietism added some of the transformational energy of Calvinism to Lutheranism, but at the cost of bringing along some of Calvinism's psychological baggage, for if service and work are inextricably tied to grace, then the temptation to use worldly success as an indicator of standing with God is nearly irresistible. The imperative is to act on behalf of others, that they might find grace, but the salvific implications of earthly successes and failures magnified the eternal implications of one's actions.

Two earlier patterns of rulership appear important for analysis of Francke's understanding of the prince's and the church's responsibilities and also for Brandenburg-Prussia's development. The first is that found in the Hebrew Scripture, where the patriarchs and later the king were to rule according to the laws of the faith, not setting themselves above the people and observing the covenant.42 The covenant between God and des Menschen als göttlichen Auftrag. Die Arbeit, die bisher egoistischen Zwecken diente, hat nach der Bekehrung einen anderen Sinne bekommen." ibid., p. 91.

42 See especially Deuteronomy 17-18 for instructions regarding how even a king was to observe the faith. Deppermann cites Francke as stating Josephat and 125
the people promised earthly blessings so long as the people continued to worship faithfully and conducted their earthly affairs in a Godly way.43 Loyalties were not to be divided in Hebrew society; the Hebrews were to devote themselves only to their unique God. Religion played a dominant role in Hebrew life, and the priests and the especially the prophets not only interpreted the faith but also guided and even rebuked the political leaders.44 Ideally, Hebrew society was to be completely

Josiah (II Chronicles) were ideal Christian rulers. Deppermann, *Der hallesche Pietismus*, p. 150.

43 Hintze's comments regarding the Hohenzollerns, their view of the ruler's relationship to God, and the Pietists are especially interesting regarding this point. Hintze, after studying the Political Testaments of the Great Elector and Friedrich Wilhelm I, suggested that the belief that worldly success is proof of election was not held by the Hohenzollern monarchs. "One finds, rather, the simpler, naive belief, flowing apparently from Old Testament sources, that religious conviction establishes a covenant between man and God, almost a relation of trust and service which guarantees the loyal servant, besides salvation, prosperity in his earthly concerns -- provided of course that these too are conducted in the spirit of that service relation -- that is to the glory of God. This conception was peculiar also to the later German Pietists of A.H. Francke's stamp, as well as to the Moravians and other Protestant sects concerned with promoting success in solid business activities." Hintze, "Calvinism and Raison d'Etat," in Otto Hintze, *The Historical Essays of Otto Hintze*. ed. & intro. Felix Gilbert, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1975), p. 106.

44 It deserves note that, according to the Biblical account, the golden years for the ancient Hebrews came during the period when the monarchy was the strongest, and the period of decline coincided with a rise in the power of the landed nobility.
theocratic, i.e. the people were to interpret every part of life through the lens of the Hebrew faith.

The second, especially interesting because of its close parallels to the path which Brandenburg-Prussia took and because of its Reformed origins, is the model Heinrich Bullinger and his colleagues used in Zurich after Zwingli's death. Bullinger was not a strict predestinarian but rather believed that God's call was universal; those who chose to sin were responsible for their own dismal destiny. The core of his social beliefs was a covenant like that of the Hebrew Scripture. In addition, Bullinger moved beyond Zwingli's affirmation of magisterial sovereignty within the combined civil-ecclesiastical community toward a theory of indivisible sovereignty similarly rooted in the Old Testament. For Bullinger, salvation became a communal responsibility, and he identified the earthly welfare of the community with its eternal salvation.


46 This is but one of many similarities between Friedrich Wilhelm's particular version of Reformed Christianity and Bullinger's. *ibid.*, p. 27.

47 *ibid.*, p. 167-71. Baker also makes the point that where for Calvin and Luther the covenant was one-way, i.e. from God to humanity through Christ, for Bullinger it was bilateral. *ibid.*, xxii.

48 While others had approached the theory of indivisible sovereignty in the past, Bullinger developed
Zurich were not a separate corporate entity but part of one coterminous entity with the magistrates; they performed the priestly function, expositing Scripture and bringing a prophetic voice to the community. All else came under the control of the magistrates, who, basing their laws on the divine law, were responsible for the well-being of the community up to and including Christian discipline.49 This idea of covenant as a foundation for society passed out of the mainstream during the late 16th century but underwent something of a revival during the 17th, according to J. Wayne Baker, perhaps as a reaction to increasing theological and social rigidity in Calvinism.

What, then, was Francke's vision of how a prince should serve God and his people and how the pastors functioned within the realm?50 Both were to serve God and neighbor. The most important policy goals princes could pursue were renewing their lands and serving the

---

49 ibid., xiv.

50 Francke also elaborated his view of rulership in his document on the education of a prince, "Gedanken von der Auserziehung eines zum Regiment destinierten Prinzen."
people God had placed in their charge. Accomplishing this goal would help the people by ameliorating the trials of 18th century life and prevent God from bringing harsh judgment upon their land. Again looking at Duty to the Poor, it is clear how Francke contrasted the human tendency to self-interest with the magnanimity and service of the Christian ruler:

In view of this (selfishness), Christian rulers can do nothing which is more pleasing to God the Lord, more necessary to the prevention of the harsh judgment of God, more profitable to the Christian nature and more fitting to their leading high office than when they undertake this care and take adequate steps that the groans of the poor and wretched of the cities and countryside may be prevented. Through such care, rulers are what they should be, true fathers of their land. Through this they bear the image of God the Most High, who yet looks upon the lowly. Through this they confirm by their own example in what honor their subjects should hold the royal commandment of love. Through this they raise for themselves pious and willing subjects and awaken in each and every one a sincere and genuine love in return.

Therefore Francke envisioned a much more proactive role for the Christian prince with regard to his people's spiritual lives than Luther, and perhaps even Spener, had

51 Regarding Francke's specific ideas for actions the prince of Brandenburg-Prussia should take, see below and Chapters Four and Five. For his general views of the obligation of the prince, see especially Oschlies, pp. 204ff.

52 Sattler, p. 155. Note the image here of rulers as "fathers to their land," clearly reminiscent of the Hebrew patriarchies. Later in this introduction he also stated that princes are to restrain wickedness among the people and give the people a good example.
-- a role much closer to that of the patriarchs of the Hebrew Scripture.53 The prince was to be simultaneously Christian and patriarch.54 It was not enough for the prince to merely protect the people and institute earthly justice, leaving spiritual affairs to the pastors as much as possible. Instead, princes had the duty to take their place at the head of the church seriously and actively promote piety among their subjects.55

Francke's trust of the prince was not limitless, for without the influence of true Christianity on the prince, pastors and princes would continually be set at odds. Peschke suggested that Francke actually saw earthly regimes as generally despoiled, with only the occasional God-pleasing exception.56 The church's duty is thus to

53 On this topic, Hinriches noted: "Luther nannte den Fürsten den Amtmann Gottes, Freylinghausen nennt ihn den Amtmann des Reiches Gottes." Hinrichs, Preußentum, p. 89. Francke did not, however, follow some of the spiritualists in departing from the Lutheran model of society.

54 Oschlies, p. 206.


guide the worldly authorities so that they might perform their duty as patriarch acceptably.57 Francke and the Pietists were also willing to accept their share of the responsibility for the problems of the world.58

In practice, Francke and his Halle colleagues, especially Breithaupt, were more willing even than some of their colleagues to enter into close relationship with the prince, seeing in that relationship the opportunity to establish their own programs more securely and perhaps even guide the state's priorities.59

Herod as the prototype of the bad ruler. Peschke, Studien zur Theologie August Hermann Franckes, p. 120.


59 For example, when a controversy arose regarding ordinations in Magdeburg, it was J.J. Breithaupt and Francke who supported the absolutist position despite the
As Luther had held, so too for Francke regarding the duty of the citizen to obey the prince. Francke and his colleagues were certainly willing to try their best to shape the actions of their prince, and, as the following chapters will illustrate, did on occasion tell their prince "no." Ultimately, though, the duty of the Christian was to obey God's legally constituted authorities. Francke, in fact, made this point quite sharply in a 1714 to Bartholomäus Ziegenbalg, a Pietist missionary in the Indian territory controlled by the Dutch East Indies Company. Ziegenbalg had enmeshed himself in an ongoing dispute in the region, confronted the Dutch commandant of the region, and eventually found himself in jail for his refusal to obey.60 When the news reached Francke, he did not take Ziegenbalg's side, but rather chastised him soundly in a letter that suggested that Ziegenbalg should have reined in his eagerness in favor of prudence, moderation, and submission when dealing with the authorities.61 Thus while one could and

---

objections of those within their group, including Canstein, who wished to assert the rights of the church over against those of the prince. Depermann, Der hallesche Pietismus, p. 50.


61 August Hermann Francke to Bartholomäus Ziegenbalg, 14 Oct 1714. AFSt./M IC6:88.
should assert oneself in attempting to carry out God's work, that work must be balanced by a clear understanding of one's place and duty. As time passed the Halle Pietists sought to achieve that balance, with remarkable results, in Brandenburg-Prussia. Francke, his colleagues, and his supporters at the court in Berlin, had by the early 1700s succeeded in establishing institutions with which to begin to implement their vision of transformation. Starting in and with Halle, but with the entire world as its eventual goal, Francke had created a vehicle of reform well suited to the circumstances -- if he could keep and even strengthen his base of support, especially his support at the court in Berlin. That support was totally dependent upon maintaining the favor of the mercurial Friedrich Wilhelm.

Reform was certainly also a goal of Friedrich Wilhelm. In both word and action, he attempted to follow the maxim that he wrote on 8 February 1722 in reference to East Prussia, "...wenn ich baue und verbessere das Land und ich mache keine Christen, so hilfet mir alles nit."62 The weight of evidence supports the thesis that

62 "If I build and improve this land and I don't make any Christians, so help me, all is for nothing." Fritz Terveen, Gesamtstaat und Retablissement: Der Wiederaufbau des nördlichen Ostpreußen unter Friedrich Wilhelm I. 1714-1740 (Göttingen: Musterschmidt, 1954), p. 93, and A. Keil, "Das Volksschulwesen in Preußen und Litauen unter Friedrich Wilhelm I," Altpreußische Monatsschrift Bd. 23 (1886), p. 120. The king wrote this on the margin of a report from the Königsberg Regierung,
this ideal governed many of his actions throughout his reign. For example, he built schools and orphanages for the children of his soldiers, thus continuing and broadening the initiatives of his father and grandfather, though he moved beyond his predecessors by using the Halle Pietist model to govern their operation. When he opened a military orphanage for boys in 1724, his instructions echoed Francke and the Pietists: the main purpose of the institution was to bring up the youth for the service of God and neighbor.63

That Christianity had an immense impact on Friedrich Wilhelm's life is unquestionable. He was no skeptical Enlightenment philosopher king, but rather a Reformation prince, perhaps Germany's last, for whom religion was a

which had resisted his instructions regarding the building and staffing of churches and schools. The complete passage, rarely cited, is most instructive: "Dieses ist nichts, denn die Regierung dieses arme Land in Barberei behalten will, denn wenn ich baue und verbessere das Land und ich mache keine Christen, so hilfet mir alles nit, sie sollen sich mit Obermarschall Printz zusammentun und Porst, Reinbeck und sollen zusammen mir vorschlagen, wie die Sache am besten und kürzesten anzustellen, und zum Oberdirektorio muß ein Weltlicher sein, den man von hier hinsenden muß und der ein Gottes Mann ist." Note that the instruction refers specifically to Porst and Reinbeck, two of Halle Pietism's most reliable representatives in Berlin. See Chapters Five and Six.

living concern. Several sources, written in the king's own unique German, attest to this fact. He publicly placed his trust in God, though he of course hedged his bets a bit with his army. He also spoke of his Christian awakening at 20, and of his assurance of grace.64 His words have a decidedly different tone than do those of his predecessor of successor, both of whom discussed religion in their Political Testaments but from a much less personal standpoint. He and his family attended worship some 150 days a year, both morning and evening.65 Even the notes he made on the margins of reports he received sometimes contained Biblical quotes.66

Friedrich Wilhelm was a Calvinist, as all the Hohenzollern rulers at least nominally were. He never

64 "...Mit God dem allerhochsten stehe ich wohll. und habe vom 20ten jahre meines alters mein gantzes vertrauen auf Gott feste gesetzt, den ich steh(t)s umb genedige erhörung angeruhfen habe und had auch mein Gehbet bestendigst erhöhret und bin versicherdt durch die genade Jesus Kristij umb sein bitteres leiden und sterben sehlig zu werden alle grohbe und innerliche sünden die Ich begangen habe sindt mir von hertzen leidt und bitte Gott das er sie mir vergehben wolle umb Jesu Kristij ich habe steh(t)s gearbeitet mir zu beßern und ein Gottsehl: lehben und wandell zu führen soviell als ich als Menschl. mögl. gewehsen und werde mit Gottes hüfe beharren biß an mein sehliches ende dazu verhelfe mir der Heilige Geist." Gericke, p. 198, also AB, Bd. III, p. 457.


66 For example, on a report of January 1726, "gehbet Gott was Gott ist und dem König was des Königs ist." (Likely a favorite passage of rulers everywhere.) AB V, p. 2.
left his confession; he never took communion in a Lutheran church.67 His support for his confession took more proactive forms as well. For example, when there was controversy over whether Francke had fulfilled the terms of an agreement under which a free table was to be established for Reformed students at Halle, the king supported the Reformed position.68 Yet while he publicly stated his intent to remain in the Reformed church, his proclamations also make clear his beliefs that one could find true Christianity through both confessions and that there were no fundamental, irreconcilable differences between the two -- the strife was due to quarreling preachers.69 His rejection of predestination, which dated to his childhood, undoubtedly smoothed his path to this position. Likely reasons of state did so as well; as Schmoller and others have pointed out, the Hohenzollern policy of encouraging confessional union served to unify the realm as well.70 In addition, the king was concerned that should his subjects accept predestinarian beliefs, they would also

68 GSPK, Rep. 52, nr. 159n3a, also AFSt, A176:7.
69 Klepper, p. 7 ff.
70 AB VI, 1, p. 52.
adopt a fatalism that would make them less likely to serve the realm diligently.

A number of texts exist that illustrate these points. For example, in his 1722 Instructions to his Successor:

Wahs die Religion anlanget so bin ich und werde mit Gottes hüfle Reformiret sehlich sterben indeßen bin versicherdt das ein Lutterischer der dar Gottsehlich wandelt eben so guht sehlich werde als die Reformirte und der unter[sch]eidt nur herrühre von die Prediger Zenckereien haltet dehrowegen Reformirte und Lutterahner in geleiche würde tuest sie alle beide Religionen geleiche gut und machet keine differance davor wierdt euch Gott sehgenen und werdet dadurch bey alle beide liebe euch erwerben.71

And again in a 3 January 1722 note to Ilgen and von Printz, in the king's own hand: "Ich mache Kein differance(.) wir wurden alle beiden Religion sehlig(,) aber ich will Durchaus mit und bei größten Angenade meiner bediehne(.)"72 He admitted to being close to a Lutheran -- one of his most oft-cited remarks is, "Ich bin in der Reformierten Religion geboren und erzogen, ich werde wohl auch darinnen leben und sterben, aber die Lutheraner liebe ich auch und gehe lieber in ihre als in unsere Kirche."73 He made a similar statement in 1722: "Ich bin reformirt, u. werde beherren bis an mein Ende,

71 &£ III, p. 457.
72 GSPK, Rep. 52, Nr. 159n3a.
73 W. Wendland, Das Erwachen religiösen Lebens in Berlin (Berlin, 1925), p. 122.
ich declarire, daß ich keinen Unterschied under der lutherischen religion u. reformierten halte. also heben sie Angelegenheit so thun sie mir kund schriifftl., u. nehmen mir in billichen Sachen zu ihren advocaten, da ich der jurection bis dato gethan, u. continuiren werde bis um mein Ende. F.Wilhelm."74

He even diminished the differences between Catholicism and the Protestant confessions (a stunning reflection of both his personal temperament and the changes which had come since the 30 Years' War), and said to the Catholic chaplain Bruns:

Ich glaube, nicht alles, was die Reformierten glauben, zum Beispiel von der Prädestination; ich glaube auch vieles, was die Lutheraner, und vieles, was die Katholiken glauben. -- Mein lieber Pater, wenn ich wüsste und erkannte, dass ich im Irrtum sei, so würde ich noch heute katholisch. Ich glaube aber, dass alle Christen, welcher Konfession sie auch angehören, selig werden können; denn wenn sie auch in einzelnen Nebendingen verschiedener Ansicht sind, so stimmen sie doch alle in den Hauptsachen Überein.75

Was Friedrich Wilhelm a Pietist in the Halle sense?

When in 1711 he admonished Leopold von Anhalt-Dessau to spend more time on their faith he disclaimed that label, writing, "I am no Pietist, but God before everything in

74 Quoted in a letter by Porst of 31 Dec 1722. AFSt D57:S526.

75 Klepper, p. 6. The fact that this Calvinist king not only had Catholic chaplains in his army but knew them personally also illustrates his ecumenism.
the world." Late in his life he was critical of Pietism in a letter to Graf von Zinzendorf, stating, "Ich werde mich durch Gottes Gnade bearbeiten, solche (Sünde) nicht mehr und so viel schwachen Menschen nur möglich ist, abzulegen und suchen, Gott dankbar zu werden. Ein Kopfhänger bin ich dabei nicht und werde es auch nicht werden, weil ich glaube, dass das thätige Christentum nicht darinnen bestehet." Yet in the intervening years Friedrich Wilhelm not only worked closely with the Pietists but favored Pietist pastors for his appointments. He attended Lutheran churches with his family and enjoyed the counsel of Lutheran pastors. When Francke stayed at the palace during 1725, Friedrich Wilhelm's religious enthusiasm reached its peak.


77 Friedrich Wilhelm I. und Graf von Zinzendorf (Berlin, 1847), p. 28.

78 See Chapters One and Six.

79 Chapters Four and Five discuss their relationship in detail.
only did the king preach a sermon each afternoon to his assembled family, but he discussed abdicating in favor of Crown Prince Friedrich and moving the remainder of the family to Wusterhausen where he would superintend his farm, the better to worship God.80 It also appears that the king had a great appreciation for the ideas of Johann Arndt, so much so that he considered *True Christianity* a guide to right conduct. An endorsement to the king of a person or an initiative as being in accord with Arndt was endorsement of value.81 Friedrich Wilhelm's God resembled Arndt's God as well, a God who was capable of

80 A nervous Seckendorff and Grumbkow dissuaded the king from abdicating, thanks in part via a trip to the court of August the Strong -- where perhaps not coincidentally August offered Friedrich Wilhelm the temptation of a beautiful nude courtier. (Friedrich Wilhelm, so far as is known, did not accept the offer). Princess Wilhelmina and Prince Friedrich (Frederick the Great) had little use for their father's sermons, and indeed at least Friedrich had little use for religion. Wilhelmina recorded her thoughts during this period: "My brother and I were often inclined to laugh, and sometimes we could not help bursting out. But we were instantly overwhelmed with all the anathemas of the church, to which we were obliged to attend with a contrite and penitent air, which we found it difficult to affect. In short, the tedious Francke made us live like the monks of La Trappe." Wilhelmina of Bayreuth, *The Misfortunat Margravine*, ed. Norman Rosenthal, (London: Macmillan and Co Ltd, 1970), pp. 108-09. Her work offers a colorful portrait of palace life, but historians have noted some inaccuracies, usually in dating or exaggeration of numbers. It is a valuable resource, however, particularly because it offers the perspective of a woman who felt free to criticize.

81 This was also true during the reign of Friedrich I.
taking grace away from people if they failed to fulfill their Christian duty. 82

Friedrich Wilhelm had a life-altering faith that was based in a combination of personal and family experience as well as in his education, and his words and actions were tangible results of that faith. His apparent desire to confirm God’s grace (and his salvation) via successful enterprises has at least as much in common with the Reformed faith as with Pietism. Thus the conclusion of Wolff and Stolze, that Friedrich Wilhelm was not a Pietist in the Halle sense, appears valid. Only if one extends the definition of Pietist so far as to include anyone who responds to a feeling of grace by devoting their life to service can the king be termed Pietist, and that definition is so broad as to be useless for

82 Several writers have suggested that if the king were not a Pietist he certainly had Pietistic tendencies, and there was a lively (if small) debate over this topic in the German literature during the first half of this century. See Wilhelm Stolze, "Friedrich Wilhelm I und der Pietismus," Jahrbuch für Brandenburgische Kirchengeschichte 5; Albert Krebs, "August Hermann Francke und Friedrich Wilhelm I. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Schul- und Anstaltwesens," Fortschritte der Jugendfürsorge, Reihe I, Heft 1 (Langensalza, 1925.); Karl Wolff, "Ist der Glaube Friedrich Wilhelms I von A.H. Francke beeinflusst?", Jahrbuch für Berlin-Brandenburgische Kirchengeschichte 33 (1938), pp. 70-102; and more recently Wolfgang Gericke, ed., Glaubenszeugnisse und Konfessionspolitik der Brandenburgischen Herrscher bis Preußischen Union, 1540 bis 1815 (Bielefeld: Luther-Verlag, 1977). Stolze, Wolff, and Gericke contended that Friedrich Wilhelm remained true to his Reformed confession, Krebs that the king followed Francke.
scholarly analysis. Further, his rejection of predestination in its most austere form -- even forbidding its teaching in the army -- does not mean that he rejected his family's confessional history. His dedication to the Reformed church is clear. His ecumenism was apparently sincere as well, for though his desire to unite Prussia likely increased his interest in a union of the Lutheran and Reformed confessions, his tolerance extended beyond those two groups.

Did he have a comprehensive philosophy of rulership that guided his actions, a vision of Christian kingship by which he integrated his faith and his responsibilities? Friedrich Wilhelm was no philosopher king, and those documents of which his authorship is most certain, such as the instructions for the General Directory, are mainly concerned with efficient administration.83 His Instructions, though, give some indication of how he approached his duties, or at least of how he believed a king should conduct himself. The first order of business, he wrote, was to lead a circumspect and Godly life:

> Let my dear successor be well assured that all successful rulers who keep God before their eyes and

83 Regarding this point, it is telling that no scholar has compiled a comprehensive "Works of Friedrich Wilhelm I" in any language. The two collections which do exist -- the Acta Borussica and the Corpus Consitutionem Marchicarum -- concern themselves with administration.
have no mistresses or, rather, whores, and lead a
godly life -- on such rulers God will shower down
all worldly and spiritual blessings. I therefore
beseech my dear successor to lead a godly life and
to show a good example to his lands and army, not to
tipple and gorge, which lead to a dissolute life.84

Comedies, operas, ballets, and other devilish things are
not to be tolerated, he added, for it is through avoiding
such works of Satan that the house of Hohenzollern has
enjoyed God's blessing from the time of Johann
Sigismund.85 Following these admonitions, Friedrich
Wilhelm outlined the need for a strong army, the nature
of the various provinces, and the need for the prince to
be a careful and thorough administrator.

Carl Hinrichs noted the importance of Viet Ludwig
von Seckendorff's Kurze und deutliche Institution eines
jungen christlichen Prinzen, was er in seinem Stand und
Regiment in acht zu nehmen to the education of young
Friedrich Wilhelm.86 Von Seckendorff's book is
effectively a catechism of Lutheran teachings regarding
the state, intended for the training of a Christian
ruler. Following this idea to its logical conclusion and
examining the works of Luther regarding proper rulership
leads inexorably to the conclusion that Friedrich Wilhelm

84 Macartney, p. 310, AB, IV, p. 450. Friedrich
Wilhelm opened his Instructions with this section.

85 The first of the Hohenzollerns to convert to
Calvinism.

86 Hinrichs, Friedrich Wilhelm I, p. 63.
had drunk deeply from the Lutheran stream, whether through von Seckendorff, Francke, Luther's works themselves, or another source. Friedrich Wilhelm, in word and deed, conformed remarkable closely to Luther's model of a Christian prince.

"First we must provide a sound basis for the civil law and sword so no one will doubt that it is in the world by God's will and ordinance," Luther wrote. He never wavered from this view, firmly distancing himself from all who would have Christians dissociate from the world. Temporal authority has existed from the beginning of time, he stated, using the statutes set forth in the Levitical code as Old Testament authority for this view. He also tied this idea to the New Testament, noting that John the Baptist did not instruct the soldiers in Luke 3:14 to leave their occupation, only not to extort money or accuse falsely -- to behave as Christians within the scope of their calling. This concept of the Christian in temporal government using authority only for the protection of others appeared frequently when Luther wrote regarding rulership.

Luther's commentary on the Sermon on the Mount is an essential text for assessing his position regarding the

---

responsibilities of the Christian, and the Christian prince, in society. The faith does not require complete denial of the world. Rather, it requires the Christian to act as a Christian in every situation. The words of Christ grant an inner freedom that allows one to act in love. "So be poor or rich physically and externally, as it is granted to you - God does not ask about this - and know that before God, in his heart, everyone must be spiritually poor. That is, he must not set his confidence, comfort, and trust on temporal goods, nor hang his heart upon them and make Mammon his idol."88 Similarly regarding verse five, in which the meek are said to inherit the earth. "What does it mean, then, to be meek? From the outset here you must realize that Christ is not speaking at all about the government and its work, whose property it is not to be meek . . . but to bear the sword . . . He is only talking about how individuals are to live in relation to others, apart from official position and authority . . ."89 Meekness is not the call of the Christian in government, but conscientious performance of duty is.


89 ibid., p. 23.
Christians are to obey the temporal government regardless of their need. "Because the sword is most beneficial and necessary for the whole world in order to preserve peace, punish sin, and restrain the wicked, the Christian submits most willingly to the rule of the sword, . . . and does all he can to assist the governing authority, that it may continue to function and be held in honor and fear," he stated.90 It is a form of Christian service, needed by the community.

Returning to Luther's writings on Matthew, the full implications of the Sermon on the Mount are clear. The Christian cannot act for self: "Briefly, anyone who wants to have Christ must put in jeopardy his body, life, goods, reputation, and popularity in the world," wrote Luther concerning Matt. 5:10.91 Yet there is a place for force as well, as Luther illustrated when discussing Matt. 5:5: "Therefore if we have an office or a government position, we must be sharp and strict, we must get angry and punish; for here we must do what God puts into our hand and commands us to do for His sake. In other relations, in what is unofficial, let everyone learn for himself to be meek toward everyone else, that is, not to deal with his neighbor unreasonably,

90 Temporal Authority, p. 94.
91 Sermon on the Mount, p. 45.
hatefully, or vengefully, like the people whom they call 'Headlong Hans'."92

God should remain the central focus of rulership. As Luther wrote in To the Christian Nobility, "We must not start something by trusting in great power or human reason, even if all the power in the world were ours. For God cannot and will not suffer that a good work began by relying upon one's own power and reason."93 Thus all are equal before God, and while God calls different people to different offices, all need God -- no matter how lofty the earthly station. Successful rulers trust in God, call upon God for guidance, and resist the temptation to rule on their own, he added regarding Psalm 101, and any success a ruler has is through God's guidance and blessing.94

A ruler must act in a Christian way toward God, giving self over completely to God, praying for guidance in action, and generally following Solomon's example.95

92 ibid. p. 23.


95 Temporal Authority, p. 126.
The prince must govern wisely, caring for the people with whom God has charged him and always aiming to maintain peace and justice. God has given the German people an empire, and they should not give it up but rather rule it sagely.\footnote{Christian Nobility, p. 209.} It is a huge undertaking, and one for which God holds rulers accountable. He wrote toward the end of Temporal Authority:

I have tried to point out the many good works the temporal government could do, and what the duty of every government should be, so that everyone may learn what an awful responsibility it is to rule and sit in high places. What use would it be if an overlord was as holy in his own life as St. Peter, if he did not diligently try to help his subjects in these matters? His very authority would condemn him. It is the duty of authorities to seek the best for those they govern. (emphasis added)\footnote{ibid., p. 215.}

Instead, a ruler should say, "I belong to the land and the people, I shall do what is useful and good for them. My concern will be not how to lord it over them and dominate them, but how to protect and maintain them in peace and plenty."\footnote{Temporal Authority, p. 120.}

Three remaining points which Luther made especially call Friedrich Wilhelm to mind. First, the ruler should thank God for dependable subjects and helpers. "A prince or lord should learn and know that devout servants, faithful workers, and a good administration are gifts of
God, and great gifts. Let this be his noblest treasure. . . and let him thank God for this with the prayer that He may preserve and improve such a treasure for him," Luther wrote in Psalm 101.99 Second, "He who would be a Christian prince must certainly lay aside any intent to exercise lordship or proceed with force."100 War is only prudent if there is a greater benefit than harm. Princes should not let their "mad wills" lead them into foolish and unjust wars. Luther likened this to fishing with a golden net, where one takes the chance of losing much more than the possible gain. He stated in Treatise on Good Works:

He who drives a cart must act differently than if he were walking alone. . . . A prince is in the same position. He stands at the head and leads the multitude, and must not go or do as he wants but as the multitude are able. He has to pay more regard to their needs and necessities than to his own will and pleasure. 101

Finally, those in the ruler's court ought to work as well. Speaking of them, he stated, "The government does not want you to lie on the couch and rest, or to sit

99 Psalm 101, p. 152.
100 Temporal Authority, p. 118.
101 Good Works, p. 94.
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behind the stove like a lazy, sleepy, ravenous hound. It wants you to work!"102

There are also a considerable number of parallels between Friedrich Wilhelm's behavior and what Wolfgang Weber has suggested were the core of absolutist theory during the era.103 True worship of God and the conservation of the state were the goals, and both Godly law and natural law proscribed certain behaviors. Human laws were less binding, though, especially in case of emergency. The monarch existed for the sake of the state, not the other way around. The prince was not the father of only his family, but of the realm, and the prince had an imperative for discipline and action. With respect to religion, protection of the faith and harmony were goals, and atheism was an intolerable affront with the potential to cause antisocial and even rebellious behavior. As for the military, a strong military was an obligation, but it should be a legitimate and native force, not the mercenary bodyguard of a tyrant.104 Finally, education was to have present utility, and

102 Psalm 101, p. 215. If Friedrich Wilhelm ever read this passage, it undoubtedly became an immediate favorite.


104 ibid., p. 910.
public education was to correct any failings of the parents and protect the moral character of the students. Keeping the Lutheran tradition, the theories of the era, and the king's actions in mind, it appears justified to state that Friedrich Wilhelm I believed he was a king in the Old Testament tradition, patriarch of his people, party to a covenant with a harsh God, and liable for his actions. Two of his statements serve to illustrate this belief: "As the only just Judge will on that great day punish wrong with an inescapable eternal punishment, we shall not be remiss in punishing it with great severity so long as we are His representative in this temporal existence."105 Furthermore: "One must serve the lord with body and life, with belongings and possessions, with honor and conscience, and all of that set except salvation. That is for God. But all else must be mine."106

What was the practical effect of these ideas? As Ergang described Friedrich Wilhelm's rulership, "Next to being a good Christian in his private life he desired nothing more than to be a good ruler, to give his

105 CCM II, Pt 1, p. 517.

provinces a good administration.\textsuperscript{107} His administrative reforms and his efforts to staff his churches with Halle Pietists are two manifestations of Friedrich Wilhelm's understanding of his responsibilities. Another area that illustrates not only Friedrich Wilhelm's commitment to his faith but also the way he combined that devotion with his desire to build his realm comes from his treatment of religious refugees.

In 1732, 17,000 Protestants from Salzburg settled in Prussia. Prince-Archbishop Firmian of Salzburg had yielded to Jesuit pressure and expelled them in violation of the Peace of Westphalia and without the three-year grace period and free disposition of property they legally deserved.\textsuperscript{108} Friedrich Wilhelm offered them homes, stated he would defend their right of safe passage through all lands, and gave them both travel money and supplies once they reached their new homes. The Prussian people took them as boarders when necessary as well.

\textsuperscript{107} Ergang, p. 46.

\textsuperscript{108} This was a particularly ugly incident. Not only had they been guaranteed religious freedom and the grace period, but on the exodus their women were raped, their children were stolen, and the men tortured. The peace-loving Salzburgers had even offered to worship in the Catholic manner if permitted to worship as they chose as well, to no avail. See especially Friedrich Förster, Friedrich Wilhelm I: König von Preußen (3 vols., Potsdam, 1834-5), vol. 2, pp. 329 ff.
To Friedrich Wilhelm, this was an opportunity to serve God, rejuvenate East Prussia, and perhaps even diminish the influence of the local Estates, and he made the most of it. Giving the Salzburgers land and livestock as a start, he made frequent trips to East Prussia to take them everything from farming consultants to plows. He was unusually, perhaps uncharacteristically patient with the settlers. Others heard of this, and Swiss, Palatinatian, Walloon, Bohemian, and Alsatian refugees came to Prussia. A phrase of the time went, "No one becomes Prussian except out of need, but once you are one, you thank God."109 Even his son Frederick, whose relationship with his father was at least trying, wrote admiringly regarding his father's work in East Prussia to Voltaire:

There are more than half a million inhabitants, more cities than before, more cattle, and productivity is greater than in any other part of Germany. All this is due to the king alone. He not only gave the orders, he made the plans and implemented them. He spared neither care, nor labor, nor large sums of money, nor promises, nor rewards to secure the happiness of thousands of thinking human beings. To him they owe their existence, to him their prosperity. . . . I see something heroic in the magnanimity of the king and in the energy with which he has repopulated this desert and made it fertile and happy.110

109 Fischer-Fabian, p. 111.
110 Cited in Fischer-Fabian, p. 119.
Even if one excludes churches and schools from consideration, the realm was becoming more pietistic -- perhaps puritan is a better word -- if not necessarily Pietist. The king's emphasis on thrift, duty, and service may have been in sharp contrast with the beliefs of his father, but there was clearly a coherent program taking shape. Honest reports to Berlin were now the rule: his 1723 regulations against flattery and unjustifiably favorable reports noted that writers of such reports must "answer for it before God, us, and their consciences, under pain of Our extreme disfavor and most severe and active displeasure toward those who do not obey exactly this."111 Secrecy was required as well; this king had no tolerance for tongue-waggers, whether in or out of court.112 Not only did the nobles at court wear uniforms, but the ranks were adjusted so that many who were formerly in the upper strata of the hierarchy


112 AB III, p. 650. The intrigues at court did not stop, of course.
now ranked lower than mid-level army officers.113 These changes were informed by not only the king's desire for order but his faith. The Brandenburg-Prussia he hoped to create was shaped more by his Christianity than by any other idea or ideology. As Dorwart noted, "Theological principles and divine sanction may have yielded in theory before the teachings of Pufendorf, Thomasius, and Wolff, but not in actuality until after Frederick William I."114 This restructuring was to be both Godly and comprehensive. As East Prussia and Lithuania were to become economically self-sufficient, so was the realm as a whole. Brandenburg-Prussia was to grow its own wool, make its own cloth, manufacture its own muskets, and grow its own food. Autarky was to be the order of the day, an autarky shaped, controlled, and monitored by officials who, like their king, believed bureaucratic service was a calling.115 In the main, these officials were to be former soldiers, who had learned diligence and obedience in an army that was becoming both Prussia's shield against a hostile world and an arena for the instilling of Pietist Christianity.

113 AB I, p. 143.
114 Dorwart, Prussian Welfare, p. 17.
115 AB III, p. 647.
CHAPTER FOUR

A new king, a new ally

Brandenburg-Prussia ranked tenth in area and twelfth in population among European polities in 1700. The Thirty Years' War, and the plagues and starvation which accompanied it, had cut the population approximately fifty percent and shattered the land's agricultural economy; the Prussia of 1700 was a developing country trying to re-populate its scattered provinces. Abandoned farms, wild animals, and empty land filled East Prussia. Despite Elector John Sigismund's conversion of the ruling Hohenzollern house to Calvinism in 1613, the nobility (Estates) and the commoners remained staunch Lutherans, dating from Elector Joachim II's conversion of

1 Prussia was an amalgamation of several small lands, not all of which were contiguous. The three main areas were East Prussia; Minden, Ravensberg, Mark, and Cleves; and Brandenburg, Pomerania, Magdeburg, and Halberstadt.

2 The Cambridge Economic History of Europe, vol. 4 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), p. 42. The extent of the overall population loss remains a topic of disagreement among scholars, and the extent of the losses varied widely between different regions. There is general agreement that the territories held by the Hohenzollerns were among those most severely damaged, however.
his realm to Lutheranism in 1539. While the exact situation in each region varied, the Lutheran church, the nobility, and the towns usually exerted their influences in concert. Their combined and separate strengths were to wane, however, in the face of the aggressive centralizing policies taken by the Hohenzollern rulers from Friedrich Wilhelm the Great Elector to Frederick the Great.

The Hohenzollerns and the coalition of nobles and towns contended with each other for authority in a framework in which tradition had established the roles of each party. In this medieval pattern, the elector attempted to form overall policies for the realm, in particular military policies, and the Estates and towns financed them. Should an elector begin a project with which the nobles disagreed, the nobles refused to provide him with the necessary financing. Conversely, a recalcitrant or even rebellious noble was no real

---


4 Military policies were still by far the principal concern of the electors, and the bulk of royal expenditures went to the army. Poor relief and other humanitarian policies were increasingly a concern of the elector, though, as were capital investments for industry and trade.
challenge to the elector, who could summon other nobles under their feudal obligations to help him restore order. Stability and tradition were the focal points of the system, and each group knew the basic roles of the others. There was a balance, a sense of order, that usually prevented the tensions brought by the self-interests of the various parties from bringing about chaos; Brian M. Downing's description of this balance as "medieval constitutionalism" seems an appropriate term for it.

With the ascent of Frederick William the Great Elector to the Prussian throne, however, the contest took a new dimension. During his reign (1640-1688), he eliminated the combined Diet of towns and nobles once he gained a grant of new taxes from it, a grant that he used to pay for a standing army. The existence of this new force, which gave the elector troops that were independent of control by the Estates, allowed him to continue to collect the taxes even after their term expired. He also changed the tax system to separate the interests of the towns and the Estates -- from 1680, the

towns paid the new excise tax, the countryside the traditional *Konttribution* -- which allowed him to control the towns through his tax commissars and gave him the resources and strength to quash any restless nobles and collect ever-higher taxes from them. He muscled independently-minded Cleves-Mark into line, and he smashed a rebellion of the Prussian Estates. These nobles, hoping to maintain their privileges, had repeatedly appealed to the King of Poland for redress against the Elector (the King of Poland was historically the Elector's overlord in East Prussia, though the Elector had gained a grant of absolute sovereignty in 1660). Frederick William eventually tired of their appeals to Poland, refusals to recognize his sovereignty, and other rebellious (in his view) acts. He punished the ringleaders harshly, ending the uprising and with it the old balance. According to F.L. Carsten, "By the end of the seventeenth century a powerful Hohenzollern state had arisen in north-eastern Germany in which the Estates no longer were an important political factor. They had lost their influence over civil and military appointments, were not consulted in foreign affairs and hardly in

---

6 Among other actions, the no-nonsense Elector took 2000 troops to Königsberg in 1662 and arrested his chief opponent there (Hieronymus Roth), had his old foe C.L. von Kalckstein kidnapped, tortured, and executed in 1672, and quartered troops in Königsberg in 1674 until the city paid its taxes.
military matters; above all, they no longer wielded the power of the purse, but the elector had become independent of their financial grants." At the beginning of his reign, the Great Elector had been sovereign more in name than in reality; by the end of his reign there was no doubt who was sovereign in Brandenburg-Prussia. Significantly for later events, the Lutheran Church had staunchly supported the nobility during the rebellion (c.1661-71). The Great Elector was also ahead of his time with respect to religion, introducing religious parity among Lutheran, Reformed, and Catholic churches and tolerance for most sects.

His son and successor, Frederick III, continued the consolidation of absolutism and acquired the title "King in Prussia," allowing him to keep pace with Elector August of Saxony, King of Poland from 1697, and to beat the Hanoverian prince George, King of England from 1714, to a royal throne. In addition, he established his


8 Brandenburg was an electorate of the Holy Roman Empire, and while that brought with it significant influence, the Emperor did not permit his vassals to acquire royal titles. However, Prussia, also held by the Hohenzollerns, was outside the Empire. In exchange for compensation, most notably Prussian troops to fight with the Emperor's in the War of the Spanish Succession, Emperor Leopold agreed to recognize the title. Thus after 1701 Frederick III was known as Frederick I, King in Prussia, giving him the cumbersome designation Friedrich III(I) in much of the literature.
authority over the Berlin churches more firmly and mandated that all church appointments, even to churches with noble patrons, gain the approval of his consistorium. The Elector's well-known love of opulence and flattery nearly proved the undoing of his father's efforts to strengthen the Hohenzollern dynasty, though. Frederick found himself unable to tolerate Eberhard von Danckelmann, the stable and able Calvinist friend of his father who had served as his tutor and was now Prussia's de facto prime minister. 9 Convinced by court favorites that von Danckelmann had prevented Prussia from gaining in the treaty ending the Nine Years' War, the Elector had von Danckelmann removed from authority in 1697 and put into prison. The "Three Woes," Counts Wartensleben, Wittgenstein, and Wartenberg, took over the day-to-day operation of the government; by 1710 they had nearly bankrupted Prussia while enriching themselves. Only the intervention of the Crown Prince, Friedrich Wilhelm, prevented complete ruin. He took matters into his own hands, initiating an investigation that brought the malfeasance and theft of the Woes to light and brought their dismissal. Friedrich Wilhelm would essentially

9 According to Dorwart, "Danckelmann was in effect Oberpräsident of all the colleges in B-P -- an office vacant since the death of Schwerin in 1679." Dorwart, Administrative Reforms, p. 24.
control the government from this time until his
coronation; thereafter he controlled it with an
efficiency never before seen in Brandenburg-Prussia.10

Overall, the situation in the early 1700s was
significantly different from the situation fifty years
before, for the ambitious Hohenzollern electors were
rapidly combining the formerly separate spheres of
influence into the beginnings of an effective absolutist
state. The towns, shorn from their traditional allies,
were almost powerless against the crown. The Estates,
while not in danger of losing their personal privileges,
saw the electors inexorably shaving away their political
power.11 And the Lutheran church, no longer enjoying
primacy, was quickly losing what independence it still
enjoyed to the central supervisory bodies. The already-
pressed orthodox Lutherans perceived their Pietist
brothers and sisters as still another threat. This
threat, though, was one from within. It almost certainly
appeared both more insidious -- a betrayal of their


11 The Estates did gain confirmation of their
authority over local matters, including confirmation of
the serf status of their peasants and of their authority
to administer justice within their realms from the
Electors in exchange for their loss of influence in state
matters.
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Lutheran principles and a threat to their livelihoods -- and more within their control.

Spener moved to Berlin in 1691 to serve St. Nicholas church; the controversy which his Pietism engendered had made his position in Dresden as court preacher to Elector Johann Georg of Saxony untenable. The Elector Frederick III generally followed his predecessor's policy of tolerance and was also personally relatively positively inclined toward the Pietists. The Elector also likely believed that the Pietists could be a help in achieving a union between the Reformed and Lutheran churches in Prussia. Like the other Hohenzollerns of this era, he

12 Though it is difficult to determine the exact extent, anti-Pietist sentiment had also played a role in Spener's resigning his call as supervising pastor in Frankfurt. His ministry in Dresden lasted only six years, from 1685 to 1691, and he enjoyed little apparent success there. The elector rarely attended Spener's preaching and continued his hard-living ways.

13 Frederick III (later Frederick I, King in Prussia) was the son of Frederick William the Great Elector, though it is hard to imagine a father and son more dissimilar than the no-nonsense Great Elector and the self-indulgent, ceremony-loving Frederick III. This pattern of great contrasts between father and son of course continued for two more generations.

14 Of course the exact opposite was true. The Halle Pietists, even after royal support via privileges became absolutely integral to the continued operation of their institutions, remained adamant in their view that such confessional issues were non-negotiable, for example in Friedrich I's 1704 attempt to unify the two confessions. As Deppermann stated regarding that controversy, "Franckes Haltung in der Unionsfrage zeigt, daß der hallesche Pietismus trotz seiner engen Verbindung mit dem Berliner Hof, die für ihn eine Lebensnotwendigkeit war, kein serviler Diener der
followed a strong interpretation of "cuius regio, euius religio," acting as his own bishop and not making state politics dependent upon the church.

For Pietists in the late 17th century, the rapidly-growing Prussian capital became a safe haven. The Berlin court was religiously diverse, including nobles who were strict orthodox Lutherans, reform-minded Lutherans, and some who, like their elector, held to the Reformed confession. Friedrich's court preacher, Daniel Ernst Jablonski, came from the Bohemian Brethren, and though Jablonski's lifestyle did not exhibit the modesty typical of Pietists pastors and even Pietist nobles, his views approached those of the Pietists more closely than did his actions. He and Spener built a solid relationship, despite their 25-year age difference. Spener met the Elector shortly after his arrival and appears to have made a positive impression, since Frederick forbade anti-Pietist preaching in January 1692 and required that all

Obrigkeit geworden ist." Deppermann, p. 156. It also is a powerful argument that, despite the claims of their contemporary (and our contemporary) critics, they remained firmly Lutheran.

15 Given the elector's position as a Calvinist prince in a Lutheran land, the diversity was almost certainly intentional.

16 Deppermann, Der hallesche Pietismus, p. 31.
17 Schmidt, p. 60.
disputes be submitted to the consistory. In effect that meant that the elector resolved religious disputes; Frederick would consistently support Spener in intra-church strife.

Furthermore, Spener established working relationships with a number of court nobles who were either Reformed or reform-minded Lutherans: Viet Ludwig von Seckendorff (Kanzler of the University at Halle and a well-known reform writer), the three Danckelmann brothers (Eberhard, Premierminister, Daniel Ludolph, Generalkriegskommissar, and Sylvester Jakob, Konsistorialpräsident until 1695), Geheimrat Franz Meinders, Kammerat Johann Andreas Kraut (whose family was from Halle), Paul von Fuchs (Konsistorialpräsident from 1695 with responsibility for Justice, Churches, and Schools, Oberkurator of the University of Halle from 1701), Kammerpräsident (Finance) Samuel von Chwalkowski, Geheime Rat and Magdeburger Domherr Georg Rudolf von Schweinitz, and General Gneomar von Natzmer (who would join the Crown Prince in campaigning with Marlborough in the war of the Spanish

18 Brecht, p. 354.

Succession, also Zinzendorf's stepfather). More nobles, including Christoph Kratsch, Franz Meinders, Timotheus und Ernst Schmettau, Ezechiel Spanheim, and Ehrenreich Bogislav Creutz, were sympathetic to the Pietist cause. These influential friends were a great help in gaining for Pietist proposals an approving audience with the elector. It is simply not conceivable that Prussian Pietism could have taken the form and gained the influence it did without this widespread court support. The most important ally of Pietism at the court, though, was Freiherr Carl Hildebrand von Canstein.

Canstein, born on 4 August 1667 in Lindenberg, was the son of Raban von Canstein, Geheimen Rates, Oberhofmarschall, Kammerpräsidenten and Direktor of the Kammerwesen. After a university year at Frankfurt an Oder and travel, he came to Berlin in 1688. After hearing a lecture on Spener's idea, he adopted Pietist views and became a close ally of Spener in Berlin. Introduced by Spener to Francke in 1697, Canstein would become a supporter and friend of the younger Pietist


leader as well. Correspondent and confidante to Francke, Canstein essentially became the representative of Halle Pietism at the court and would be indispensable for Pietism's early successes there.22

When Francke gained his appointment(s) in Halle, the Pietists' allies at court were a ready circle of supporters for the new arrival. Spener, long interested in education reform, had been instrumental in the building and development of Halle, in concert with his ally von Seckendorff, its first Kanzler. In fact, Spener, Seckendorff, Eberhard von Danckelmann, Kraut, and J.J. Breithaupt, another Pietist who had been the first professor of theology called to Halle, all played a role in obtaining Francke's call. Yet, given the overwhelming number of orthodox Lutherans holding pulpits and professorships in Brandenburg-Prussia, the Pietists remained a sidestream of the flow of religious life. As Brecht has noted, nothing was guaranteed them, and faced with this uncertainty, the continuing support of the prince was essential.23

22 He also strongly advocated distribution of Bibles in German, and because of his leadership and financial support the Canstein Bible Institute at Halle became one of the largest publishing houses in Europe, selling Bibles at prices so low that occasionally even Francke objected.

23 "Sie war nicht ein für allemal garantiert. Die Pietisten mußten sich unter wechselnden Konstellationen immer wieder neu um sie bemühen. Sie hatten dabei keine Bedenken, den Staat für ihre Sache zu beanspruchen. Das
Elector Frederick III promoted the Spenerian Pietist von Fuchs to First Minister in 1697, replacing the sacked Danckelmann -- an extremely fortunate change for Francke and the Pietists, given that the "Three Woes" were ascendant. Also in 1697, Francke applied for and was granted a privilege which freed the Anstalten from the excise tax. In October 1698 the cornerstone of a new Hauptgebäude for the Anstalten was laid, and more privileges followed in the succeeding months which not only protected the institutions but permitted them to engage in businesses as diverse as publishing, drugmaking, and dry goods.

By the early 1700s, the Pietist programs were flourishing and attacks by orthodox Lutherans and their allies in the nobility had abated. Francke visited the court in Berlin from 14 August to 16 October 1702, hoping to have Halle's privileges renewed and widened. With the help of von Fuchs, von Chwalkowski, and other allies, he

Resultat war die bedeutsame Verbindung von 'Preuβentum und Pietismus', ohne die Franckes Werk nicht zu denken ist." Brecht, p. 453.

24 Hinrichs makes his view on this quite clear: "Es war ein großes Glück für Francke, daß nach dem Sturze Danckelmanns einer der fähigsten Minister der Großen Kurfürsten, Paul von Fuchs, ein persönlicher Gönner Speners, nachdem er von allem eigentlich politischen Einfluß abgedrängt wär, das Kirchen- und Schulressort erhielt, um das sich der neue Machthaber Wartenberg nicht kümmerte." Hinrichs, Preuβentum, p. 23.
was able to fulfill all his goals.25 The Halle institutions would now be able to teach the sons of nobles and burgers as well as orphans and poor children, plus not only were Halle teachers and students henceforth freed from taxes but the excise taxes (30%) paid by the Halle institutions on building materials were refunded them. After this came joint ventures with businessmen to manufacture items ranging from stockings to plates and also a privilege to operate a newspaper. Their actions say that the Pietists believed Godly hard work would change the world, and given that they enjoyed the support of their king, Francke and his colleagues were justified in seeing a promising future for their programs.

In 1703, when Friedrich Wilhelm was fifteen, Francke's enterprises in Halle had enjoyed five years of growth under the privilege of the elector. The death of the Pietist minister von Fuchs on 5 August 1704, however, weakened Francke's tie to the elector.26 Spener's death

25 "Die Privilegienwünsche Franckes wurden von der Berliner Regierung in vollem Unfange erfüllt."
Deppermann, Der hallesche Pietismus, p. 144.

26 For example, Francke's 1704 project for a royal commission that would conduct a visitation, school reform, justice reform, and poor relief (all guided by Pietists, of course) did not come to fruition. It also opened the door further for the "Three Woes," Wittgenstein, Wartenberg, and Wartensleben (above), and opponents of Pietism such as Marquard Ludwig von Printzen, who took over von Fuchs' responsibilities as Lehsdirektor, Chef des Kirchen- und Schulwesens und
on 5 February 1705, Kammerpräsident Samuel von Chwalkowski's on 30 October 1705, and Geheime Rat Georg Rudolf von Schweinitz's suicide on 2 November 1707 all damaged the Pietists' relations to the court further. After a brief warming of relations, Frederick essentially ended the affiliation in 1709 when he banned Francke from Berlin, thinking that the Pietist pastor bore responsibility for Queen Sophie Luise's instability. Sophie Luise, "the Venus of Mecklenburg," was Frederick's third wife, after Elisabeth-Henrietta of Hesse-Kassel and Sophie Charlotte of Hanover, the mother of Friedrich Wilhelm. The new queen was at best unbalanced, and Francke unsuccessfully attempted to temper her extraordinarily emotional Lutheranism. Friedrich Wilhelm also became extremely prejudiced against Francke because of this incident and vowed that once he succeeded to the throne, he would not abide Francke and the Pietist institutions to remain.27

Protektor der Sozietät der Wissenschaften. Dankel Ludolf von Danckelmann, who remained a friend of Pietism until his own death in 1709, took von Fuchs' duties as Präsidium des brandenburgischen Konsistoriums and Oberkuratorium der Universität Halle.

27 An observer at the court reported that Friedrich Wilhelm said "Nun mag Francke mit seinem Hause wandern." G. Kramer, Neue Beiträge zur Geschichte August Hermann Franckes (Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1875), p. 142.
The Crown Prince's attitude was a grave threat to the Pietists and their efforts, more serious than any previous menace. Already Friedrich Wilhelm was recognizable as a man of determination and efficiency -- if he vowed to be rid of the Pietists at his succession, so it would be. While he probably based his bias on an incorrect perception of Francke's relations with the queen and an ignorance of the essential agreement of their objectives, there is no reason to believe that his understanding or his attitude would have changed without encouragement.28 Indeed, actions by the state during this period, such as the 21 April 1711 prohibition of

28 Friedrich Wilhelm in fact recalled his early mistrust of the Halle Pietists and their Anstalten, as well as his changing attitude, for Francke's son and successor, Gotthilf August. The latter spent a week at Wusterhausen in October 1727, after A.H. Francke's death, and recorded their discussions (in a combination of direct and indirect quotes). "...Rex aber hat es umgekehret, und daher zu dem neuen rescript Anlaß genommen. Darauf kam Rex auf die Anstalten, sagte, wie er ihnen erst gar nicht gewogen gewesen, und sie nicht würde haben stehen lassen; er habe sie aber genau geprüft, und gefunden, daß nicht allein der Endzweck gut und auf Gottes Ehre ziele, sondern auch die Frucht davon sich in seinem ganzen Lande ausgebreitet; man solle gedenken, wir hätten wenigstens 200 praecptores, an denen allen mit besondern Fleiß gearbeitet werde, da müsse ja etwas gutes herauskommen u. Und er danke nicht allein Gott, sondern auch gewissen Menschen, die ihn gewarnet, da er und verfolgen wollen, er möchte sich nicht präciptiren." ibid., p. 177.
collegia pietatis in Herzogtum Magdeburg, make it clear that the situation was grim for the Pietists.

Francke and the other Pietist leaders realized that only an accord with the headstrong Crown Prince could assure institutional survival. Friedrich Wilhelm did pass through Halle in August 1711, but while the Pietists' structures made enough of an impression that he remarked, "That is not [just] a building! [It is] a whole street of buildings!," his antipathy was such that he did not speak with Francke, instead sending for an escort from the Anstalten to whom he could direct his questions. The answers that the Crown Prince received to his questions, combined with the substantial appearance of the buildings, apparently favorably affected his opinion regarding the usefulness of the Pietists. This change did not last, though, for while Natzmer worked diligently at court to engender favor for his Halle brethren, a representative of the Magdeburg Estates worked as diligently and more effectively to stoke Friedrich Wilhelm's mistrust of the Pietists.


30 According to several sources, he said, "Ist das nicht ein Bauen! Eine ganze Gasse Häuser!"

31 Canstein wrote a lengthy letter detailing Natzmer's efforts and the counter-efforts of the Magdeburg representative. Whatever else the Pietists may have been, they were certainly not political novices, as
Among other decisions, the Crown Prince decided to prohibit Pietists from serving as pastors in Hanover and Lüneburg; were this policy to continue or even expand, opportunities for the Pietists to carry out their program (and ultimately the University of Halle itself, or at least their control of it) would disappear.32

Having missed one chance to meet Friedrich Wilhelm and improve his situation, Francke composed a document in August 1711 with the Crown Prince in mind that outlined Pietist beliefs in general and the usefulness of the Halle institutions in particular.33 On Canstein's advice, the Pietist leadership decided that this piece would not be sent directly to the Crown Prince but would be passed along to Natzmer in the hopes that Natzmer could meet with his friend Friedrich Wilhelm and help bridge the gap between the Prince and the Pietists.34 Canstein and Francke polished the statement, trusting their careful efforts to influence Friedrich Wilhelm's opinion show. The letter is printed in Th. Wotschke, "Die Gewinnung des Kronprinzen Friedrich Wilhelm für den halleschen Pietismus 1711," Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift 41 (1930), pp. 692-6.

32 ibid., p. 694.

33 He may have only edited an earlier document; see below.

34 "Canstein war es, der auf einen besseren Weg verfiel, um die Brücke zum Kronprinzen zu schlagen." Hinrichs, Preussentum, p. 95. Natzmer was an old army buddy of Friedrich Wilhelm's. See Deppermann, Der hallesche Pietismus, p. 166.
that the Pietist general would deliver it with constructive commentary. 35

35 The identity of the document is not clear. According to Deppermann, the final version of the piece that Francke wrote for Friedrich Wilhelm on 23 Aug 1711 regarding the usefulness of the Halle Anstalten is a document that until last year was at Merseburg (Rep 52/131b1, now in the GSPK, Berlin), and the piece that is published in Kramer, Neue Beiträge, on pages 131-6 was not actually given to the Crown Prince. Deppermann, Der hallesche Pietismus, p. 166. Hinrichs suggested that it was the 1711 version of the document known as "Der Große Aufsatz," because that version does not include a section regarding future projects known to be deleted from the document prepared for Friedrich Wilhelm. Hinrichs, FWI, pp. 592ff, and Preußen. p. 95. Podczeck, however, editor of a critical edition of "Der Große Aufsatz," did not take a firm position regarding the debate, though he noted the views of the various scholars involved and some difficulties with Hinrichs' view. Podczeck, p. 20.

The Kramer piece, which while it may not be the final version used to win the prince does indicate the general direction of Francke's thought at the time regarding what would be useful to the Pietist cause, contains one particularly interesting passage: "So noch weiter euer königlichen Hoheit jemand beibringen wollen, ich hielte verbotene conventicula, bin ich mir dergleichen im geringsten nicht bewußt. Denn hier wird niemand auch nur mit dem allergeringsten Schein dergleichen mich beschuldingen können, da ich ja als ein ordentlicher und öffentlicher Lehrer im Amt stehe, und vermöge dessen schuldig bin, so öffentlich als besonders die Leute zu lehren und zu ermahnen, nach Apostelgesch. 20.20. So bin ich auch mit öffentlicher Arbeit dergestalt überhäuset, daß ich zu sonst auch zulässigen privat-conventibus keine Zeit finde." Francke acknowledges that others are accusing him of holding illegal conventicles and replies that he would not do so, that he is a law-abiding teacher, and that in any case he was so busy with his work that he didn't have time to hold private meetings. A stress on utility is clearly apparent. Kramer, p. 134.

Lampertus Gedicke, in Potsdam may have played a role in this process as well. A book, perhaps "Footsteps," was sent from Halle to then-Crown Prince Friedrich Wilhelm in November 1712. Natzmer also took a personal interest in this matter, perhaps acting as the courier. Gedicke wrote Francke, "Schließlich habe nebst hertzlichn Grüß von dem herrn Roloff zuerlassen. Der Kronprinz hat
Three conclusions are appropriate here. First, it is apparent that at this time, Francke and his colleagues envisioned Halle Pietism as a universal movement, i.e. a reform movement without borders. Given that his audience was the Crown Prince of Brandenburg-Prussia, a man who would soon succeed to the throne of a minor European power that was threatened from virtually every direction and whose overwhelming concern was the preservation of the realm, it would seem logical for Francke to have abandoned any universal aims, or at least to have downplayed them in his statement(s). The fact that he did not take this easier course is strong evidence that at this time the Pietists had a sincere commitment to reform of the entire world. Second, Francke clearly based his appeal to the Crown prince on the utility of the institutions; the Pietists were savvy enough politically to recognize that efficiency would be the


36 Regardless of which document one supports as being the "genuine Aufsatz," the dedication of the Pietists to universal reform is quite apparent.
measure of value in the upcoming reign. Third, the form that the Pietists selected, a carefully planned campaign using all the assets at the Pietists' disposal, suggests that they believed it remained possible to convince a headstrong prince who had vowed to be rid of them of the mutuality of their interests. Francke's Aufsatz, carefully shaped for the Crown Prince, and the lobbying that went along with it, was the work of a group that believed its place to be in the mainstream of Prussian progress and that no obstacle was too great for their Godly work to overcome.

Natzmer reached Berlin on 20 October 1711, and his conversation with Friedrich Wilhelm on 7 November was a success for the Pietists, though Friedrich Wilhelm

37 The document that Deppermann supports as the "Aufsatz" is titled "Nutzen der zu Glaucha an Halle seither Anno 1695 gemachten Anstalten," and it indeed puts forward a utilitarian argument for the worth of the Anstalten. Deppermann, Der Hallesche Pietismus, pp. 165-6. In addition to those mentioned above, there is also a Francke piece from this period which appears to be another alternative in Hermann Lorenzen, August Hermann Francke: Pädagogische Schriften (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1957), p. 121. In a similar fashion to the others, it stresses utility and universal reform. Finally, a document exists in the GSPK, Berlin, in Rep. 52/131b2 (n. 314) entitled "Nutzen der zu Glaucha an Halle gemachten Anstalten," undated but in a binder of documents from the period 1710-13, that appears also to be a 23-point case for the worth of the Anstalten. Without address, signature, date, or opening and closing formalities, it is perhaps the document that was given to Natzmer by Canstein and Francke to prepare him for his talk with the Crown Prince, for there would seem to be few other reasons why such an unpolished document would have found its way to Berlin and into the Prussian archives.
instructed the Pietists that they needed to keep him informed of their actions. Still, the general's words (and the institutions at Halle) started a shift in the thoughts of the future Soldier King, who shortly afterward would tell Canstein, "Professor Francke is an honest man, of that I am completely certain. Natzmer made it clear to me, and I am sure he tells no lies. With my own eyes I have seen how many houses are built." Francke's relief at hearing the news of this shift was undoubtedly great; he soon wrote to Friedrich Wilhelm expressing his thanks and offering his best and unconditional wishes for God's blessings in the coming year. The Pietists likely did hope that God would bless the crown prince, and they almost surely were convinced that God's blessing was upon them, for they had passed from a desperate situation into one filled with hope. Yet Friedrich Wilhelm maintained reservations about the Pietists, especially on the issue of the


39 "Prof Francke ist ein erlicher Mann, des bin ich völlig überzeugt. Mit meinem eigenen Augen habe ich gesehen, wie viel häuser erbaut. Die Länge beider Straßen machen sie aus." Wotschke, p. 697. Here also we see Friedrich Wilhelm's focus on economic improvements.

40 The letter is printed in Kramer, Neue Beiträge, pp. 136-7.
military. It is unlikely that the Pietist leadership believed their position totally secure, for these meetings had shown them that the heir was a far more dynamic (and volatile) person than anyone with whom they had dealt before.

Two years had passed since Francke's banishment from Berlin, and while the Pietists' careful maneuvers had begun to reshape the prince's opinion, not for almost two more years would Francke have the opportunity to make the Pietist case personally. Friedrich Wilhelm assumed the throne at his father's death, on 26 February 1713. On 12 April he traveled to Halle to visit Francke, taking with him Fürst Leopold von Anhalt-Dessau, Generals Finckenstein and Gersdorff, and the younger Danckelmann. An anonymous transcript of the meeting survives, probably written by a student or a younger associate of Francke's, for it displays particular deference to Herr Professor Francke.

The conversations indicate that Friedrich Wilhelm met Francke with three topics, almost three tests, in

41 See below.
42 Oddly, he did not take Natzmer with him. Klepper, Der König und die Stillen im Lande, p. 23.
43 ibid., pp. 22-39, and Kramer, Neue Beiträge, pp. 142-150. While the transcriber may have erred or polished the words, such possible glosses are not a particular problem, for the subject matter itself proves the essential points.
mind: the military, economic concerns, and political alliances. As stated above, the new king was beginning to increase the army. Before the General Directory of 1723, the military was really the only part of the government over which the king held exclusive control, thus enlarging it increased the king's authority as well as Prussia's security. Compounding this increase were the cuts in the court's size and budget, which decreased the authority of the Estates. Before he granted royal privileges to Francke, Friedrich Wilhelm logically would want to know the Pietist pastor would be an ally, or at least not an opponent, with respect to these vital themes.

Much of the transcript is the kind of discussion one might expect on a tour. Such seemingly mundane questions as, "How many eat here?" and, "Who gives the examinations?" are actually quite significant, for here the King tested Francke's competence and Francke attempted to convince the king of the soundness of his work. Friedrich Wilhelm, planning to rebuild the land

44 Downing's argument that the Hohenzollern monarchs had little choice but to enlarge and modernize the army along the lines of what Michael Roberts first referred to as the "Military Revolution" if they wished for their state to survive is worth recalling. Whether or not the king's desire to build a godly Prussia was sincere, he was bright enough to recognize that without a substantial modern army, there likely would not be a Prussia.
and build new industries, also looked for ideas. When Francke displayed a new building, the king asked whether Francke had hired a contractor. Francke replied that he had used one at the beginning and then fired the man for corrupt work, certainly welcome words to the economy-minded king.45 The king asked repeatedly, "How much?" and "How many?" The builder of Wusterhausen checked his prospective partner over very thoroughly.

There are also crucial passages which address the king's three immediate goals. In one, Friedrich Wilhelm questioned Francke on his expenditures and his sources of funds; notably, Francke did not mention the nobles as a source of income.46 Friedrich Wilhelm's concern with the military is also readily apparent. At one point he and Francke were discussing the orphans living at Halle and their educations. The Pietist pastor noted how some students studied and others received training as tradespeople. The king asked if any could become lawyers; Francke replied that he knew of none, but that

45 FW: Hat er keinen Baumeister dazu gebraucht?

46 FW: Wieviel kostet das Gebäude wohl?
AHF: 40 000 Taler sind bisher verbaut.
FW: Woher is das alles kommen?
AHF: Das ist alles so nach und nach zusammengekommen. Ich habe manchmal noch nicht das Geld gehabt zur Stunde des Auszahlens. Denn versteckte ich mich. ibid., p. 31., also p. 32.
they especially studied theology. Friedrich Wilhelm then asked if none became soldiers; Francke answered that a tradesperson could easily become a soldier.47 In another, the king asked, "What do you believe about war?" Francke replies, "Your Majesty must protect the land, but I am called to preach: Blessed are the peacemakers," using the Biblical phrase. The king pressed, asking what Francke's people believed on the topic, then asking whether one could be blessed and be a soldier. Francke replied, "I know some Christian soldiers. I have more friends and supporters among the soldiers than among the preachers." Francke's somewhat indirect, ironic reply displays his political savvy. Even though Friedrich Wilhelm had only been king a short time, Francke's good connections at court had undoubtedly made him aware of the king's ambitious plans for the military, making a condemnation of the military imprudent for one seeking the king's favor. Francke's answer, short of a full endorsement of the military, apparently satisfied the king. It also shows a constructive use of irony, reminding the king of the troubles Francke and the

Pietists had with the mainstream Lutherans.48 Also regarding opponents, when Francke mentioned that he had enemies, the king replied, "Tell me, who is against you?" "Write to me only, if someone is against you, I will be your protector."49

Afterward, Francke must have felt that he had accomplished his objective.50 The dialogue shows, and the years of careful maneuvering certainly confirm, that the king's sanction of their institutions was a paramount Pietist goal. Likely Francke believed that the obvious vibrancy and efficiency of the Halle institutions would win the king's backing, once Natzmer's work prompted a visit. Francke's statement of his beliefs also won Friedrich Wilhelm's approval. He said, "I am of the

48 FW: Was hält er vom Kriege?
FW: Das ist gut. Aber seine Leute, hält er die nicht vom Kriege ab.
AHF: Mit theologischen Studenten werden, wie Ew. Maj. selber wohl wissen, Kirchen und Schüleramter besetzt.
FW: Aber die Jungens, macht er denen nicht weis, dass sie der Teufel holen werde, wenn sie Soldaten werden?

49 ibid., p. 35.

50 Deppermann concluded that Francke had accomplished his goal: "Während dieser Besichtigung wurde Friedrich Wilhelm I. endgültig für den halleschen Pietismus gewonnen." Deppermann, p. 168.
opinion that God cannot unite with a heart that is consumed with fleshly desires, and that the Holy Spirit flees from such a person, and that one to whom this happens cannot come to the realm of God."51 These words found a ready audience with the king, who despite his prodigious eating, drinking, and hunting habits favored asceticism (at least in the abstract) throughout his life.

The Pietist efforts of these years had three consequential results. First, Friedrich Wilhelm, who had declared that he would destroy the Pietist institutions, now was their protector.52 Second, the Pietists, with a reaffirmed and strengthened royal privilege, moved further from away from being a cross-current of Prussian life toward the mainstream. Finally, the Pietists, while maintaining their overseas efforts, increased their efforts to make the Prussian state the realm of God.53

51 "Ich bin der Meinung, dass sich Gott mit einem Herzen nicht vereinigen kann, das fleischlichen Lüsten ergeben ist, und dass der heilige Geist einem solchen Menschen flieht, und dass das tun, nicht in das Reich Gottes kommen." ibid., p. 30.

52 Hinrichs, of course, argued that from this time forward Pietism became a state religion. "Die Begegnung mit Friedrich Wilhelm I. sollte für den Halleschen Pietismus eine entscheidende Wendung bringen: er wurde aus einer Bewegung gewissermaßen Staatsreligion." Hinrichs, Pietismus und Preußentum, p. 100.

53 Remember that neither Spener nor Francke were native Prussians but rather religious dissidents who found a home in the tolerant realm.
As Friedrich Wilhelm's father had granted a royal privilege to Francke in 1698, one might hypothesize that the change occurred at that time. However, review of the Pietist efforts between 1698 and 1713 shows that their work was either local in Halle or directed beyond Prussia. Furthermore, despite their contacts at court and royal protection the Pietists had still been outsiders; Francke's banishment from Berlin and the Pietist efforts at regaining favor prove the point here. From this time forward, the Halle Pietists would begin a new stage in their efforts, working as partners of the man who had so threatened their movement's very existence and shaping Prussian society to a greater extent than probably even they had believed possible.

54 The Halle Pietists were among the earliest Christian groups to commission missionaries whose work paralleled our current understanding of the term. See esp. Stoeffler, Sattler.
CHAPTER FIVE

Partners in Prussia

Pietism enjoyed a secure place in Brandenburg-Prussia by late 1713. The years of diligent effort at court, churches, and the Anstalten had finally borne fruit, and the stage was set for expansion under the protection of the new king. The opportunity also existed for cooperative efforts with the monarchy, given Friedrich Wilhelm's obvious interest in renewal and reform of Prussian government and society.

Some of these cooperative efforts are relatively well-known. Education and the care of children were one natural arena for partnership. For example, Francke served as a consultant during the construction of an orphanage for the children of soldiers on the Halle model in Potsdam, though he chose not to accept the king's request that he take charge of the project himself. 1

Probably the most remarkable and productive arena of

---

1 Hinrichs, Preußentum und Pietismus, pp. 167ff. See also below.
cooperation was pastoral appointments, with Halle
students gaining calls in large and growing numbers.2

The repopulating and rebuilding of shattered East
Prussia provided other avenues for collaboration. Fairly
early in his reign, Friedrich Wilhelm seized upon this
opportunity and instructed the Lithuanian Cammer to
cooperate with Francke so that his subjects might be
better instructed in a Godly life.3 Several Pietist
professors and pastors in Königsberg, including Heinrich
Lysius (also mentioned by name in the 1718 instruction)
and later George Friedrich Rogall, Abraham Wolff, and

2 See Chapter Six for documentary and numerical
examinations of this topic.

3 "Wir haben Uns von der hiezu verordneten
Commission unterthänigsten Vortrag thun lassen, in was
Zustande sich Unser hiesiges Lithausches Cammer-Wesen
befindet. Und da Wir allergnädigst resolviret, es damit
auf einen bessern Fuss zu setzen, auch wohl erkennen,
dass die Cammer unmöglich in Ordnung und Richtigkeit
kommen kan, wofern es nicht in den Aemtern in bessere
Ordnung gebracht und gute Beambte bestellet werden, so
wollen wir zuvörderst

1. Damit Unsere bäuerlichen Unterthanen desto mehr
zu Gott geführet werden, und also Segen und Gedeyen
erlangen mögen, dass in allen grossen Dörfern
Schulmeistere bestellet, und einem jeden eine halbe hube
Land, frey von Zinss, Contribution und Einquartierung von
Unsere wüsten Huben zu seinem Unterhalt eingegeben werden
solle, Wir haben auch an Unser Samländisches consistorium
rescribiret, deshalb gehörige weitere Verfügung zu thun,
wie ingleichen unserem Hofprediger Dr. Lysio (sic) und
Magister Francke in Halle aufgegeben, wegen nöthiger
subjectorum besorgt zu seyn, wozu ihr dann und damit
unsere allergnädigste intention erreichtet werde, eures
ohrts alles dienende mit bezutragen habt, und 2. . . .
[document continues with other instructions]" To the
Lithuanian Cammer, 2 July 1718, reprinted in Stadelmann,
pp. 234-5.
F.A. Schultz, worked diligently to enhance Pietist influence and programs in the parishes, schools, and university as well despite considerable local opposition.4 The Lutheran pastors of the region, in conjunction with their allies among the nobility, were quite successful in impeding or at least retarding the Pietist efforts, even bringing about the removal of Lysius from his position as inspector of church and schools on 22 Sept 1721.5 Despite that, because of the king's belief that East Prussia and Lithuania were God's special charge to him, the willingness of the Pietists to join his efforts, and the energy of both parties, the partners achieved many of their goals for the once-shattered East.6


5 Terveen, p. 92. Though Francke wrote in support of Lysius, his words proved less than decisive. August Hermann Francke to Friedrich Wilhelm I, letter of 15 February 1721. AFSt/H A175:41.

6 Regarding Friedrich Wilhelm's view of this task, see for example Max Beheim-Schwarzbach, Friedrich Wilhelms I. Kolonisationswerk in Litauen (Königsberg, 1879). The king, when told that more colonists would be coming to Lith, replied "Sehr gut. Gottlob! Was thut Gott dem Brandenburgischen Hause für Gnade! Denn dieses gewiss von Gott kommt!" ibid., p. 203. Terveen is quite positive regarding the importance of Pietism for East
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What was the nature of this alliance? First, the dynamics of Pietist-Hohenzollern collaboration well illustrate that, in modern corporate terms, theirs was a limited partnership -- a joint venture -- and not a merger or a takeover, however friendly. Again like a corporate partnership, its formation required months and even years of effort to formulate the terms. Formal relationships required terms that were stated very explicitly, and these reflect the era's simultaneously medieval and modern character. For example, the Halle institutions had received a series of privileges from King Friedrich I, privileges that were absolutely critical if the Halle institutions were to continue their expansion. Because of this fact, the tensions between Halle and Friedrich Wilhelm at the time, and the political situation, the 10 May 1713 renewal of these existing privileges required a considerable amount of correspondence between Halle and Berlin.7

Even matters that to us would appear relatively straightforward often became quite complex, involving the king and consuming considerable time and stacks of

---

Prussia: "Zweifellos hat der Pietismus August Hermann Franckes für den ostpreußische Provinz eine außerordentliche Bedeutung gehabt." As the following chapter illustrates, however, Pietist influence in the east was actually slight in comparison with some regions of the realm. Terveen, p. 117.

7 GSPK Rep. 52, nr. 131b2.
parchment. Augusta Sophia Gräfin zu Löwenstein-Wertheim left part of her inheritance (apparently 8833 Thaler) to the Halle institutions and named Francke as her executor.8 Because another will (also from June 1719) existed, however, a dispute ensued between her family and Halle that stretched into late 1720. The situation forced Francke to write at least four letters to the king arguing Halle's case. The tone and language of these letters depict a partnership that, at least as late as 1720, remained limited.9

Second, it was a partnership tested by continued opposition from a number of quarters. Friedrich Wilhelm's ambitious program of spending cutbacks and bureaucratic reorganization flew in the face of a court and nobility that preferred the old order and dug in its heels to impede change. Halle Pietism, too, faced animosity even after it became clear that the king's sympathies lay with it. On the one hand, the Halle magistrates and Magdeburg Estates watched the financial and business operations of Francke and his associates closely, hoping to find the Pietists in violation of the terms of their privileges, and while the king generally supported the Pietists, the strife certainly diverted

8 GSPK Rep. 52, nr. 131b2.
9 See below.
time and energy from their other initiatives. On the other, Pietism's theological enemies continued their attacks, often from outside the realm (and thus Friedrich Wilhelm's reach). Theological strife lay as close as the streets of Halle, however. The town pastors of Halle had never been particularly favorably inclined toward Francke and his colleagues at the university. When one of them, a Christian August Roth, began holding theological lectures, he initiated a controversy that lasted throughout the 1710s. Roth, a diaconate at St. Moritz church, hoped to become a member of the faculty and petitioned the king accordingly. Friedrich Wilhelm in turn contacted the faculty for its opinion thereof. The Halle faculty's response was so negative and their complaints against Roth so strong that the king issued an order in December 1714 that no one outside the faculty should hold lectures and that Roth should not discredit

10 GSPK, Rep. 52, nr. 131b2 has several examples of these disputes. See also Hinrichs, pp. 220ff.

11 For example, the Halle Theological Faculty wrote to the king on 24 April 1714, complaining about the attacks of the Wittenberg Theologians. He responded to their request quickly, sending a letter to the King of Saxony/Poland on 3 May 1714 regarding theological strife and especially "Löschern" (V. E. Lösch), "associated preachers," and their criticism of Halle. GSPK, Rep. 52, nr. 159n3(a) (1699-1723).

12 See Deppermann and Hinrichs, Preußen, p. 220ff.
the University. Despite this prohibition, Roth apparently persisted, for the Theological Faculty complained again in 1715, 1716, and 1719, and the king eventually reissued the order. The strife continued, though, with the faculty at one point even suggesting that perhaps Roth be arrested for his transgressions. Friedrich Wilhelm was apparently none too concerned about the problem, though, as he simply referred later complaints to the Magdeburg authorities, hardly a body that could be expected to pursue the matter with much diligence.

Third, the relationship between Halle Pietism and the Hohenzollern monarchy during the period 1713-27 did not stem from the two principals spending large amounts of time together. In fact, they met less often than do

13 Letters of Friedrich Wilhelm to Halle University Faculty, 28 October 1714, Friedrich Wilhelm to Halle Theological Faculty, 3 November and 3 December 1714, Halle Theological Faculty to Friedrich Wilhelm, 27 November and 27 November 1714 (2 letters), and Halle University Faculty to Friedrich Wilhelm, 3 December 1714. The University Faculty supported the Theological Faculty. GSPK, Rep. 52, nr. 159n3(a) (1699-1723).

14 11 September 1719. He also referred a 16 August 1721 complaint from Halle regarding Roth back to the Magdeburg Regierung on 28 August 1721. GSPK, Rep. 52, nr. 159n3(a) (1699-1723).

15 Friedrich Wilhelm may well have been using the possibility of appointing Roth to the theological faculty as a tool with which to remind the Halle theologians who was king. Roth remained at St. Moritz church, curiously later bearing the title "Sachsen-Weisenfelsischen Kirchenraths." Dreyhaupt, p. 1087.
many late 20th century national leaders -- the two had only five "summits," if one could even use that term for their generally short meetings, during the fourteen years between Friedrich Wilhelm's succession and Francke's death. The first was Friedrich Wilhelm's 12 April 1713 tour of the Halle Anstalten, a gathering that was admittedly indispensable for the establishment of a relationship of trust between the new king and Francke.16

The next month Francke, representing the University, traveled to Berlin along with Geh. Rath Stryck for the funeral of Friedrich I, preaching at St. Nicolai Church on 7 May and then at the Berlin garrison church on 14 May.17 Francke also enjoyed an half-hour audience before the king during his visit, and the king not only renewed and extended the privileges of the Anstalten during the visit but resolved the issue of possibly appointing the Reformed theologian Heyden to the Halle faculty in favor of the Pietists. It was also agreed that Lutheran and Reformed students would be separate at the "royal free

16 See Chapter Four.

17 According to Kramer, it was after Francke's sermon at the Garrison Church (on the theme that one who has not the spirit of God is not blessed even if he is a great lord in the world, but that one who has the spirit of God is blessed, even if he wretched in the world's eyes) that the king remarked that Prof. Francke was a good man who spoke the truth. Kramer, Neue, pp. 152. Regarding the visit as a whole, see Kramer, pp. 151 ff, and also Hinrichs, Frei§entum und Pietismus, p. 112.
table" at Halle, and that only funds collected at
Reformed parishes were to go to support Reformed
students. Francke agreed to donate 160 Thaler for their
support in exchange for being permitted to keep the two
groups separate. Furthermore, the king promised his
emphatic protection of Francke in the latter's efforts to
serve God's honor and Brandenburg-Prussia.

After these two successes, however, it would be more
than six years before the next series of visits, and
those were quite brief. Canstein fell ill in early
August 1719, leading Francke to travel to Berlin on 16
August. Canstein died on 19 August 1719; Francke
remained in the capital until 21 September. One year
later Francke made another visit to Berlin, again

18 Deppermann, p. 171. The question of whether
Francke had fulfilled the terms of this agreement would
be raised by Francke's opponents. The controversy lasted
until at least 1722, at which time Friedrich Wilhelm
issued an order (5 January) respecifying Halle's
obligations under the agreement. GSPK, Abt. 1., Rep. 52,
Nr. 159 n 3a, and AFSt/H, A176. The king's displeasure
over this matter may possibly lay behind his relative
nonchalance in the matter of Roth and his theological
lectures, which was occurring throughout this period. It
is also likely that he was attempting to maintain a
balanced position with respect to the local authorities
in Magdeburg, whose antipathies toward Pietism remained
strong, and the Halle Pietists themselves.

19 While in Berlin, Francke wrote a number of
letters to the king which lamented Canstein's death,
reminded the king of the good work being done in Halle,
and asked for Friedrich Wilhelm's continued support
against Pietism's opponents. AFSt/H, A173. He also had a
brief audience with the king. Wolff, "Ist der Glaube...,
p. 71.
speaking briefly with the king while he was there.20 Then on 4 October 1720 the king traveled to the Halle Stiftungen for an inspection.21 Not until 1725 would they meet in person again, despite the fact that the intervening five years were arguably the most productive of their partnership. Francke, a pastor and professor, became a trusted adviser to the uncouth and unlettered Soldier King not through the shared experiences of the parade ground and barracks, or even by serving as a court preacher or army chaplain, but because of their common priorities.

In fact, Francke's visit to Berlin and Potsdam in 1725 illustrates the reciprocity that typifies the latter years of his partnership with Friedrich Wilhelm. Friedrich Wilhelm's 1722 visit to Halle had convinced him of the need for and potential utility of an orphanage on the Halle model, and though Francke had demurred when the king asked him to supervise the military orphanage, he did agree to act as consultant. Over a two-year period, the king built an orphanage to house 200 children, and Francke worked to fill its leadership positions with

20 He wrote the king on 30 May, requesting an appointment for 3 June. AFSt/H A174:56. Wolff, p. 71, confirms that the audience occurred.

21 Francke's letter of 12 October (12 June in the catalog) thanking the king for his time is in AFSt/H A174:151.
trusted Halle people. While Francke was in Potsdam, he
inspected the orphanage, reviewed the documents governing
its operation, and reported his views thereon to the
king. He also wrote a number of letters recommending
candidates for appointments and spoke with the king
regarding spiritual issues.

Fourth, the considerable correspondence between the
two men makes clear their mutual respect and shared
calling of service to God. The difference in rank of
their earthly stations is usually apparent, but their
trust is perceptible as well. The programmatic writings,
such as the Große Aufsatz, are just that, and as such
offer few insights into the relationship. In most cases
the official documents are quite formal, even formulaic,
in their language. For example, this closing of a 17
June 1719 letter from Francke to Friedrich Wilhelm
regarding the will of Augusta Sophia Gräfin zu
Löwenstein-Wertheim:

22 See Hannelore Lehmann, "Pietismus in Potsdam im
Spiegel von Briefen an August Hermann Francke (1663-1727)
und seinen Sohn Gotthilf August (1696-1769)," Jahrbuch
für brandenburgische Landesgeschichte 44 (1993), p. 51,
and also Ludwig Lehmann, Bilder aus der Kirchengeschichte
der Mark Brandenburg (Berlin: Vaterländische Verlags-

23 AFSt/H A179:36, AFSt/H A179:37.

24 AFSt A179:27, AFSt/H A179:31, AFSt/H A179:37
include such recommendations. See Chapter Six.

allerunterthänigsten fürbitterbey Gott August Hermann Francke.25

Similarly, this 20 Jan 1722 letter from Francke to the king regarding the support of Reformed students at Halle closed with these words:

Wann ich hiedurch nichts anders suche, als eine albegdst u. höchst nöthige confirmation der nur schon vn Ehr. K. Majst. verlichenen hohen Gnade; als zweiffele ich nicht an der Allergndgstn deferizung, und bitte Gott den allerhöchsten daß er diese u. alle andern nur vorhin geschene begnadigung Eu. K.M. in Zeit u.. Ewigkeit vergelten will.26

Francke certainly recognized that on most matters he needed to obey the wishes of the king, and would acknowledge that in his letters. When he was offered a call to move from his parish in Glaucha to St. Ulrich's in Halle, he sent a letter to Friedrich Wilhelm that made that fact clear. He began the letter by noting that he was writing in deepest subjection, that he had not

---

25 GSPK, Rep. 52, nr. 131b2.

26 AFSt/H, A176:7 (draft).
solicited the call, and that he was unsure what course to choose. He concluded:

Sollte nun E.K.M. allergnädigster befehl dahin ausfallen diesem Rufte zu folgen, so will ich solchenfalls zugleich im allergnädigstne Erlaubniß geboten haben, daß ich allerunterthänigsten Vorschlage thun möge, wir solches ohne allem Nachtheil sowol Universitaet als der Gemeinde zu Glaucha und absonderlich derer Anstalten am besten geschehen könne. E.K.M. geruhen Dero allergnädigste Willens-Meynung, worin ich gern acquiesciren werde, hierüber zu eröffnen, und ich Verharre in allerunterthänigsten Devotion.27

When Johann Daniel Herrnschmid died, Francke and his colleagues wished to have Francke's son Gotthilf August appointed an Adjunct to the Theological Faculty, Johann Freylinghausen named Subdirector of the Anstalten, and Johann Jacob Rambach appointed an Adjunct to the Theological Faculty. Based on the correspondence, the king had expected that a new member would be called to the faculty in Herrnschmid's place. In an 11 May 1723 letter proposing the promotions, Francke made clear the willingness that he and the other faculty members had to contest the king before God. First he outlined the qualifications of each for their positions and reminded the king of his assurance that Francke would be permitted to nominate Herrnschmid's successor.28 The closing, though, is perhaps most interesting:

27 August Hermann Francke to Friedrich Wilhelm I, 22 Dec 1714. GSPK, Rep. 52, nr. 159b.
28 See Chapter Six.
Ich u. meiner Collegen aber, die mit mir in
diesem allerunterhänigsten vorschlage vollkomen
einig sind, können diese bey den zu guter Anführung
unserer zahlreichen studierenden Jugend, mir nöthig,
also höchstnützlich gebrauchen, weil Sie Gottlob! in
der Wahrheit und nach aller Zeugniß unsere eifrige
Nachfolger in allem guten sind. Ich contestire E K
M auf mein Gewissen vor Gott, daß ich die Sachen auf
keinen beßere füß zu setzen weiß, als auf solche
Weise. Ich submittiere aber alles der direction
Gottes der allerhöchsten, und E K Magst höchst vor
nun stigen (vernunftigen) und reifesterüberlegung u.
Gutbefinden in pflichtschuldigster Devotion dero
Agndgsten Auchschlag u. befehle darüber erwartend
worin ladiglich acquiescerer wurde, als E K M.
aunttgster fürbitter, August Hermann Francke. Halle
den 11th Mai 1723."29

Not all the correspondence was so formal. Francke
regularly sent New Year's greetings to Friedrich Wilhelm
and his family, though he on occasion worked a suggestion
for an appointment into the greeting.30 And, as time
passed, the letters from Francke to the king, and
especially their openings and closings, grew shorter and
less formal. In a letter of 20 July 1725, a typical
letter from later in the partnership, Francke greeted the
king and reached the topic of the letter all within one
sentence, writing, "Ewr. Königl M. dancke ich auntthgst,
dieselbeneine Dero agndgst resolution Karstädtten zum
Guarnison-Prediger in Potsdam zu nehmen. . ."31 The

29 August Hermann Francke and Halle Theological
Faculty to Friedrich Wilhelm I, GSPK, Rep. 52, nr.
159n3a.

30 For example August Hermann Francke to Friedrich
Wilhelm I, 1 January 1724. AFSt/H, A178:2.

31 AFSt/H, A179:94.

Most of Friedrich Wilhelm's correspondence was of course written by others, most often Marquard Ludwig von Printz during this era, and merely approved by the king. The proclamations and orders are formal, official documents. There are examples that illustrate the nature of their relationship, though. One is a letter he sent to Francke in 1723, with which Francke was so pleased that he sent a copy to his colleague Elers in Leipzig:


32 ibid.

33 Given his language skills and handwriting, this fact is fortunate for all concerned. Francke, too, had secretaries who occasionally wrote a draft of a final copy for him, but the bulk of his correspondence is in his small, neat hand.

34 The transcript is from Francke's letter to Elers; the original is not on hand at Halle. AFSt/H, A181:111a.
Note especially the king's clear trust in Francke. Another short note, this a postscript on a memorial message that the king sent Francke on 1 November 1726 after the death of the "Hertogin zu Wehmar," also illustrates the collegiality that they had reached by that time:


Francke was not Friedrich Wilhelm's pastor. There were a number of men who filled this role, including several who had either trained at Halle or had close ties to Halle, but Francke was not among them. Aside from the few times Francke preached to Friedrich Wilhelm, there is no documentary evidence to support the hypothesis that Francke was either primary or secondary in meeting the king's spiritual needs. Certainly Francke may have served as something of a pastor or at least counselor during his 1725 visit, but the nature of their partnership was long since determined by then.35

Friedrich Wilhelm did believe Francke to be the prototype of an efficient preacher, a fact which likely


Still, the Soldier King, with his near-unbelievable record of church attendance, heard most of his sermons from others.37 One was Lampertus Gedicke, later Feldpropst of the military church. Gedicke of course served as a chaplain in Potsdam before gaining that position on 6 January 1717, and also had opportunities to preach before the king on the 1715 Pomeranian campaign. Gedicke made the most of his fortuitous circumstances, passing literature to the king and speaking on behalf of Francke and Halle despite the grumbling of the king's friend and confidant Leopold von Anhalt-Dessau, who was


37 Some pastors apparently also believed that they could influence Friedrich Wilhelm through Sophia Dorothea. See AR I, p. 342 for one example. It is worth noting that the sermon topic chosen here was from the Hebrew Scripture.
somewhat skeptical when it came to matters of faith.38 Johann Porst, Friedrich Roloff, and Johann Gustav Reinbeck, three able Pietist pastors in Berlin, were others who had the king's ear.39 So, too, did the Reformed court preachers -- recall that Friedrich Wilhelm, for all his support of Halle Pietism, attendance at Pietist-led services, and loathing of predestination, never changed his confessional loyalties.40

The possibility exists that Francke did attempt to shape the king's religiosity in a way that most would find negative, by attempting to inculcate a fear of God


39 See Chapter Six.

40 In addition to Friedrich Roloff, Lampertus Gedicke, Johann Porst, and Johann Reinbeck, Ludwig Lehmann noted the Reformed preachers Daniel Ernst Jablonski and Arnold Notenius as particular favorites of Friedrich Wilhelm's. Ludwig Lehmann, Bilder aus der Kirchengeschichte der Mark Brandenburg (Berlin: Vaterländische Verlags- und Kunstanstalt, 1924), p. 120.
in Friedrich Wilhelm. Hinrichs suggested that, shortly after Francke's 1713 trip to Berlin, Canstein advised Francke to encourage this fear in order to increase his influence in the face of opposition from, among others, Leopold von Anhalt-Dessau. If Francke did attempt to nourish a fear of God in the king, though, his probability of success would have been slight. As Wolff, Gericke, and even Hinrichs himself have shown, the nature of Friedrich Wilhelm's faith was set before his partnership with Francke began. Furthermore, having been burned quite badly in his attempts to (re)shape Queen Sophie Luise's spirituality, it seems unlikely that Francke would have ventured too far along such a risky course, especially when he and his Halle allies had only recently recovered from that setback. Certainly the king feared God, but this was hardly a unique belief in the early modern era. Friedrich Wilhelm had feared God from childhood; ascribing too large a role in the formation of


42 See Chapter Three and also Wolff, "Ist der Glaube ..." pp. 71 ff, Gericke, pp. 60ff, and Hinrichs, *Friedrich Wilhelm I*, pp. 559-582.
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that belief to Francke seems unjustified, especially given the thin documentary evidence in support of the hypothesis.

Fifth, their relationship was reciprocal. Certainly Friedrich Wilhelm gained from it, but so did Francke and the Halle Pietists. Several incidents illustrate their remarkable influence within the realm and the limits of that influence. Francke's limits became clear to him when he opposed the calling of Philipp Michaelis from a successful 17-year term leading a Pietist congregation in Archangel back to Brandenburg-Prussia in 1717 to serve as *Garnisonprediger* (base chaplain) in Potsdam.43 The luckless Michaelis died two years later; the life of a *Feldprediger* in Potsdam was difficult.44 Francke's own calling to St. Ulrich's in 1715 may also have been against his will, but he acquiesced.45 His protestations against the forced recruiting of Halle students by Leopold's unit, garrisoned in the Halle area, were only partially successful.46 Each side in this dispute attempted to use the king's nature to their advantage.

43 Hinrichs, *Preußentum und Pietismus*, p. 156.


45 See above and also Chapter Six.

The wily Dessauer, knowing Friedrich Wilhelm's frugality and hatred of deceit, worked to stoke mistrust between the king and Francke by intimating financial improprieties at Halle. Canstein and Natzmer, well aware of the king's faith, responded by questioning Leopold's commitment to God. Matters worsened, exacerbated by the controversy surrounding the preaching of Christoph Tuchtfeld of Dössel in Magdeburg against recruiting. Francke and the Dessauer eventually reached a *modus vivendi* in 1718, when the latter requested and received an "exemplary preacher" from Halle for his regiment, and tensions decreased further with the implementation of the Cantonal Reglement, which ended the worst excesses of the recruiters. In fact, Leopold invited Francke himself to preach before his regiment in 1720 and 1721, and the two maintained courteous contact thereafter.47

The strife between the rationalist philosopher Christian Wolff and Francke and Wolff's subsequent expulsion from Halle for "atheist" views is widely known.48 Francke and the Halle faculty wrote the king

47 ibid., p. 152ff.
about Wolff and an associate, Thümmig, on 16 October and 2 November 1723.49 The king replied to the letters on 8 November, noting for Francke that he had issued orders against Wolff and Thümmig.50 The most extraordinary part of the letter, though, is the king's own postscript: "ich habe das nit gewuust, das der wulf so gotlohse ist das werde mein dage nit in meinem lande statuiren laßen wen ich aber nits weis, so ist es nit meine schuldt. FW."51 In other words, the king of Brandenburg-Prussia, most powerful person in the realm and a man who believed himself to be God's chosen monarch, is asking a mere university professor not to hold him responsible for the teachings of one of his own appointees.52

49 In the first letter, Francke referred to, "die irrigen lesen der Prof Wolffen, mithin auch seines Discipels des adiunct Thunnings, und den daraus bey der Indirenden Jugend entsehenden Schaden und große entsehenden Schaden und grosse Gefahr von Gottes Wort ab und zum Atheismo verleitet zu werden erkenne," then notes his duty to God and the king to report such damage. AFSt/H A177:110 and AFSt/H A177:114.

50 Kramer, Neue, p. 154.

51 Wilhelm Stolze, "Friedrich Wilhelm I. und der Pietismus," Jahrbuch für brandenburgische Kirchengeschichte 5 (1908), p. 191. Kramer, Neue Beiträge, p. 155 has it as: "ich habe das nit wuust, das der wulf so gotlose ist, das ihm aber mein dage nit in meinem Lande statuiren laße, wenn ich aber nits weis, so ist es nit meine schuld." The author was not able to examine this document at Halle.

52 Francke followed his victory with two letters thanking the king, sending his good wishes for the royal family, and expressing his hopes for the continued success of the university and Wolff's successor. AFSt/H A177:120, AFSt/H A177:123. Shortly thereafter, he and
Nor was Wolff the only professor to run afoul of Francke and his allies. In a 3 November 1725 letter, Francke named Professor Christian Gabriel Fischer of Königsberg as being a rationalist and especially dangerous to youth.53 Friedrich Wilhelm's reply was not long in coming -- he notified Francke on 17 November that Fischer had been given 24 hours to leave Königsberg and 40 hours to leave the realm completely.54 So, too, when his colleagues nominated the son of theology professor Johannes Lange for the position. AFSt/H A178:2.


Francke informed the king that he did not want a Wagener named as professor at Halle: "Ich habe aus Eurem Schreiben vom 16 dieses ersehen, was Ihr wegen des gewesenen Blankenburgischen Schulrectors Wagners vorgestellet habt. Ich habe darauf sogleich Ordre gestellet, daß derselbe nicht zum Professore philosophiae extraordinario zu Halle bestellet und angenommen werde, weil ich dergleichen Leute auf der Hallischen Universität zu Professoren nicht haben will."55

The king's support for Pietism took forms other than simply removing its opponents. Former Potsdam chaplain Johann Gottfried Hornejus became provincial assistant superintendent in Stettin in 1726, upon Francke's recommendation.56 There he encountered opposition from Pomerania's general superintendent, Laurentius David Bollhagen, who complained that Hornejus was trying to usurp his position.57 Gedicke and Francke lobbied on Hornejus' behalf and were able to gain limited protection


57 An order of 18 Dec 1726 had instructed Bollhagen to vacate his house in Stettin in favor of Hornejus and move to Stargard; the relationship went down from there. AB IV, 2, p. 105.
for him from Friedrich Wilhelm, though Bollhagen
maintained his position.58

Compromise was also the result when a parish
appointment in Halle became enveloped in controversy.
Johann Friedrich Olearius, the son of Consistorialrath
and Oberpfarrer Johann Christian Olearius and a member of
an extremely large, prominent, and generally anti-Pietist
family of pastors and professors, received a call to
serve as vice-adjunct pastor at St. Moritz church in
Halle in July 1723.59 He was born in Halle in 1697, the
son of Francke's superintendent, and matriculated at the
university in 1714, though he spent the majority --
perhaps all -- of his university years in Leipzig. His
candidacy had the support of the congregation, the
magistrates had called him according to their rights, he
had a good testimony from Leipzig, and he had a

58 "Da es häufiger zu Reibungen kam, an denen
übrigens, wie es scheint, der selbstbewußt auftretende
Hornejus den größeren Teil der Schuld trug, so sah sich
der König veranlaßt, die Hallische Richtung hier noch
weiter zu stärken, um, wie der Oberpräsident von Massow
den darob erzürnten Stettiner Geistlichen bemerkte,
'durch diese vor andern zerfallene Christentum wieder
aufzurichten und den seligmachenden Glauben zur rechten
Aktivität zu bringen.' Die Vermittlung Freylinghausens
und Franckes war natürlich." Stolze, "Friedrich Wilhelm
I. und der Pietismus," p. 193. The strife continued into
the 1730s; an order of August 1733 demarcated the
districts which each would supervise. AB V, 2, p. 538.

59 Tracking the Olearius family, with at least six
members who served as pastors, professors, or both over
three generations, is made considerably more difficult by
the fact that they all had the first name Johannes.
recommendation from pastor and Inspector Johann George Francke(n) in Halle.60. Because he had studied at Halle, however, according to the terms of several 1718 decrees he also need a testimony from the Theological Faculty there.61 This was not forthcoming. In two lengthy letters sent four months apart, first the faculty (Francke, Philipp Michaelis, Paul Anton, J.J. Breithaupt, and Johannes Lange) and then Francke made their arguments against him.62 In the initial letter, they stated that they had insufficient knowledge of the candidate, because, while he was a "Stadt-Kind," his attendance had been so sporadic as to constitute a renunciation of the program.63 The second was hardly more complimentary, but in it Francke begrudgingly agreed that a recommendation

60 Magdeburg Regierung and Consistorium to Friedrich Wilhelm I, 2 October 1723, Congregation of St. Moritz to Friedrich Wilhelm I, 10 July 1723, Johann Olearius to Friedrich Wilhelm I, 24 July 1723. GSPK, Rep. 52, nr. 159b. Johann George Francke(n) may or may not have used an "n" on the end of his name. The available documents spell the name both ways, but to avoid confusion with A.H. and G.A. Francke I have chosen to keep the n, but in parenthesis.

61 Friedrich Wilhelm I to Magdeburg Regierung and Consistorium, 18 July 1718 and 18 September 1718, and Friedrich Wilhelm I to Halle Theological Faculty, 19 September 1718. GSPK, Rep. 52, nr. 159b.

62 This is, of course, not the same Philipp Michaelis who died in Potsdam in 1719. See above.

63 They also suggested that perhaps he was not yet ready for a parish. Halle Theological Faculty to Friedrich Wilhelm I, 24 July 1723. GSPK, Rep. 52, nr. 159b.
might be forthcoming after a year of supervised study at Halle.64, That was best outcome for which Francke could hope, since the king had on 4 November ordered Olearius tentatively admitted to the parish, with a handwritten note on the bottom of the draft order saying that Olearius, "Soll mit Francke correspondieren und sein tentiret."65 With these orders, the king made the best of a difficult situation.66

This episode is doubly interesting because of the involvement of J.G. Francke(n). He had succeeded Heineccius (who died on 11 September 1722) as the Inspector of the Dioceses of the Saal-Kreyses and a Consistorial Rath, and served in this position until his death on 29 January 1747. Despite his name, though, he was neither a relative nor a friend of Francke and the Pietists. Indeed, Francke had written Friedrich Wilhelm a letter noting his reservations regarding the selection and asking that Francke(n)'s appointment be rescinded. Friedrich Wilhelm did not do so, however, thus

64 August Hermann Francke to Friedrich Wilhelm I, 13 November 1723. GSPK, Rep. 52, nr. 159b.

65 Friedrich Wilhelm I to Magdeburg Regierung and Consistorium, 4 November 1723. The final order came on 20 November. GSPK, Rep. 52, nr. 159b.

66 As Olearius became pastor at Coßlitz and Wiedebach in 1725, it would appear that his consultations with Francke did not succeed.
maintaining (intentionally or not) a counterweight to the Pietists Halle faculty.67

The network of people through whom the partnership functioned was both complex and flexible. The contemporary airline network between two major cities — say New York and Los Angeles — offers a suitable analogy. One can fly nonstop between the two cities, but there are also innumerable other routes that might involve one or two changes of planes but still allow one to get to the destination. So, too, with the partnership between Halle Pietism and the Hohenzollern monarchy. There was a sizable and important correspondence between the two principals, Friedrich Wilhelm and Francke. There were also many intermediaries through whom ideas and messages might pass — Gedicke, Canstein, Porst, Reinbeck, Christian Friedrich (father) and Johann Andreas von Kraut, von Printz, even von Dessau, and others — and these intermediaries likely accomplished the bulk of the communication.68 Porst, for example, was an particularly attentive watcher of the court, sending Francke reports

67 AFSt/H A176:111.

68 It is, of course, impossible to accurately quantify "communication." Despite this difficulty, I believe the point is valid. Friedrich Wilhelm and Francke set the direction of the partnership and even involved themselves directly with issues large and small. It was the pastors, superintendents, army chaplains, and church consistory members, though, who actually made the partnership happen.
on matters ranging from appointments and his dealings with members of the court to the health of the former queen.69 Reinbeck, too, served as Francke's ears at the court, writing his mentor frequently regarding matters in Berlin, his conversations with nobles such as von Printz, and the king's perceived intentions.70 Until his death in 1719, Canstein also provided Francke with detailed reports from the court and the king with information from Halle.71

While Friedrich Wilhelm and Francke were certainly the pivotal individuals in the network, they (and especially not Francke) were not the "controllers" of dictatorial organizations. Nor were the networks specifically organized to provide information in the way


70 SPKB, Nachl. Francke, K 17, 2, Johann Gustav Reinbeck.

71 Canstein's letters to Francke are collected in Peter Schicketanz, ed., Briefwechsel Carl Hildebrand von Cansteins mit August Hermann Francke. Texte zur Geschichte des Pietismus, ed. K. Aland, vol. 3., August Hermann Francke Handschriftlicher Nachlaß (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1972). Unfortunately, the volume does not include Francke's letters to Canstein. Canstein's role in Pietist-Hohenzollern cooperation is largely known through the work of Hinrichs, Deppermann, and others, thus this study concentrates on relatively lesser-known intermediaries such as Porst, Reinbeck, and Gedicke.
that Louis XIV used his **intendants** and informers.

Instead, it was a well-developed but voluntary association of people whose similar faiths and goals brought them together. Each partner sought to use and improve the network to further their own goals, but those goals remained in basic harmony. Friedrich Wilhelm I hoped to consolidate his authority through appointing Halle people, **feldprediger**, or both to influential church positions, but, with the occasional exception such as the calling of Philipp Michaelis, Francke approved of and even encouraged those appointments. The same was true of the Halle Pietists. Francke and his colleagues encouraged the enrollment of the sons of Brandenburg-Prussian nobles at the Halle Gymnasium and university as a means of advancing their agenda through "awakening" those who could most help them. Friedrich Wilhelm was aware and indeed supportive of this program, for it helped advance his agenda as well by supplying him with educated nobles, trained in the belief that by helping the realm they were helping fulfill God's plan.72

72 In fact, Francke would sometimes report the numbers of or even the names of Halle's noble students to the king. When he wrote Friedrich Wilhelm on 17 July 1717 requesting permission to take six weeks off to travel, he carefully noted the continued growth of the Halle programs, that 658 students enrolled at the university versus 641 last year, and that in that number were 6 Grafen (versus 1 last year) and 75 Barons and Edel (versus 6 last year). He also mentioned that God had favored them by keeping their students away from excess. AFSt/H A170:49
Similarly, in the bundle of documents pertaining to the 1713 extension of Halle's privileges, there is a "Catalogus Alumnorum Padagogii Glaucha Halensis" listing nobles who had attended the school and their home regions. As in the example above, Francke, when requesting something from the king, sought to strengthen his case through recalling how many nobles his various institutes were training.

"Catalogus Alumnorum Padagogii Glaucha Halensis"
The military loomed large in this partnership. Many of Pietism's most loyal and effective supporters among the nobility were of course military men. Von Natzmer, von Canstein, von Finckenstein, and even eventually the "Old Dessauer" offered support for the partnership, as did generals Löben, Wartensleben, and Gersdorff.73 The Feldprediger, especially Gedicke but others as well, were not only conduits for information but the foot soldiers of the Pietist revolution, guiding the troops toward a Halle-style spirituality. Because of the ever-increasing size of the army, this was of no small benefit. Especially after the institution of the Cantonal Reglement, a large percentage of the men of Brandenburg-Prussia passed through the army's ranks, and the growing practice of garrisoning the army in cities, villages, and towns exposed many more people to the army and its ways.74 Still others were inculcated in Pietist


74 The posting of army units to cities caused some confusion and strife between the local pastors and the
Christianity through the orphanages and the Berlin Cadet Corps. Because it supplied the majority of the chaplains during the reign of the Soldier King, Halle Pietism played a role in and benefitted from the militarization of Prussian society.

There are topics, though, that illustrate the limits of the partnership. The first is church union. Friedrich Wilhelm I followed and even surpassed the work of his father and grandfather in his attempts to minimize the differences between the confessions and his active promotion of a union between the Protestant confessions. He has even been considered the "spiritual father" of the 1817 creation of the Prussian Union church. Though Francke and before him Spener had been at best lukewarm to the idea of uniting the chaplains, and the king issued regulations in 1720 and 1721 (and reissued them later) that only the Feldprediger were to serve the troops' spiritual needs. See CCM I numbers CVIII, CIX, CX.

Hinrichs referred to these as "mächtige Schleusen für das Einströmen pietistischen Geistes in die Armee." Hinrichs, Preußentum, p. 170.

The percentage of chaplains who had studied at Halle was remarkably high during the period. See Chapter Six.

Regarding his personal ecumenism, see Chapter Three.

Protestant churches, Friedrich Wilhelm sent Francke a copy of a tract on church union in early 1726, hoping for a positive opinion. Francke, however, did not favor the proposal. He had, in fact, already suggested to the king that separation was necessary for the continued health of both confessions, citing particularly the need to ensure that pastors and teachers be called who had the proper fear of God. Francke even risked the king's


80 August Hermann Francke to Friedrich Wilhelm I, letter accompanying a memorial from the Theological Faculty, 26 January 1726. AFSt/H A180:19.

81 August Hermann Francke to Friedrich Wilhelm I, 5 Jan 1726, AFSt/H A180:11.
animosity rather than allow Reformed and Lutheran students to mix at Halle.82

Francke's firm stance against confessional union even shaped his relations with potential allies. The English Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge (SPCK) which like the Halle reformers emphasized Christian education, lifestyle reform, publication of devotional literature, and Biblical study, would have seemed a logical ally of Halle. Indeed, the SPCK leaders actively corresponded with similar movements in other lands, including such Halle supporters as Cotton Mather. A representative of the SPCK and other similar English movements in Germany, however, Robert Hales, had expressed support for an Anglican-style church union proposal drawn up by Daniel Jablonski in 1701. The Pietists spoke with Hales during his travels in Germany, but based on Hales' support for union Francke maintained his distance from the SPCK.83

Francke and his colleagues in Halle were not the only Pietists to oppose union. Gedicke, along with Porst

82 The "160 Thaler" matter; see above.

and Reinbeck, were staunchly and energetically against
union.84 The three, plus Roloff, wrote an 8-point letter
to the king in December 1722 asking for equality among
the confessions after the king had appointed Reformed
ministers as well as Lutherans to two churches in the
Neumark.85 In addition, Gedicke wrote a letter opposing
union to the king in 1725.86 Porst wrote Francke on 5
January 1726 that he, along with Gedicke, Roloff, and a
Propst Rauen from Berlin-Cölln, had received from the
king a copy of Fratelli's tract.87 Since they believed
the tract supported the Reformed position and union under
such conditions would not only be impossible and not
useful but even damaging, he requested that Francke send
them a copy of his response to it for their use.88

84 Kurt Weiske, "Pietistische Stimmen. . . .", p. 213.

85 Stolze, "Ein Beitrag zur Unionspolitik," p. 59. Stolze
reprinted the document on pp. 63-6 of the same article. An
original, according to Stolze, is at Halle. The
king's reply was that since he found no difference
between the confessions, his orders should be carried
out. Friedrich Förster, Friedrich Wilhelm I: König von
Friedrich Wilhelm, who saw no real difference between the
confessions, supported the construction of these "union
churches," which were to hold services for both
confessions.

86 This time the energetic Gedicke made a 12-point

87 SPKB, Nachl. Francke, K 17, 1, Johann Porst.

88 "Wir haben ein Jeder nach seiner Erkändtnis
gezeigt, wie der Auctor, welcher sich Fratellus nennet,
die Lutherischen und Reformirten glaubens-Puncte mit
The other limit on the partnership was the continued need for Francke and his colleagues to be aware of the political situation and act accordingly. Though the general form of the partnership was set in 1713, and it deepened in a more or less continuous manner until at least Francke's death, the relationship required unrelenting vigilance and maintenance. With the threat of forced union, the continued opposition from Lutheran Orthodoxy, and the growing strength of Enlightenment thinkers such as Christian Wolff (whose ideas would begin to influence the king after Francke's death), the Halle Pietists could not relax even in their decade of triumph. Pietist professors and teachers continued their efforts to educate, Pietist chaplains worked to bring about a more Godly army, and both groups paid special attention to students who were potentially influential. Documents such as Footsteps were used to bring people to the faith and to increase Halle's prestige, and work on the Anstalten continued apace. By 1730, Halle Pietism had reached a position beyond probably even Francke's most optimistic hopes -- the power to bring down opponents was

einanderzu vermischen sucht, und wie er bey allen seynen Vorschlägen dennoch in allen Stücken die Reformirten Lehre zu behaupten sucht, welches wir durch alle Puncte bewiesen und die Lehr Sätze gegeneinander gesetzt, auch gezeigt, wie bei solchen Umständen eine Vereinigung unmöglich, nicht nützlich, ja höchst schädlich seyn würde -- Wann Ew. Hochw. mit ihrer Schrift fertig, so bitten wir uns eine Copie aus." ibid.
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now theirs, and Halle attendance was now mandatory for pastoral candidates -- but the conditions which had been so favorable could always change. Thus, especially after Francke's death, the Pietist leadership worked toward codification of their status as leading theologians and teachers of the realm. In a bit of historical irony, however, that institutionalization brought with it the rigidity that would hasten their eventual fall from the position for which they had striven so long.
CHAPTER SIX

The key to the kingdom

There can be little doubt that Lutheran Pietists enjoyed considerable success in obtaining influential appointments within Brandenburg-Prussia during the reigns of Friedrich I and especially Friedrich Wilhelm I. At the risk of restating the obvious, the appointment of Spener to St. Nikolaikirche in Berlin was of paramount importance, not only on its own but also because Spener used his appointment to further the Pietist cause. Friedrich I and his advisors had for some time sought to bring scholars and pastors of repute to the realm. Gaining Spener, who had held what was arguably the most widely-recognized Lutheran pulpit in Germany, was something of a coup for them. To Spener, it surely seemed a matter of God's grace after his difficult Dresden experience, providing him an opportunity to inspect parishes and schools, ensure the catechism was taught, and help his colleagues in the faith find influential calls.1 Among other appointments, he

1 Regarding his teaching and visitation, see especially Stein, pp. 128-9. K. James Stein, Philipp Jakob Spener: Pietist Patriarch (Chicago: Covenant Press, 223
engineered the appointment of Johann Porst to first Malchow then Friedrichswerder, Johannes Lange to tutor of the son of Graf Canitz between 1693-96 and thereafter to teach at Halle, and Johannes Rau, Lange's brother-in-law, to an associate's position at St. Nikolai church. Once in Berlin, these pastors also worked to further the cause of Pietism through gaining appointments. Lange and Rau, for example, met weekly with Baron Carl Hildebrand von Canstein in order to discuss possible candidates for vacant pulpits.

The network of Pietist appointees which Spener helped create certainly also included Francke, whose

1986). Stoeffler also noted Spener's promotion of his fellow Pietists: "Spener made it one of the chief objectives of his career to fill all pastorates within the sphere of Prussian influence with pietistic, usually Halle trained, pastors. This applied to Berlin and its environs as well." Stoeffler, German Pietism, p. 71.


efforts on behalf of potential Halle appointees were prodigious and productive. His purview extended far and near in these matters, from Halle to as far away as Königsberg. For example, as part of 1715's lengthy negotiations regarding his promotion from St. George's Church in Glaucha to St. Ulrich's in Halle, he requested and obtained from Friedrich Wilhelm the appointments of his associate Freylinghausen as adjunct at St. Ulrich's and the promotion of a Johann Hieronymun from the diaconate at Glaucha to the pastorate there.4 The course of Freylinghausen's career also makes Francke's leadership of the Pietist movement especially clear. Johann Porst had actually requested Freylinghausen for his adjunct at St. Nikolaikirche in Berlin in 1713, conditioned on Francke's permission.5 That not forthcoming, Freylinghausen remained in Halle, where he

4 August Hermann Francke to Friedrich Wilhelm I, appointments requested in letters of 22 January 1715, Magdeburg Regierung and Consistoria ordered to confirm appointments 5 March 1715. GSPK, Abt. 1, Rep. 52, 159 B, 1713-20.

5 "... daß ich auf Michaelis einen Adjunctum und Successorem in Praepositura bekommen möge, der H. aber zeige mir selbst einen Mann nach seinem Hertzen. Könnte ich H. Freylinghausen bekommen, so möchte die Stadt und das Land glücklich seyn; Ich will aber nichts, als was Gott und Ew. Hochwürden wollen und rathen. Zu seinem unterhalt will ich geben 500 Thl. freye Miete und frey Holtz, 100 thl. wird ihm Gott sonst noch aufs wenigste zu werffen." Johann Porst to August Hermann Francke, 14 January 1713, Staatsbibliothek Preußischer Kulturbesitz Berlin (SPKB), Nachlaß Francke, K 17.
would eventually succeed (along with Francke's son Gotthilf August) his mentor as leader of the Anstalten and the movement.

In the same vein, Francke asked for and received a promotion for his then-likely successor Johann Daniel Herrnschmid in 1716. Herrnschmid, however, did not enjoy good health, despite requesting and being granted at least one leave, in August 1721. When Herrnschmid died in 1723 at age 47, Francke eventually obtained the promotions of Gotthilf August Francke to adjunct on the Theological Faculty, Johann Jakob Rambach to the Theological Faculty, and Johann Freylinghausen to

---

6 The letters regarding this promotion, each written and revised several times, provide a fascinating portrait of the care that went into Halle's dealings with the monarchy. found in AFSt/H, A169, and also GSPk, Abt. 1, Rep. 52, 159 N 3a.

7 "Weil ich nun in meinem Gewißen mich hiezu gedrungen befinde, auch die Sachen, u(nd) wol bey hiesigen Theolg. Facultät, als auch bey denn Anstalten, daß Waysenhauses, sich wohl also einrichten läßen, daß meine Abwesenheit keinen Schaden bringe, hingegen ich hoffnung habe, unterwegs mit gutem Nutzen auf sonst noch ein und andere auszurichten; als lebe ich daß allerunterthdnigsten Vertrauens, Ew. Kön. Maj. werde mir eine Reise ausser Lande auf etlihe(?) Wochen allergnädigst erlauben ; um welche bewilligung ich dann hiemit in tieffser Submision ansuchung thun, und in denn erwartung, mit herzlicher anwunschung . . ." This letter illustrates several points. One is the need of faculty members to have royal permission for breaks and/or travel. More interesting, though, is the way in which even in this rather mundane letter the theme which the Pietists would consistently stress to the king appears: usefulness. GSPK, Abt. 1, Rep. 52, 159 N 3a.
Subdirector of the Halle Anstalten. According to a letter Francke sent to Friedrich Wilhelm on 2 March 1723, shortly after Herrnschmid's death the king gave Francke the assurance that he could nominate Herrnschmid's successor himself. In May, Francke wrote the king again, recalling that assurance and noting that he was having difficulty finding a candidate with the proper theological training who would care for the Anstalten in the way in which the king expected. With the conservation of the institutions in mind, he added, he and his colleagues were nominating G.A. Francke, Freylinghausen, and Rambach for promotion in lieu of nominating another candidate. This decision, Francke noted, was made in order to best serve the students and in submission to the direction of God.


9 "E.K.M erstatte ich auntthgst Danck für die agndgse Versicherung, daß keinem die Profession in der Theologia wieder gegeben werden solle, ich habe dann einen ausgesucht u vorgeschlagen, und daß derselbe mir als dann in das verstorbenen Dr. Herrenschmids Stelle zugleich mit assistiren soll." August Hermann Francke to Friedrich Wilhelm I, 2 March 1723, Archiv der Franckeschen Stiftungen, Handschriftenabteilung, (AFSt/H), A177:35. Another letter from Francke to the king, of 11 May 1723, gives 27 February as the date of the king's letter to Francke.

10 "Ich u. meiner Collegen aber, die mit mir in deisem allerunterthänigsten vorschlage vollkommen einig sind, können diese bey den zu guter Anfuhrung unserer zahlreichen studierenden Jugend, mir nöthig, also höchstnützlich gebrauchen, weil Sie Gottlob! in der
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Wilhelm ordered the promotions on 8 July. And, as noted above, Francke advanced Johann Joachim Lange, son of his colleague in the Theology Faculty, as a candidate for promotion to ordinary professor of philosophy and math in place of the departed Christian Wolff.11

Francke, like Spener, worked to ensure that a steady progression of Halle Pietists obtained appointments in Berlin and its surrounding region. In this matter his allies in the city, with their ability to quickly learn of opportunities, were invaluable. Two of Pietism's most
able representatives were Friedrich Roloff, appointed to St. Marienkirche in 1721, and Johann Gustav Reinbeck of St. Petrikirche. As Chapter One notes, in 1733 these two pastors gained the right to examine all candidates for ordination in the Lutheran church in Brandenburg. Another was of course Johann Porst, the former student and protegé of Spener who from 1713 served as pastor of St. Nikolaikirche, served also as a Consistorial Rat, and was in effect an ambassador for Halle Pietism. Several Berlin Pietists monitored court matters for Francke, but Porst appears to have been an especially keen observer. In addition, Porst informed his colleague in Halle of pulpits that were vacant due to deaths and transfers and of who succeeded whom in such cases. Porst would also occasionally commend to Francke a candidate who wished to study at Halle, serve a parish, or both.

Another Halle Pietist who made his way to Berlin was Lampertus Gedicke, who matriculated at the university in 1703 and became a chaplain in 1709. After Canstein brought Gedicke to Natzmer's attention, Gedicke became chaplain to the Wartenslebische Regiment and a Garnisonprediger in Berlin. In 1717, he became provost

12 For example, in his letter to Francke of 30 May 1715. SPKB, Nachlaß Francke, K 17, 1.

13 Among others, his two letters of 8 April 1722 and his letter of 18 September of 1722 consider such matters. SPKB, Nachlaß Francke, K 17, 1.
or head chaplain (Feldproost) of the military church.
Gedicke enjoyed considerable authority in this position.
In conjunction with Porst and Reinbeck, he examined all
candidates for the military chaplaincy, those whom he had
recruited and those presented by others, and he also
served as inspector of the military church, submitting
yearly reports to the king.14 On the matter of
appointments, Gedicke often coordinated his choices with
Francke. One consequential outcome of this partnership
was that a number of men who had served as instructors in
the Halle institutions entered the military church.15

14 AFSt/H C42: 43.

15 Between 1708-29, according to Weiske, 15
teachers from the Halle Pädagogium became Feld- und
Garnisonsprediger (chaplains): "1708 Hermann Eschenburg
aus Narva, 1715 Mich Lichtenauser aus Franken, Joh. Casp
Carstedt aus Bismark to Rektor der Sladrischen Schule und
Garnisonsprediger Brandenburg (1727 to Potsdam, finally
Feldproost in Berlin), Christian Krause aus Altb'burg,
1717 Gotthelf Aug Laurentii, 1718 Friedrich Wagner aus
Caro, 1720 Joach. Lachmann von Stendal (Garnisonprediger
Spandau), Christ. Zachar. Schultze aus Storkau (to teach
Kadetten Katechismus, later Pfarrer in Potsdam), 1724
Friedr. Griese aus Pritzwalk (Kadettenprediger in Berlin,
later Pfarrer Petrikirche, Berlin), 1728 Brandon Friedr.
Mylius aus Wanzelben (to Sandrischen Schule), 1726 Joh.
Gust. Chemnitz aus Kyritz (Feldprediger in Magdeburg),
1727 Joach. Sentzke aus Lüben (also Kadettenprediger),
Joh. Georg Widemann aus Nördlingen (Garnisonprediger und
Rektor in Brandenburg), 1729 Joh. Jak. Specht aus
Salzwedel, and (1729 also?) Sim. Henr. Oldenbruch aus
Magdeburg zu Kadettenprediger Berlin (later
Konsistorialrat in Stargard)." Kurt Weiske, "Pietistiche
Stimmen aus der Mark Brandenburg," Jahrbuch für
For a survey of the relative representation of Halle
candidates in the military chaplaincy as a whole, see
below.
Reinbeck was also a participant in this cooperation, occasionally relaying information deemed important from Gedicke to Francke. In one case of particular interest from 1724, Reinbeck informed Francke of the king's requirements for a Feldprediger; Friedrich Wilhelm's words make his views regarding Halle especially clear. As quoted by Reinbeck, Friedrich Wilhelm ordered, "Gedicke soll ihn hieher kommen laßen ihn erndig hören und examinieren, und, wenn er nach dem halleschen prespyterio ist in leben und Wandel, ordinieren, sonß aber nit." Reinbeck also made certain to inform Francke when Roloff was transferred from Feldprediger of the Giant Grenadiers in Potsdam to St. Marienkirche in 1721, adding that the king wished to find for his giants, "einen Prediger, der fromm sey, gut predige, und nicht zu commode sey." This appointment was of special interest, for the king generally attended services with his favored grenadiers when in Potsdam. Gedicke himself relayed to Francke an instruction he received from Friedrich Wilhelm in April 1725 that again illustrates the king's preference for Halle: "Würdiger, besonders lieber, Getreuer! Es fehlet bey des Genl. Maj. Prinz von

16 Johann Gustav Reinbeck to August Hermann Francke, 13 April 1724, SPKB, Nachlaß Francke, K 17,2.

17 Johann Gustav Reinbeck to August Hermann Francke, no month or day given, 1721, SPKB, Nachlaß Francke, K 17,2.

In fact, it would be difficult to overstress Gedicke's importance in ensuring the success of the Halle programs. His frequent correspondence to Francke -- over 50 letters written between 1713 and 1727 survive -- was an absolute gold mine of information for the Pietist leader. Through Gedicke, news of open positions, students who showed promise, visitors at court, and of course the king's mood reached Francke, who then either acted himself on the information or directed an associate to do so. Gedicke was thus not only essential for the implementation of the Pietist program in not only the army but throughout society.

Pietists also received calls to serve in the provinces beyond Brandenburg. The turbulent career of the Pietist Heinrich Lysius as pastor, professor, and

18 Lampertus Gedicke to August Hermann Francke, 14 April 1725, AFSt/H, C42:61.
inspector of schools and churches in East Prussia is obviously well established.19 So is the work of Johann Christoph Schinmeyer as pastor in Stettin during the 1730s, where he was instrumental in the creation of an orphanage, schools, and programs for teacher training.20 Still more widely recognized in the literature are Abraham Wolff and George Friedrich Rogall, who held positions on the Königsberg faculty and eventual also held the right of examination of all pastoral candidates in East Prussia, and F.A. Schultz, who replaced Wolff at his death.21 Francke offered strong support to Wolff and Rogall. He commended the efficiency of Rogall to the king in an April 1724 letter, and first suggested that Wolff be transferred from Professor of Hebrew Languages to Ordinary Professor of Theology and Magister Rogall be made Ordinary Professor of Philosophy and Extraordinary Professor of Theology in Königsberg in a letter of 27 January 1725, giving the rationale that they could help set Königsberg "on its feet" in the Halle manner.22

19 See Terveen, Hubatsch, Keil, or Gawthrop's summary.


21 See Chapter Five regarding their examination of candidates.

Leaving nothing to chance, he repeated his advice in letters to Friedrich Wilhelm on 6 February, 3 March, and 16 March. Though given the continued strength of Lutheran Orthodoxy in the region Stolze's characterization of Francke's views as decisive for church and school politics in East Prussia may be a bit strong, these two appointments were certainly a major step forward for Halle Pietism in the region. The Königsberg Theological Faculty as a whole became steadily more Pietistic, so that while the Orthodox professors outnumbered the Pietists as late as 1725, the numbers were even by 1735.

These high-profile appointments are only part of the story, however. The network of Halle Pietists, centered around Francke, concerned itself with appointments across the realm, in cities and villages, universities and infantry regiments. This interest is especially easy to

23 August Hermann Francke to Friedrich Wilhelm I. AFSt/H, A179:11, 24, 27. In the 6 February letter he also advocated the appointment of a Matheseos Langen to the philosophy faculty at Halle to replace one Sperlette, who had died.


trace during the 1720s, when Francke would simply write to the king with suggestions for specific appointments. The relatively low number of letters he wrote on this topic during the early years of Friedrich Wilhelm's reign grew exponentially as the years passed, and they grew more specific as well. These facts would be meaningless had the king ignored Francke's advice, but in fact Francke's rate of success, both in specific cases and across the realm, was quite high.26

At times Francke would suggest candidates in a somewhat general way, placing their names before the king and suggesting that they would be well qualified for any openings.27 As the years passed and the cooperation between Halle and the crown grew closer, though, the recommendations grew more particular. Two episodes, one from 1725 and one from 1726, illustrate the process. When Hornejus moved to Stettin, Francke wrote the king, recommending either a Koppen from Salzwedel, a Brunsford, or Carsted, the garrison preacher in Brandenburg, who eventually received the position.28 Once that was

26 See below regarding overall numbers.

27 For example in Francke's letter of 10 April 1723, suggesting George Friedrich Rogall and Andreas Schumann for any vacancies in Prussia. AFSt/H, A177:58.

28 August Hermann Francke to Friedrich Wilhelm I, 17 April 1725, AFSt/H, A179:55. Francke's interest did not end once a person received the appointment. When Carsted and his family had difficulty finding housing, Francke wrote on their behalf to the king. August
decided, Francke then took the opportunity to put forward a candidate for the Brandenburg position Carsted had vacated.29 In September 1726, when the Holy Ghost Church in Potsdam was to open, Francke commended to the king Johann Heinrich Schubert, who had studied 5 years at Halle and then served a parish; Schubert received the call.30 As outlined above with respect to the Berlin region and the military church, Francke's network of friends, colleagues, and supporters served the Pietist cause well with respect to appointments in the outlying provinces, even in areas where Pietists had traditionally had difficulty in gaining nominations. When the diaconate in Mohrungen (Prussia) came open in 1726, Franz Albert Schultz wrote Francke that the magistrates, who held the jus vocandi, were not opposed to appointing a Halle student named Bunecke if a recommendation could be provided.31 Apparently it was, for later that year he

---

Hermann Francke to Friedrich Wilhelm I, 26 Feb 1726, AFSt/H A180:23.

29 August Hermann Francke to Friedrich Wilhelm I, 9 May 1725, AFSt/H, A179:63. There exist a number of other letters from this era that are similar.

30 August Hermann Francke to Friedrich Wilhelm I, 14 September 1726, AFSt/H, A180:64. This letter contains several recommendations regarding appointments, salaries, etc., typical for the letters written late in Francke's life, and followed another such letter by only two weeks.

31 Franz Albert Schultz to August Hermann Francke, 5 Aug 1726, SPKB, Nachlaß Francke, K 19,1. 236
obtained the call, the first for a Halle preacher in that region.

* * *

If the combined efforts of Friedrich Wilhelm and the Pietists in obtaining calls for Pietists to key church and university positions were in many cases fruitful, what of the overall numbers across the realm? Did favorable orders from the king and a network of supporters in the church and university hierarchies result in calls for Pietist candidates, and did those calls come in numbers high enough to support the thesis of substantial Pietist influence in worship and education? Here the record is virtually unknown.32

For this study, I examined the number of Halle matriculands in Lutheran pastoral appointments as both a percentage of the total pastors and as a percentage of new appointees in four regions and hundreds of Kirchenkreise in Brandenburg-Prussia, plus the military church, and also samples from Saxony.33 Where possible, 32 The study to which some other scholars refer on this matter, that of Pariset, is quite small and not especially systematic.

33 There are of course a number of complicating factors in such a study. In addition to those which the body of the text outlines, one is the danger of double-counting, i.e. counting a pastor as a new appointment more than once. Though the fact that pastors (especially
also compared the superintendent with the appointments in his area. In short, I completed a systematic and comprehensive survey of Halle penetration into pastorates across virtually the entire Hohenzollern realm, and given the close ties between Halle and Friedrich Wilhelm, the results offer a unique and useful look at not only the Lutheran church but in reality at the consolidation of absolutism in Brandenburg-Prussia.34 While Halle attendance is no guarantor of Pietist beliefs, it is

in rural parishes) tended to serve appointments for life reduces this difficulty, I did pay special attention to this possibility and counted only the first appointment wherever I was able to discern multiple appointments. Another difficulty is matching names of matriculands to names on parish records. I did accept slight variations in spelling, especially if I could verify identity further through a hometown or middle name and if the matriculation date and field of study allowed for the person in question to have taken the position (i.e. even if I found the name of a pastor on the Halle rolls, if the appointment came in 1727 I did not count a person who matriculated in 1697 as a match, even if the name and hometown were identical). Furthermore, people with common names ("Johann Schmidt," "Christian Fischer," and the like) were generally discarded completely due to the obvious difficulty of discerning which, if any, of the thirty or so people of the same name at Halle was the correct one. Since there is no reason to believe that would-be pastors with numerically common names were statistically more or less likely to attend Halle, this cautionary practice should not introduce any significant error into the analysis. In sum, if I erred, I believe it was on the side of caution, and while the numbers may actually be slightly low as far as the percentage of former Halle students in parishes, the numbers for the various provinces, periods, and districts should be accurate relative to each other.

34 A lack of available information precluded inclusion of Magdeburg; I did not intend to include the smaller provinces in the West in this study.
certainly the most workable proxy extant. 35 Indeed, when measuring the influence of Halle Pietism, Halle attendance may have more utility than any chimerical attempt to perceive beliefs. In early 18th century Prussia, "Hallenser" meant "Pietist," and people would likely have perceived a new pastor from Halle, especially one with recommendations from the faculty there, as adhering to Halle's program regardless of his personal views. 36 Acceptance of or resistance to a Halle candidate in many cases depended upon the attitude of the parish, patron, or superintendent toward Halle Pietism and toward Friedrich Wilhelm's priority of appointing Halle pastors. Thus the rate of appointment of the candidates was something of a referendum on Halle and absolutism. 37

35 It is my belief that a historian (indeed, that any person) cannot discern with absolute certainty the beliefs of another. This being said, Halle attendance is a workable proxy for adherence to the program, because students did have choices regarding university attendance.

36 There were certainly cases where the parishes knew the candidates (Olearius, for example), but as the preceding chapter illustrates, in many cases the appointment of a candidate was engineered in Berlin and Halle.

37 The lack of tables outlining the specific results of the study may come as a surprise to some readers, especially those with whom I have discussed this study over the years of its completion. Such tables do exist, and I anticipated publishing them with this dissertation. After lengthy conversations, however, the members of my Ph.D. dissertation committee (Drs. James M. Kittelson, John F. Guilmartin, and John C. Rule, all of
The first region to consider is the Mark Brandenburg. Scholars have devoted little time to the role of Pietism in the Mark, preferring to examine the strife between Pietism and Orthodoxy in East Prussia/Lithuania and Magdeburg/Halle. As the center of the Hohenzollern realm and the base of Hohenzollern strength, though, this region was essential for Friedrich Wilhelm in his efforts to consolidate his absolutist authority and also for the Halle Pietists in their attempt to reshape the Lutheran church. For both, success in the far corners of the realm would be meaningless if not accompanied by success in the Mark. This study examines two regions within the Mark, first Berlin and surroundings and then the central region of the rural Mark (Mittelmark and Priegnitz) itself.38 The

---

38 The church in the Mark actually changed very little between the early 18th and early 20th centuries. Few new parishes were added, and the Kirchenkreise (districts) generally remained the same. The Berlin region, in contrast, grew dramatically over the period, apparently from 3 districts to 11. District boundaries changed as well; thus I treat the Berlin region as a unit. It includes Berlin, Friedrichswerder, Köln, and Spandau towns, plus 39 surrounding parishes. It does not include Potsdam, nor of course does it include the
number of Halle pastors in Berlin in 1727 was over half the total, 53%, quite high given the number of pastors who would have likely completed their university work before Halle even opened and the smaller size of the university during its early years. The rates of appointment during the periods 1720-24 and 25-29 are even higher -- 64% during the first period, and 100% during the latter. In Berlin, at least, the partnership functioned with remarkable efficiency.

The situation in the regions outside Berlin is a bit more complex and much more interesting. Overall, in 1727 former Halle students held roughly 50 percent of the appointments. And, as in Berlin, the rate of appointment of Halle students to parishes in the rural Mark was higher than the overall percentage and rising, though not so high as it was for Berlin. It is the regional variations here that are especially curious, though. Some districts, including several in the south, had numerous Reformed parishes in Berlin. I have examined the Neumark region, but I am also holding those results for future publication.

I selected 1727 for my "snapshot" of Halle penetration because it was the year August Hermann Francke died and as such probably represents the year of greatest Pietist political influence, though not the year of highest Halle entrance into the bureaucracy. Recall also that both the total numbers and the number of appointments cited here are a few pastors smaller than the actual numbers because of pastors who, for reasons stated above, fell into the category of "unknown."
numbers of Halle people notably higher than average, both overall and as a percentage of new appointments. Others neighboring districts had rates that were lower, sharply so in several cases. Were these simply random variation? Certainly rates would be expected to vary across districts, but do other factors enter the equation?

One factor that deserves attention is a possible correlation between the superintendencies and the numbers of Halle appointees. Those districts with the lowest percentages of Halle people holding parishes in 1727 were extremely unlikely to have had Halle-trained superintendents; those with the highest have people who trained at Halle, served as a Feldprediger, or both.40 In fact, if the districts are divided between those with superintendents who neither trained at Halle or served as army chaplains and those with superintendents who were at least one of the two, the numbers change considerably. The number of Halle-trained pastors in the districts without either a Halle- or army-trained superintendent in 1727 is on aggregate roughly twenty percent less than that of the in the Halle/Feldprediger districts. It also appears that the king and his Halle allies found the going relatively rougher in the Priegnitz region,

40 The districts for which information about the superintendent was unavailable are not included in either group.
northwest of Berlin, where the Halle percentages are lower than average even in those districts with a Halle- or army-trained superintendent.

Halle penetration is also quite low in the Zossen district, southeast of Berlin. This might lead one to hypothesize a general lack of support for Halle Pietism in this region, so close to Saxony and Wittenberg. In fact, however, this was not the case. Several of the districts with the highest numbers of Halle pastors lay on or near the Saxon border. In fact, because of the border's twists and turns, two Saxon Kreise, Belzig-Niemeigk and Baruth-Dahme, actually lay somewhat north of Luckenwalde, a district with high rates of Halle penetration. Checking these two plus the district immediately to the south of Luckenwalde, Jüterbog, show a marked contrast with the districts in the southern Mark, with negligible Halle penetration in the Saxon districts. These results certainly argue that political loyalties affected parish appointments and perhaps even religious sentiments among the inhabitants.

The Hohenzollerns gained control over Pomerania only in stages, a fact that slightly complicates but also enriches its study. After the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648, Sweden held Vorpommern, including Stettin, and the
Great Elector held Hinterpommern. With the end of the Swedish-Polish War in 1658, Brandenburg-Prussia gained the regions including Lauenberg, Bülow, and Draheim. Then, in the 1720 Peace of Stockholm that concluded the Great Northern War, Friedrich Wilhelm I gained Stettin, Usedom, Wollin, and most of Vorpommern in exchange for 2 million Thalers. Because of this stepwise incorporation, the most logical course appears to be to examine Pomerania in two sections, one of districts that became part of the Hohenzollern realm in 1648-58, the other of districts that passed to Brandenburg-Prussian control in 1720.

The difference between the two is striking. While a former Halle student was serving in over a third of

41 The names are with respect to Brandenburg, so Vorpommern is the "front" or western region, and Hinterpommern is the eastern.

42 After Louis XIV's revocation of the Edict of Nantes, the Hohenzollerns founded colonies for French refugees in Stargard, Kolberg, Stolp, Stettin, and Pasewalk (founding dates between 1687-1727), and also founded Reformed churches for the refugees.

43 The Swedes kept what would later be the Neu-Vorpommern Gebeit, north of Peene und Rügen. Friedrich Wilhelm placed his Hofgericht in Koslin in 1720, and a Kriegs- und Domänenkammer in Stettin in 1723. Prussia gained the remainder of Pomerania in 1815.

44 The 1720 group is smaller than the 1648/58, both because of the parcels of territory involved and because I limited the 1720 study to five regions, both town and rural, that were without question completely contained within the land that passed to Prussia in 1720, not before, not after.
parish positions in the 1648/58 region in 1727, the same
was true for less than ten percent of the positions in
the 1720 region at that time.45 There was a similar
variation in the rate of appointment -- the 1648/58
region had rates of appointment of 45% between 1720-24
and over 60% between 1725-29, whereas less than 10% of
the new appointees during the decade in the 1720 region
came from Halle.46 The numbers in the neighboring
Neumark fall between those of the two Pomeranian regions.

45 In contrast to the other regions of the
Hohenzollern realm, many pastors in both halves of
Pomerania had studied in Sweden or even Finland.

46 It is less simple to draw conclusions regarding
any correlation between superintendents and appointments
in Pomerania. If one assumes that senior pastor of the
church/town which gave the district its name was the
superintendent (the pattern in Brandenburg, where the
sources are more solid), then it appears that the
percentage of Halle appointees and Halle appointment
rates were slightly higher in those districts. Given the
smaller sample size and necessity of making such
assumptions, however, no firm conclusions are possible.
Pomerania is not known to have been an area of strength
for Pietism: "Generally speaking, Pomerania cannot be
considered very fertile soil for the pietistic
perspective." Stoeffler, German Pietism, p. 79.

This fact was recognized at the time by Pietists
such as Hornejus and Gedcke. Gedcke, in fact,
complained to Francke that, "Das gesamte Ministerium in
Pommern ist mit solchen Leuten besetzt, die in
Wittenberg, Griefswald, und Rostock studiret haben, einen
bittern, unversöhnlichen Haß gegen alle Hallenser tragen
und keinen von ihnen in Bedienung einlassen wollen!
Insonderheit soll der Past. Prim. D. Maskovius ein großer
Feind von Halle sein, daher er denen Feldpredigern nicht
eher erlauben wollen, öffentlich zu predigen, bis er
ratione orthodoxiae mit ihnen konferiret. Allein S. Kgl.
Maj. sind ihm bald durch den Sinn gefahren und
Schiedsmann in der Sache gewesen." Weiske, p. 218.

Based on the districts studied in the Altmark, such
appears to have been the case there as well.
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What can be said of the situation in East Prussia? There was no appreciable Halle Pietist presence in the pulpits of East Prussia until after 1725, and even after that time the rate of Halle appointments was remarkably low compared with the Mark Brandenburg or Hinterpommern. It was rising, though, attesting to at least some limited effectiveness of the partnership. Only five percent of those taking a pulpit in Prussia or Prussian Lithuania as a first charge between 1720-24 had trained at Halle, while approximately 3 of 10 who arrived between 1725-29 had done so. Less than ten percent of those serving in 1727 were Halle-trained. Where had they trained? For the most part, Königsberg.

The situation was exactly the opposite among the military chaplains. Of those newly ordained to regiments between 1720-24, over 7 of 10 were former Halle students, and of those ordained between 1725-29, nearly 9 of 10 had studied at Halle.47 These rates, on the order of those for the Berlin area, are doubly interesting when one considers the remarkable success of the Feldprediger in

47 Given the generally short tenure of chaplains, the percentage of total chaplains with a Halle background would not differ dramatically from the average of the new appointees of the previous three to five years. As with parish pastors, it was not possible to determine the university background of some chaplains; they were likewise omitted, as were chaplains who had previously held a parish position. Available sources do not contain records of any field ordinations; Brandenburg-Prussia was at peace through the 1720s so these were likely few.
subsequently attaining superintendencies -- of the 75 chaplains in these two cohorts, more than 1 in 3 later became superintendents within the realm.

The results of these studies argue convincingly that university choice for theology students in early modern Germany was not simply a matter of convenience, and that university attendance is a reasonable proxy for adherence to the Pietist program. Early modern students were remarkably mobile given the poor transportation network of the era; the custom of Wanderjahre and indeed the academic careers of Spener and Francke themselves are evidence of that fact. Further proof of both mobility and the religious/political nature of university choice comes from the fact that of a randomly selected group of another 50 pastors in Saxony who took their first assignment in the 1720s, none attended Halle, despite its location in the center of Saxony, closer for many Saxon students than Wittenberg. Conversely, many theology students traveled from the far reaches of Brandenburg, Pomerania, and even East Prussia to Halle. Ideology, including religious belief, political loyalty, and even utility all appear to have been stronger motivations for university choice and subsequently for obtaining a call than ease of travel. Certainly students could and did attend more than one university, but the well-known Pietist leanings of the Halle faculty and the need for
candidates to obtain a recommendation from that faculty likely deterred the non-Pietist hoping to use a semester at Halle as a quick route to a parish during the 1720s. The Pomeranian results -- more Halle pastors in the east, farther from Halle, than in the west -- also suggest other factors than geography at work.

These other factors were political and theological in nature. It is nearly impossible to separate the essentially coterminous struggles of Halle Pietism versus Orthodoxy within the church and absolutism versus the landed nobility in the secular realm, and to attempt to do so would twist the historical record -- Friedrich Wilhelm I and August Hermann Francke believed they were building God's realm on earth in partnership with each other. Clearly, though, their efforts in that struggle had not brought about an unequivocal victory in the 1720s. As the variation across districts in Brandenburg illustrate, there remained some pockets of resistance even in areas where the battle was generally going their way. The role of the superintendents is an interesting

48 See above and Chapter One regarding faculty recommendations. It is more likely that students chose Halle for career reasons during the 1730s; see below.

49 Though I did not conduct a systematic study comparing hometowns, universities, and eventual appointments, examining the careers of these hundreds of pastors made it clear that, then as now, many students went away for their university training but returned to their home areas.
factor to consider in these regions. Either the superintendents exerted considerable influence on the patrons' choice of candidates, or the patrons themselves sought out candidates of a particular type and then exerted influence on the superintendents regarding those candidates. Given that the king was patron of the superintendencies, and seeing from the record that Friedrich Wilhelm I aimed to fill these positions with those he believed most loyal (men who had attended Halle, served as chaplains, or both), argues that at least in his view, the former thesis was true. It is also of interest that the "loyalty" of superintendents with Halle training and superintendents who had served as chaplains as measured by the rates of appointment in their districts appears similar.50

The authority of King Friedrich Wilhelm I, model absolutist, was limited, and the consolidation of absolutism in Brandenburg-Prussia proceeded unevenly. Based on this survey, it proceeded most slowly in East Prussia. The Halle presence here was negligible at the beginning of the decade, and it grew much more slowly than in neighboring Hinterpommern. In fact, the penetration of Halle Pietism into the parishes came at

50 Here too, the presence of Gedicke as head of the military church appears to have been enormously beneficial for the king and for Pietism.
roughly the same rate as in Vorpommern during the period 1720-24, despite the fact that the Hohenzollerns had held the latter only since 1720 and the former for hundreds of years. Why was this so? For the Lithuanian parishes, the language barrier was likely a factor, though probably not so much as the local nobility and churchmen, who wished to impede Halle's progress, claimed. The rigorous conditions of life in the east also seem likely to have deterred at least some non-natives from taking or seeking calls there. It is hard to escape the conclusion, though, that patrons, superintendents, or both were offering effective resistance. Even in Friedrich Wilhelm's reign, in well over half the parishes candidates who hoped to gain a call needed a recommendation from the noble or the magistrates who were the patron. The king could and did appoint superintendents, members of the church Consistoria, and professors who favored appointing Pietists, but there were limits to his powers of persuasion -- he apparently could not or would not force patrons to nominate against their will, at least during the early 1720s.51 The tide

51 Were it not for the way the patronage relationship functioned one might be tempted to conclude from previous literature highlighting East Prussia as an area of Pietist success and the low number of Halle people sent there that the east was actually an area of relatively high royal authority, i.e. that there was no perceived need for Halle people there, because the king's sovereignty there was unquestioned. Given the effect of patronage, the results from Pomerania, and the
had begun to turn, though, if slowly. Halle people gained appointments in Prussia at a rate six times faster during the period 1725-29, than in the preceding five years, and while the rate was still low compared with the Mark or Hinterpommern on aggregate, it is nearly equal to the rate between 1720-24 in those districts of the Mark in which the king's agenda proceeded most slowly, those which had superintendents who were neither Halle attendees nor former chaplains.

There are two final issues that deserve consideration. One is whether to consider those who had attended the University of Königsberg as supporters, opponents, or neutral observers in the strife over absolutism and Pietism. Königsberg did not enjoy a particularly strong academic reputation during the era; the same plagues and poverty that had damaged the remainder of the eastern provinces had hurt the university as well.52 Halle, newer but closer to the

differences across Brandenburg, though, the opposite appears to be the case -- Friedrich Wilhelm was indeed weakest in the east. Unfortunately, I have not yet been able to find reliable records of who held right of nomination of the individual churches. It also bears remembering that Friedrich Wilhelm was working to integrate the Prussian nobility into his army during this era, and he may have feared that pushing too hard with regard to parish appointments would cause a reaction in that arena.

52 Dorwart refers to the academic standards of the professional faculties at Königsberg (and Frankfurt) as "considerably below the academic standards of
bulk of the Hohenzollern realm and with a number of what universities today would call academic "stars," quickly usurped it as the premier Lutheran university of Brandenburg-Prussia. Yet theological students from East Prussia continued to attend Königsberg. As noted above, geography likely played a role in their choices. The combination of family tradition, political loyalty to the province, and utility -- likelihood of receiving a call -- appears to have been stronger, though. Friedrich Wilhelm was able to appoint Pietist professors to the Königsberg Theological Faculty, but only up to half of the faculty by 1735, and the literature makes it clear that their opponents made their work there difficult. They remained outsiders, sustained by the support of the king. Recall also that it was not until 1736 that the right to examine candidates from Königsberg passed from the Halle faculty to the faculty there. Thus, while for later periods one might equate the aggregate of Königsberg students with the Halle students as to their Pietistic tendencies or beliefs, the evidence does not

universities in the other German territories." Dorwart, Prussian Welfare, p. 205.

53 In fact one could better consider the University of Jena (or even Wittenberg) as having been the preferred Lutheran university of Brandenburg, despite being outside the realm.

54 See especially Hinrichs (Preußen), Keil, and Terveen.
support that assumption for this era. Some students there were undoubtedly Pietists, and they may have been a highly motivated group, but in all likelihood institutional momentum meant that the percentage was small during the 1720s.

The other issue is whether the period examined is too brief to offer useful insights into the progress of Prussian Pietism. Certainly the relative newness of Halle eliminates the possibility of doing a study across time, on 20- or 40-year intervals. The opportunity of studying different regions and individual districts within those regions, however, compensates for that by providing a picture of the different rates at which the Pietist/Hohenzollern program, the consolidation of absolutism, progressed. Indeed, the 1720s were something of a unique decade for Pietism and absolutism. Friedrich Wilhelm I succeeded to the throne in 1713, and cooperation with the Halle Pietists began shortly thereafter, but given the lags in instituting policies and the length of university study, notable changes probably began around 1720.55 By the 1730s, his policies in all areas, including the church, were largely codified, and with regard to university attendance, the

55 Recall also that the Friedrich Wilhelm instituted the General Directory in 1723, ten years after his succession.
1729 requirement that theological candidates attend Halle make a study of that decade seem less likely to offer new insights. It is the appointments between 1720-30 -- mainly of students who entered university between approximately 1717 and 1727, and of students who generally had the option of attending Jena, Rostock, and other universities -- that illustrate the critical period of transition. The king had expressed his preference for Pietism, the Pietists had devoted their remarkable energy to this program, but as we have seen, the program progressed at very different rates across the realm. In sum, by 1730 Halle Pietism was in a position to exert a substantial influence on the future of Brandenburg-Prussia, but the strength of their position varied by region and district, and it would be rashly premature to conclude that they had completely superseded the old order.
CONCLUSION

The partnership of Halle Pietism and the Prussian monarchy largely succeeded in producing Pietist control of pulpits and schoolrooms across the realm by 1730, and the trends lay in their favor. King Friedrich Wilhelm I was well aware of the centrality of the pastorate for their goals, and he was codifying his preference for Pietist pastors in ordinances. The realization of the partnership's ultimate goal -- nothing less than the creation of a God's realm on earth in Brandenburg-Prussia -- remained less certain, but their grasp on the professorships, pulpits, chaplaincies, and teaching positions of the realm was becoming increasingly firm.

The corpus of Pietist ideas regarding social reform that had guided the actions of the Halle reformers was not new, and Francke's activism lay squarely in the Pietistic tradition. The writings of both Arndt and Spener had contained a strong social reform element. Indeed, the progression from Luther to Arndt to Spener to Francke appears straightforward and without any fundamental discontinuities, especially so between Arndt, Spener, and Francke. Pietism's political involvement had
also begun well before Francke. This fact should not be particularly surprising, since it is nearly inconceivable that any early modern movement aimed at reforming the established church could succeed without a keen awareness of political circumstances. If Halle Pietism differed from other reform movements with regard to its politics, ascribe that difference to its political sagacity, not to any unique willingness to engage itself in politics. The evidence is also less than conclusive regarding claims that Pietism was fundamentally in opposition to the Gospel and its call to charity.1 This suggestion appears anachronistic for two reasons. First, it is extremely unlikely that people of the time perceived Pietism as such. Second, while it is certain that the Pietist educational methods were strict and by our standards even repressive, the ability of present-day observers to judge the veracity of the Pietist leaders' stated commitment to offering Christ to the world is much less certain.

Friedrich Wilhelm's understanding of service formed the foundation for his changes in and standards for Prussia's government. This understanding, in turn, stemmed directly from his fervent and oft-stated belief that he was not only called but compelled to transform

1 "In this evangelizing/mobilizing process, however, the central ethical teaching of Christianity, the doctrine of charity, was fatally corrupted." Gawthrop, p. 282.
his realm into a Godly land. Friedrich Wilhelm I was not a hard-edged, uncouth soldier or a devout Christian -- rather he was both, simultaneously, and it appears certain that in his mind there was no incompatibility between the two. Furthermore, he likely believed his beloved Prussian army to be God's army, the iron fist with which he was to protect his charges and his dynasty and also a means of effecting a change in the hearts of his subjects. Germany's last Reformation prince, he likely saw himself an Old Testament patriarch -- perhaps Prussia's David, as Hartmut Lehmann has suggested. If the personal faith of this Reformed, Reformation prince was not completely in accord with Halle Pietism, there were enough areas of fundamental agreement between him and Francke to make their partnership possible. Circumstances within the realm certainly constrained his efforts to reshape Brandenburg-Prussia in accord with this ideology, but he proved capable of making the tactical and strategic compromises necessary to keep his program on track and of seizing opportunities as they arose.

Friedrich Wilhelm's desire for harmony between the confessions heightened his interest in the partnership, since he hoped that the Halle Pietists would prove
amenable to confessional union. The fact that their common foes, Lutheran Orthodoxy and its noble supporters, continued to resist both Pietism and absolutism also served to bring the two parties closer together. Clearly multiple foci of political-religious allegiance (if the political and religious can even be separated to that extent) persisted among the landed nobility and orthodox Evangelical pastors well into Friedrich Wilhelm's reign; both groups continued to question the king's sovereignty in word and deed. If the medieval era was more or less over, it had not ended abruptly. It left other substantial and persistent legacies as well, such as the informal, noninstitutionalized patterns of authority that still existed alongside the new formal institutional structures. The efforts of Friedrich Wilhelm and Francke to transform Prussia into a theocentric realm likely brought a single focus of devotion, that of a Godly state, to a much stronger position among Prussia's citizens. If a further shift of devotion from God to state occurred, however, it likely came after Friedrich

2 These hopes were of course unrealized. See Chapter 5.

3 See Melton, pp. xvii ff. The multinodal, multiroute communication network between Halle and the king is an example of such an informal pattern of authority, even though its participants were of course dedicated to supplanting the medieval order.
Wilhelm's death in 1740, or at least after Francke's death in 1727.

The 1713 meeting of the king and Francke at Halle was the culmination of political maneuvers that brought Pietism to a new position in Brandenburg-Prussia. It established to the skeptical king's satisfaction that he could indeed trust Francke and his co-workers. Once the two parties established that relationship of trust, they found opportunities to work together. In large measure, the partners relied upon on a number of trusted colleagues for communication, obviating the need for frequent direct correspondence. The evidence does not support the hypothesis that the relatively small (though obviously not so small as is often cited) number of direct letters proves there was no close relationship between Francke and Friedrich Wilhelm. When matters arose that demanded the attention of the principals, the two leaders dealt with them in a timely and direct manner. They concentrated their efforts on those arenas where their efforts seemed most necessary, not simply where success seemed guaranteed. Opponents in East Prussia, Lithuania, and Pomerania would present Friedrich Wilhelm and the Halle Pietists with challenges throughout the era, but the partners did not shirk from their efforts to institute their programs in those regions.
The relationship between the king and Francke was reciprocal; the Halle Pietists were not weak, pliant toadies of the king who spent their days in mystic contemplation. Francke and his colleagues objected to the king's plan to transfer Philipp Michaelis from Archangel to Potsdam, failed to endorse Friedrich Wilhelm's plan for union, and demurred when asked to run the king's Potsdam military orphanage. Nor did the extensive involvement of Francke and his Halle co-workers in Brandenburg-Prussian school and church politics mean that Halle Pietism had forsaken its commitment to world reform. Francke persisted in his interest in travel outside the realm and kept up his correspondence with people around the world, Halle maintained and even expanded its missionary network, and the university offered both Turkish and Arabic language courses to its students, despite their obvious lack of utility within the realm. Francke and his co-workers wanted to have influence in Brandenburg-Prussia and maintain their worldwide program, and any shift in priorities after 1713 was a variation in the emphasis of their efforts and not an absolute change of course. Put another way, while one could postulate that Pietism's work in Brandenburg-Prussia hindered the Pietist mission programs by

4 AFSt, A172:6.
diverting their resources and personnel, could the Pietists have had a strong, worldwide, comprehensive and universal reform program without a strong base, which the Halle Anstalten, supported by privileges from the king and patrons throughout Brandenburg-Prussia, provided? The answer to this question is clearly no.

There is compelling evidence of a deep, mutual respect between these two men, so dissimilar yet united by their faiths and goals. The events surrounding Christian Wolff's dismissal offer confirmation that Francke represented the holy to Friedrich Wilhelm and that Francke's words, deeds, and most importantly the success of the Anstalten had convinced Friedrich Wilhelm that God cared about the Pietists. Friedrich Wilhelm's pragmatism and his religious views combined to convince him he should unite his efforts with the Halle Pietists.

Halle Pietism succeeded in obtaining placements for its pastoral candidates in important pulpits in Brandenburg-Prussia largely because of this alliance with Friedrich Wilhelm and his preference for placing Pietists. The overall numbers of Pietist appointees are substantial enough to suggest that they did contribute to the consolidation of absolutism, but the regional variations attest to continued resistance, in many regions quite effective, by the Estates and the establishment church to the placing of Halle-trained
pastors. Furthermore, in view of the relatively low number of Halle pastors in East Prussia and Lithuania, the number of royal acts and decrees advancing the cause of Pietism in these regions can be properly understood as indicators that the opposition in those regions was particularly effective. This continued opposition to the Halle/Hohenzollern program, combined with the desire of Francke and Friedrich Wilhelm for a comprehensive, thoroughgoing reform of Prussia, likely furthered their desire to use the army as a vehicle for that reform. Pietist chaplains could inculcate the proper beliefs in the troops, and loyal regiments, stationed throughout the realm, served to both protect the land from challenges without and protect the reforms from challenges within Prussia.

The relationship between Halle Pietism and the Hohenzollern monarchy likely created some change in the overall perspective on civic and religious obligation -- in the character, in other words -- of the people, church, and government of Brandenburg-Prussia, as Gawthrop has argued. If such a change transpired,

5 This view is of course not unique to Gawthrop. For example, Martin Schmidt wrote, "Franckes Pietismus bildete ein Hauptelement im Entstehungsprozeß des Preußentums. Er schuf durch die Pflichttreue und Sparsamkeit, die er für den Umgang mit Zeit und Geld einschärfte, durch die Opferwilligkeit für große Ziele und durch das unbestechliche Verantwortungsbewußtsein, das er auch für das unscheinbarste Geschäft auferlegte, die klassische Dienstauffassung und die Verbindung von
however, the new character was not as authoritarian and autocratic as he suggests.6 The Prussian state which the Pietist-Hohenzollern partnership helped create was able to survive wars, weak princes, and the stresses of industrialization. The importance for the survival of the realm of its independent, clear-thinking group of leaders, leaders for whose formation the Halle-Hohenzollern partnership and its educational institution were instrumental, is beyond question. In fact, Prussian military officers were far from the mindless automatons of historical myth -- witness the notorious (to the point of disobedience) independence of officers in Frederick the Great's army, Prussia's turn against Napoleon in 1812, or even the July 1944 plot against Hitler, all engineered by army officers.7 Yet the system which the partnership created was nowhere close to a modern bureaucracy in its comprehensiveness or its efficiency.

6 See especially pp. 270 ff.

7 For a convincing exposition of this independence, see Robert Weldon Whalen, Assassinating Hitler (London: Associated University Presses, 1993), pp. 90 ff. Gawthrop in fact makes two critiques of the relationship between Francke and Friedrich Wilhelm that are mutually exclusive. He suggests that their efforts at education actually failed, and also that their efforts succeeded in transforming the outlook of Prussia's citizens, creating willing servants. Gawthrop, pp. 281ff and pp. 268ff.
Absolutist monarch Friedrich Wilhelm may have been; 20th-century autocrat he was not.

Had the hoped-for transformations of individuals on a wholesale scale been accomplished? Measuring the mindsets of others, especially 250 years after the fact, is notoriously tricky business. The extraordinary leap in productivity of the citizens of Brandenburg-Prussia, and the recognition by the leaders of other nations of that fact, certainly suggests that at least some of them had adopted as their own the Pietist understanding of the Christian's duty being to serve God by serving others through one's vocation. The self-discipline, or at least the discipline, of the population of Brandenburg-Prussia would become legendary, to an extent far beyond what external coercion can explain. Brandenburg-Prussia did become a great power, that much is certain. If this transformation was not built upon the efforts of those who served in the realm's parishes and schools backed by the bureaucratic reforms of Friedrich Wilhelm, then upon what was it built? The list of other possible explanations is a very short and implausible one indeed. Prussia may not have become the Godly realm that Friedrich Wilhelm, Francke, and their co-workers hoped to create, but that failure was not because of a lack of effort on their parts.
Through the course of this partnership, the Halle Pietists showed themselves to be not servile state lackeys, but astute political beings. They, like the leaders of Lutheran Orthodoxy, had learned from the Lutheran Reformation that church reformers needed political support to prosper. Unlike the Orthodox leaders, they avoided institutional stasis, at least for several decades. Halle Pietism also maintained at least some of the desire for thoroughgoing reform characteristic of the more separatistic and radical elements in Christianity while avoiding schism themselves. Francke and his allies had unique and amazing success in institutionalizing their position as the favored variant of Lutheranism in Brandenburg-Prussia. By the 1730s, students who hoped to gain parishes needed to attend Halle, and Halle allies approved or disapproved candidates. The numbers of Halle people gaining parish appointments reflect that success. Ironically, though, the effectiveness of Francke and his allies at making Halle the center of theological education in Brandenburg-Prussia boomeranged once the Pietist principals were gone.8 The system they created was dependent upon specific personalities, most especially August Hermann Francke and Friedrich Wilhelm

8 Regarding this point, see also Bigler, The Politics of German Protestantism, p. 14.
I, for its success and especially its continued energy. Thus, when people like August Hermann Francke, Carl Hildebrand von Canstein, and Johann Porst died, the responsibilities of leadership fell into the hands of Gotthilf August Francke and Johann Freylinghausen, who were too inflexible, and Johann Gustav Reinbeck, who like many members of the faculty adopted Enlightenment beliefs. Similarly, Friedrich Wilhelm's attentions shifted elsewhere, and then his rationalist son Frederick, who had no understanding of himself as an Old Testament patriarch, succeeded to the throne.9 With these changes, the rigidity of the Pietists' system came to work against the goals of its founders, and Halle attendance guaranteed that pastoral candidates would learn the rationalism that Francke had so abhorred. The Pietist leadership made the fundamental error of attempting to create a rigid system in a world of variables.

Had the near-miraculous growth of the Anstalten led the leadership to believe that God would not allow any change in the conditions that had been so favorable? -- perhaps so. If the Halle leadership misinterpreted anything, it was not the meaning of Christ, as some have

9 Frederick styled himself an enlightenment prince and not an absolutist patriarch, though he worked diligently to maintain a patriarchal level of authority.
suggested, but rather the way in which society functioned and especially the way individuals came to the Pietist understanding of Christianity (indeed, the way they themselves had) -- on their own, without being impelled by others. Their actions bespeak an attempt to organize their idealism in a way typical of movements throughout later German history. It is as if their fundamental conservatism made them so uncomfortable with innovations and change, even if they were the causative agents, that they perceived a need to return to order and structure as quickly as possible. Or was it perhaps simply a desire to create a perfect system that led them to embrace and even help enact as law their new place as effectively the state church of the Hohenzollern monarchy?

In any case, the Halle Pietists' attempt to formalize what had begun as a spontaneous movement with legitimate aims of renewal was doomed from the beginning, for they fundamentally misunderstood what had happened for them and for Luther. In supplanting Lutheran Orthodoxy, they themselves became an orthodoxy, and if they did not duplicate the exact mistakes of their predecessors and opponents, they made the same kind of

10 I owe this idea to Professor Alan Beyerchen of The Ohio State University, who has suggested that this discomfort (paradoxically often accompanied by a begrudging admiration) with those who manipulate the system to their advantage, along with attempts to organize idealism, are characteristically German traits.
mistakes. They were no more inherently evil than any of their contemporaries, they were not the psychologically disturbed creators of automatons, but their attempt to use legislation to freeze time at their point of greatest success through legislation was their tragic flaw.11 In a final irony, Wittenberg, the former center of Orthodoxy and opposition to Halle, would become the center of neo-Pietist thought during the late 1700s, and the Halle theological faculty would split between rationalists and the increasingly rigid intellectual descendents of Spener and Francke. The continued conservatism of the Halle theologians of that era actually may have actually alienated people from the Evangelical church, and the close alliance of the church and the secular regime likely further diminished its spiritual authority. The dynamism of movement was lost, and institutionalized Pietism no longer followed its founders' example of meeting people where they were with the Gospel message.

Was the tie between the Prussian Pietists to the state inherently flawed, necessitating a conscious exchange of their beliefs and goals for those of the monarchy -- no, unless one believes that any relationship

11 One wonders whether this desire to freeze time at whatever point the movement's leaders believe was their "golden age" is the fate of all renewal movements, and whether it is even possible for such a movement to retain its energy and vigor when tempted by the benefits institutionalization provides for its leaders.
between the church and the state irreparably compromises a religious group. Yet while it is questionable to assert that Halle Pietism adopted the priorities of the Hohenzollern monarchy wholesale, the Pietists did err if they believed that they could maintain control of their relationship with the state indefinitely. Were they simply not prescient regarding how all-encompassing the modern state would become, or did they perhaps want it to become that powerful, so long as it supported their agenda? The Halle Pietists could not, or would not, stop at simply having their programs doing well -- they aimed at a complete, perfect, Godly church and state, and this desire for total success forced them into a rigidity that ultimately destroyed their program. Though to some extent the institutional structure they had built allowed their influence to continue for 100 years, that was the form, not the spirit, of Halle Pietism. Could other means have offered a chance of success? Rather than attempting to maintain their position through royal edicts, they could have embarked on a continual re-examination of the appropriateness of their theology and practice for a changing time, but that would have required a depth of trust in themselves and in God's continued providential blessing that the second and perhaps even the first generation of Pietist leaders apparently did not possess.
The Halle Pietists created a theologically coherent, socially vital movement. The movement's flaws lay in the application of its ideals, not in its beliefs, emphases, or practices. Its quick success despite long odds led the Halle leadership to perceive, almost certainly correctly, that it was appropriate for its time and place. They also perceived the hand of God in their success, however, and thus in the minds of the Halle leaders their opponents became the opponents of God's plan, opponents not to be suffered. Once they began trying to help God along by reshaping all of Prussia along the lines of the Anstalten, they, like so many Christian renewal movements before them, lost sight of what had enabled Christianity to go from persecuted sect to the West's dominant religion, the voluntary association of believers in community guided by the free working of the Holy Spirit. When that occurred, God's special way lay beyond their grasp.
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