

Protestant Churchmen in the German Enlightenment — Mere Tools of Temporal Government?*

John Michael Stroup

Je n'entreprends point de juger cette ancienne constitution de l'Église; je dis seulement qu'elle ne préparait point l'âme des prêtres à la servilité politique.

Alexis de Tocqueville, *L'ancien régime et la révolution*, ch. XI.

I

The German Enlightenment is reputed to have fostered subservience to governmental authority, or at best to have been inordinately willing to knuckle under. Even its leading figures—for example, Lessing and Kant—were constrained by governmental pressure.¹ Less illustrious writers and thinkers are generally held to have been hopelessly subservient to absolutism, a circumstance which has reinforced the propensity of scholars to chide the entire German Enlightenment for its lack of spine.²

Recently this view has been restated in the most sweeping terms by Thomas P. Saine, who contends that the German Enlightenment failed to produce any significant opposition to absolutism and its spokesmen.³

Because the Christian church still exercised a considerable influence in Germany during the eighteenth century, scholars have stressed the important role played by the Protestant clergy as propagators of *Aufklärung*.⁴ For Saine, therefore, to uphold his characterization of the entire German Enlightenment as a movement essentially incapable of resisting pro-absolutist pressures, he must demonstrate that most Protestant churches at the time were utterly defenseless against the temporal government's boundless desire to manipulate spiritual institutions in the service of this-worldly goals. He writes: "Die Tatsache, daß die Kirche immer zugleich National-

* Revision of a paper at the Herbsttagung of the Lessing-Akademie (Wolfenbüttel), 29 October 1976.

kirche war und von den Ministern durch die Staatsräson gelenkt werden konnte und wurde, gab dem Staat eine unwiderstehliche Macht über das öffentliche Geistesleben."⁵

Saine seems justified in this conclusion. His opinion about the infinity malleability of territorial churches and churchmen is supported by a long scholarly tradition. The churchmen of the German Enlightenment have long been regarded as the docile tools of secular government, so eager to curry favor with absolutist rulers, and to make themselves useful on the this-worldly terms dictated by triumphant philosophes and absolutist monarchs, that they were totally incapable of resisting a decisive secularization of their profession and its goals. Instead, shaken by Enlightenment scepticism, these churchmen are said to have sought and found professional contentment in a limitless fostering of civic obedience and economic productivity. This willingness to serve as agents of government allegedly manifested itself in an unbounded clerical enthusiasm for remodelling preaching and ministry so as to fulfill innumerable administrative, economic, and ideological duties for the state. This judgment, prevalent in some circles during the nineteenth century,⁶ remains the standard opinion among both ecclesiastical and secular historians.

As an example one can take the recent study by an American church historian, Edward Dixon Junkin. Focusing on the attitude of German Enlightenment churchmen to revolution, Junkin concludes that they failed to protect either their professional integrity or the distinctively biblical content of their message: both were allegedly delivered up to reactionary governmental manipulation because the clergy had already during earlier phases of the Enlightenment surrendered the basis for defending both. Having bowed to governmental pressure, the enlightened pastor supposedly agreed with secular governments that he "was a public official" whose "calling" required him "to teach good morality and to encourage decency and order in public affairs."⁷ Indeed, Junkin claims (without any attempt at systematically investigating what theological faculties and consistories actually held on the point) that for these churchmen "the primary task" of the clergyman was that of a "moral pedagogue" striving to "protect society from violent upheaval."⁸

Non-confessional scholarship also supports the idea that these churchmen were unduly ready to co-operate with secular govern-

ments. Thus Dagobert de Levie concludes that the religion and pastors of the Protestant Enlightenment, by their "tendency to secularize all aspects of life, undermined the very position of religion and ultimately led to the enthronement of nationalism as a secularized religion."⁹

It is fair to say, then, that decades of scholarship about the Protestant clergy as a professional group during the German Enlightenment can be summarized in two theses.

First thesis: In taking on numerous this-worldly duties, the Enlightenment churchmen were abjectly capitulating before the demand of secular government and its theorists that clergymen serve the state.

Second thesis: The enlightened clergy were on the whole so willing to serve as handmaidens of the state and of temporal welfare that they ended by making such this-worldly business the chief concern of their profession.

II

As Saine himself has shown, the German Enlightenment has not yet been systematically researched.¹⁰ This statement holds for the clergy and their professional aims. In fact, scholarship on the subject is in need of revision for two reasons. First, it does not give an accurate picture of the radically secular nature of the precise demands on the clerical profession made by the publicistic advocates of enlightened absolutism. Second, it fails to give a realistic idea of how the churchmen responded to these demands. By examining these two points, one can show that the summary theses above are seriously misleading—that the enlightened clergy were far more than mere spiritual clay in the hands of a temporal potter.

This paper formulates the results of an investigation of these points in two new countertheses. In defending these countertheses, I am consciously leaving out of consideration most edicts from the temporal government pushing clergy to undertake administrative and patriotic activities, since the fact of this pressure is well-established.¹¹ Instead, I want to put the matter into a broader context by discussing two kinds of examples: first, examples of radically anti-clerical demands from all over Protestant Germany, and second, instances of the clerical response as it evolved in one area.

That area consists of two close-lying and historically related territories which remained distinct enough to be regarded as specimens

of different types of small state. The two territories, Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel and Kurhannover, both shared a tradition of openness to moderately enlightened Lutheran theology stemming from the pioneering work of Johann Lorenz von Mosheim (1694–1755), who taught at Helmstedt (in Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel) and later served as chancellor at Göttingen (in Kurhannover).¹² Yet the territories were truly distinct. Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel exemplified the absolutist territory, ruled by dukes imitating Friedrich II of Prussia. Kurhannover, on the other hand, was decentralized; though technically ruled by George III in London, it was actually managed by a local aristocracy. These two territories provide, then, a fair sample of Lutheran Germany during the Enlightenment.

III

First counterthesis. The Enlightenment clergy took on an increasing number of this-worldly tasks with enthusiasm largely because — (A) this gave them a chance to refute radical pro-absolutist Enlightenment critics who, pointing to the alleged parasitism and selfish plotting of the clerical estate, repeatedly urged the state to transform the clergy into state-paid propagators of economically useful information and patriotically useful civil religion deprived of any claim to autonomous worth as professionals, and because (B) in so doing these churchmen could hope to preserve intact the core of their traditional identity and integrity as professionals devoted chiefly to expounding Christianity on the basis of its historic sources.

None of the monographs on the enlightened clergy treats the precise demands made by anti-clerical critics in detail. At most, they may mention Enlightenment criticism of and governmental pressure on the clergy, concluding that both pushed clergy toward greater state service.¹³ That the abolition of the clerical estate and the establishment of something like a civil religion were ever advocated in Germany, seems to have escaped the attention of these scholars altogether. Because the precise nature of these demands must be known in order to evaluate the clerical response, they will be sketched here.

From the middle of the seventeenth century, critics had attacked the privileges and the existence of the clerical estate, be it Protestant

or Roman Catholic. Levellers, Quakers, Pietists, theorists of secularized natural law, and sceptics all agreed that whatever was wrong was the fault of the clergy, and furthermore that a priest—however Protestant or enlightened—still remained a priest. The troubles of mankind could be traced to the fact that in its midst were priests and pastors, dangerous representatives of a *status in statu*, a selfish estate advancing its self-interest at the expense of civil society's well-being. Therefore, concluded the critics, princes should restrict the powers of the clerical estate, transform it into a group of servants paid to do the state's bidding, or root it out altogether.¹⁴

Furthermore, critics were not content with a mere reform of the clergy. They also demanded major changes in the content of religion itself. From the first appearance of modern natural law theories of church-state relations at the time of Bodin, princes were advised, not merely to curtail clerical power, but to reform Christianity itself so as to convert it into a variety of civil religion not unlike that known in ancient Rome which would be less dangerous to civic well-being than orthodox Christianity.¹⁵

This pressure from theorists of natural law, along with the pressure for a radical reform of the clergy, tended already in the seventeenth century to bring about what Gerhard Masur terms "*eine so vollständige Identifikation von Staat und Kirche*" that the threatened result was "*nicht nur die Unterordnung der Kirche, sondern ihre restlose Unterwerfung, ja ihr Aufgehen im Staate.*"¹⁶ Such an extremist goal can be clearly discerned in the works of the first important Enlightenment publicist in Germany, Christian Thomasius. He advocated conferring on the prince what Mosheim described as "*ein Jus absolutum und illimitatum*" over religion. He wanted to strip the Lutheran clergy of any independent base of power by abolishing clerical influence in consistories, clerical incomes and immunities, clerical disciplinary and sacramental authority over the laity, clerical autonomy in the determination of what was preached, and clerical freedom from arbitrary dismissal. In short, as Mosheim put it, Thomasius wanted to transform pastors from "*die Diener des Evangeliums*" into "*weltlichen Dienern.*"¹⁷

All over Germany governments realized parts of this program. And, as the eighteenth century proceeded, there were more and more calls for the wholesale transformation of clergy and religion into the tools of the government and nothing more. Such radical reform

THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

plans generally emanated from advocates of strong central planning by the state and usually represented a viewpoint which may loosely be labelled cameralist, *étatiste*, *dirigiste*, centralist, and utilitarian. Such an outlook was also associated with the pedagogical movement called Philanthropism, whose advocates (like the cameralist economic planners) tended to hold that the happiness of the individual could be fully realized only within a smoothly-ordered and rationally planned society. Advocates of this viewpoint, recognizing the influence of the clergy over public life, were not slow to see that the clerical estate as traditionally constituted represented a threat to the frictionless functioning of the planned society, and hence that any reform of society on "rational" principles would be well-advised to transform the clergy from cantankerous hindrances to progress into obedient servants of the enlightened state.¹⁸

One well-known publicist whose ideas tended in this direction was Thomas Abbt. Toward the close of the Seven Years' War, Abbt urged that the clergy become propagandists for what can with some justification be called a civil religion. In order to foster public spirit, Abbt urged clergy to de-emphasize other-worldly matters and instead to preach to young men that they should join up and die for the "Fatherland." Moreover, Abbt encouraged clergy to demonstrate their patriotism even during peacetime by vigorously advancing the temporal well-being of the state.¹⁹

More drastic suggestions followed. For example, it was sarcastically urged in the *Deutsches Museum* in 1782 that the paid clergy be abolished since they hindered the spread of natural religion and social harmony.²⁰ In 1783 Moses Mendelssohn argued for direct state compensation of the clergy, a proposal tending toward greater state control over pastors.²¹ In the same year Johann Erich Biester urged in the *Berlinische Monatsschrift* that the state, not the clergy, should solemnize marriages. Moreover, he held, "Politik und Religion" should in future become identical so that "alle Gesetze die Heiligkeit von Religionsvorschriften hätten."²²

Detailed blueprints appeared, showing how governments could carry out a radically secular transformation of the clergy and their message. One came from Carl Friedrich Bahrdt. In 1785 he contended that traditionally-trained clergy were superfluous to the state. The university curriculum in academic theology and Oriental languages ought to be scrapped so that pastors could be trained as *Volkslehrer*, or state-supervised teachers responsible for the people's

this-worldly welfare.²³ The ultimate goal of Bahrdt's plans became unmistakably clear in 1792, when he proposed setting up a deistic state religion complete with a uniform public worship service based on natural religion.²⁴

Furthermore, men in public office began to work toward realizing such plans. For example, in 1785 the former military chaplain Joachim Heinrich Campe was entrusted by the Duke of Braunschweig with a comprehensive project of school reform. Campe based his planned reform on the Philanthropist system of progressive education. He hoped to achieve maximum happiness through rational regimentation of society: early career training was to promote a goal of bee-hive-like productivity within the framework of the absolutist state.²⁵

As part of the proposed reforms, Campe advocated that rural clergy be trained as *Volkslehrer* promoting popular Enlightenment, public health, and industriousness. The ancient languages, along with academic theology and supernaturalist doctrines, were to be eliminated from the theological curriculum; to make room for a vernacular and rationalistic study of the teachings of Jesus, agronomy, the natural history of the "Fatherland," pharmacology, and surgery.²⁶ Bahrdt or one of his disciples was to be called to Helmstedt to direct theological education, and only enthusiastic advocates of Philanthropism were to be advanced to desirable ecclesiastical posts in the territory.²⁷

Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel was something of a center for radical plans. For example, in 1787 Jacob Mauvillon, an instructor in military tactics at Braunschweig's Collegium Carolinum, proclaimed that the traditional Christian clergy were beyond any hope of reform. Therefore he advised the state to set up a totally new group of teachers to propagate natural religion and political virtue.²⁸

Support for plans of this variety was by no means limited to Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel. Official endorsement for them came from many directions, including influential circles in Prussia. However, so far as I can judge, in most areas the Enlightenment churchmen themselves did not in the majority approve such radical plans. At all events, such plans were definitely rejected by the vast majority of the leading churchmen in Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel and Kurhannover.²⁹

This is, however, not to imply that the charges made against the clerical estate in anti-clerical propaganda and in radical reform pro-

posals remained altogether without effect on the basic stance of the leading churchmen. Quite the contrary: this anti-clerical propaganda evoked a long-lasting and complex clerical response that has long been forgotten or misinterpreted. Its initial effects are well exemplified in the theology and publicistic activity of Johann Peter Miller (1725–1789). Miller, who had studied with Mosheim at Helmstedt, was one of the most influential of the second generation of North German Enlightenment theologians. He joined the Göttingen faculty in 1766.³⁰ Miller's theology was largely aimed at refuting Bayle's and Rousseau's allegation that Christianity and the clergy were harmful to the state's military success and temporal well-being. His publications on pastoral theology were profoundly shaped by the radical criticism, boundless scorn, and governmental constraint directed against the clergy. Responding to such criticism by appropriating some of Thomas Abbt's ideas, Miller asserted that Christianity is "heilsam" for human society and that Christianity and the clergy can aid in making every believer into a "beeiferter Patriot."³¹ Thus there can be no doubt that Miller's theology of the ministry received its special form because he wished to provide a defensive reply to radical critics who charged that the ministry was detrimental to civil society. The pressing need to do this can be gauged from the comments made by Miller's nephew, a theology student at Göttingen in the early 1770's. He reported that five out of every six theology students abandoned their studies out of disgust at the bad reputation of the clerical estate.³²

Miller responded to this entire problem by recommending to pastors—especially to the much despised and numerous country preachers—that they devote more time to caring for the temporal well-being of their congregations. In particular, he advocated that the clergy should further the material prosperity of the peasantry by imparting to them the latest suggestions "zur Verbesserung ihres Ackerbaues, Viehstandes . . . Wirthschaft, Kinderzucht, Krankenpflege . . ."³³ Yet he was careful not to go so far in this direction as to further any radical secularization of the clerical role.

By the time of Miller's call to Göttingen, a number of pastors throughout Germany had already become active in economic agricultural, and patriotic societies in order to counteract post-war economic problems and to bolster the reputation of their estate.³⁴ In an effort to encourage such economic activity in Kurhannover and Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel while furnishing a theological

defense of it, Miller endorsed the publications issued by Johann Heinrich Ress, the Superintendent of Wolfenbüttel in Braunschweig. It is important to consider Ress and Miller as a publicistic team. Ress published a journal which gave pastors practical details on how they could become more useful, while it was Miller who re-worked Lutheran Orthodoxy on the basis of Wolffianism and Pietist influences so as to elaborate a complete moral theology which would fit the needs of pastors in his day. Thus only by considering these two figures together can one adequately assess just what this new approach to ministry did or did not imply.

Ress's journal, published between 1779 and 1783 as *Der patriotische Landprediger*, opened with an introduction in which Miller defended the theological desirability of combining practical instruction on this-worldly matters with more traditional religious instruction of the peasantry.³⁵ The purpose of this new approach to ministry became unmistakably clear in the first article, in which Ress justified its necessity by reference to the general contempt in which society held the rural clergy.³⁶

In dealing with this problem, Ress began by reprinting five pages from Thomas Abbt so as to show how clergy, by teaching their flock how to improve their temporal and civic well-being, could rescue their estate's reputation.³⁷ Later Ress described in detail how rural pastors could provide just such instruction in agronomy and other practical matters.³⁸

This new approach was intended to offer an apology for the Christian ministry so as to disarm its critics. That point is firmly established both by the thrust of Miller's entire moral theology and by Ress's own explicit comments. But this new approach was *not* intended to transform the clergy into exactly what some of their radical critics demanded, mere state-directed servants of temporal welfare. This latter point can best be illustrated by looking closely at Miller's theology.

Despite Miller's emphasis on the civic usefulness of Christianity, he retained an essentially traditional doctrine of the church. He taught that it could only be established and preserved by the supernatural power of the Holy Spirit operating through the means of grace.³⁹ He defined the *Hauptzweck* of the church as the fostering of a basically other-worldly purpose—namely, that "Die Menschen sollen zugleich und mit einander in Ewigkeit einer unaussprechlichen und vollkommen Glückseligkeit . . . genießen."⁴⁰ Miller also

held in traditional fashion that mankind could be converted and sanctified only by appropriating the merits of Jesus Christ through the aid of the Holy Spirit,⁴¹ and furthermore that the pastor must conduct "sein ganzes Amt" so as to lead his congregation through repentance, faith, and sanctification to true blessedness.⁴² In short, his views on conversion and his doctrine of the ministry, like his ecclesiology, stand in a basic continuity with the doctrinal corpus of Christian Orthodoxy, however much his views on justification and sanctification have been modified by Reformed theology, Pietism, and Enlightenment.⁴³

In keeping with this fundamentally traditionalist tendency, Miller cautioned in the clearest possible terms that the pastor's new-found interest in this-worldly duties must never lead him to neglect his duty to his parishioners' eternal welfare. In his ministry, asserted Miller, the pastor must follow the example of Jesus, who, so as to get and keep his hearers' attention, had begun his work among simple people by speaking about this-worldly matters such as the "Unterschiede des Bodens, der Sämerey . . . vom verschiedenen Ertrage der Felder . . . Ländereyverpachten."⁴⁴ However, the pastor must follow the *whole* example of Jesus, and not limit his ministry to the mere furthering of temporal welfare:

Aber unser Herr blieb hiebey nicht stehen, und begnügte sich nicht, wie jetzt gewisse Erfinder eines populären Christenthums, nur damit, daß er seinen Zuhörern zeigte, wie sie durch ihr gutes und kluges Verhalten ihren eignen Nutzen befördern . . . sondern er betrachtete, ehrte und belehrte sie als Unsterbliche, die nach eben so weisen und wohlthätigen Regeln, mit noch ungleich grössern Fleisse das ewige Glück ihrer Seelen befördern, der Wahrheit und Tugend nachstreben, und Gottes Beyfall und Gnade allem in der Welt, als seine Kinder und künftige Erben in einen bessern Welt, beständig vorziehen müßten.⁴⁵

According to Miller, then, Jesus had used an empirical or this-worldly method of instruction as a means—a means of reaching the people so as to fulfill his real purpose of teaching them, not only how to find earthly happiness, but also how they might become capable of something higher than the things of this world. That something higher was the experiencing of "jener übermenschlichen

Freuden in der Engelwelt."⁴⁶ Unfortunately, complained Miller, this caution in the use of this-worldly matters in the ministry was not advocated by certain contemporary radicals, who thought that 'die von ihnen so genannte christliche Moral nur zu einer Anweisung dienen sollte, sich durch äusserliches Wohlverhalten mit Ehren und glücklich in diesem Leben durchzuhelfen . . .'⁴⁷ It is, then, plain that Miller ascribed to this-worldly duties an important status because they could help the pastor to reach people who otherwise would ignore the ministry.

Nor did Miller's new variety of pastoral theology mix the temporal and the spiritual so as to deprive the clergy and the church of their distinct functions, thereby encouraging further the dissolving of the church within the state. Quite the contrary. Miller's treatment of the duties of the Christian shows this clearly: it is organized around a basic three-fold distinction between natural, civil, and spiritual society which keeps state and church in separate compartments.⁴⁸ Furthermore, in his treatment of the church, he adheres to the collegialist school of church law, which had come into existence for the sole purpose of defending the integrity and self-interest of the church against the tendency of Thomasius and his followers to press for a complete identification of state and church.⁴⁹ Consequently Miller maintained that "jede Gesellschaft, die im Staate ist . . . hat ihr eigenes Interesse" or "Endzweck." For the church this consisted in the furthering of its members' *Gemeinschaft mit Gott*, a communion over which—according to Miller—the state has no power.⁵⁰ This careful distinguishing of the spiritual and temporal is a clear sign of Miller's fundamental desire to protect the integrity of the church and the clerical estate.

The Enlightenment remodelling of the pastoral role was, then, at its inception conceived as a defense of the social value of Christianity which could safeguard the traditional purpose of the Christian ministry (the cure of souls) by disarming the ministry's radical critics. The Enlightenment churchmen who undertook this initial apologetic remodelling of the clerical role plainly did not intend for this-worldly or civic duties to get the upper hand, as the example of Miller illustrates: to allow that would have been to capitulate to the demands of the radically secularist critics. The latter indeed aimed at transforming the Protestant clergy into mere tools of the temporal government; whereas the churchmen who came to the defense of the clerical estate aimed at no more than demonstrating

how the clerical estate could, in an incidental way, fulfill useful this-worldly functions. Only in that way could they hope effectively to answer the polemical claim that the clergy were inherently harmful to civil society.

Yet one may still rightly ask whether—as Reinhard Krause⁵¹ has contended—with the passage of time most clergymen did not probably come to regard this-worldly activities as their main job. This question requires an answer in my second counterthesis. Its defense will show that, with the passage of time, the leading churchmen became ever more resolute in their adherence to the initial refusal to make this-worldly duties the clerical *raison d'être* which had been previously voiced by Miller in the earlier stages of theological Enlightenment in Northwest Germany.

IV

Second counterthesis: At no time did most leading Enlightenment churchmen abandon the principle that this-worldly duties should constitute no more than a mere supplement to the clergyman's traditional role as expounder of Christianity and shepherd of souls; when asked by governments or the theorists of absolutism to surrender this principle, most leading churchmen refused and then began a far-reaching campaign to defend the economic, institutional, juridical, and ideological basis of their traditional autonomy and integrity as professionals chiefly devoted to strictly religious (non-temporal) tasks.

Scholars treating the German Enlightenment from the viewpoint of ecclesiastical or literary history too often underestimate the way in which particularist and traditionalist forces obstructed the fulfillment of pro-absolutist plans.⁵² In Germany, just as in Montesquieu's France, nobles, assemblies of estates, and other privileged corporations at times restrained the tendency of central governments to regiment society.⁵³

One of Montesquieu's most important *pouvoirs intermédiaires* tending to check monarchy was the clergy.⁵⁴ Like their French Roman Catholic colleagues, the German Protestant clergy were situated in a legal and social position which enabled them on occasion to resist the demands of princes: even after the advent of Thomasius, they still enjoyed immunities, incomes, and privileges

giving them a certain degree of independence.⁵⁵ In fact, Protestant churchmen valued their potential for restraining absolutist rulers. For this very reason they had sought to conserve as much of their prestige and economic self-sufficiency as possible in the face of pro-absolutist attacks on it. Thus in the 1750's Mosheim, an expert in these matters, asserted (thinking more about Germany than about Montesquieu's France):

Wir wollen aus politischen Gründen darthun, daß die Geistlichen mehr Ehre und Ansehen haben sollten. Es klagt itzo alle Welt über den Despotismus, der so sehr einreißet . . . Aber durch drey Dinge wird der Despotismus noch zurück gehalten. Einmal kann der Adel noch viel thun, zweytens gelten die Parlamente . . . noch etwas; das dritte Mittel ist die Religion, und dieses ist das stärkste. Wenn aber die Religion gegen den Despotismus gebrauchet werden soll: so müssen die Geistlichen mit mehr Ansehen und Einkünften versehen werden.⁵⁶

In this spirit the majority of Enlightenment churchmen had set out to win back public respect by assuming new varieties of this-worldly duties. Given this intent, they were certain to rebuff any attempt to manipulate their new concern with civic and economic affairs so as to transform them into mere state functionaries.

The crisis in both Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel and Kurhannover came in the years 1785–1800. In that period leading churchmen in both places saw that any additional utilitarian remodelling of the pastoral role would, by giving this-worldly functions a central rather than a supplementary character, deprive the clergy of any claim to autonomous worth and integrity as professionals, decreasing rather than increasing their prestige and effectiveness in society, making them too dependent on temporal government. Hence they decisively rejected plans for such radical reforms.

In both territories the plans of Bahrdt, Campe, and like-minded publicists provided the basic occasion for this defensive effort. Differing local circumstances shaped the precise form of the clerical defense. In Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel the problem had to be faced because the projected ducal reforms threatened to effect a radically secular transformation of the clergy. In Kurhannover the immediate cause for a reappraisal of professional aims was provided by the

Göttingen theology students, whose interest in traditional exegetical and academic theology declined sharply in the 1780's as their interest in more "practical" or secular approaches to ministry rose.⁵⁷

The ecclesiastical leadership in these two territories made defense of clerical autonomy in two ways. First, it issued numerous polemical statements condemning radical secularization of the ministry and exalting the importance of the pastor's purely religious duties. Second, it took a variety of juridical and institutional measures designed to protect the integrity of the profession.

There is an abundance of examples of leading churchmen in both places who denounced excessive concern with economic or agricultural matters that threatened to become more than a mere supplement to the traditional purpose of the ministry. The leading churchmen also inveighed against the notion that religion could be used as a political tool. Among the defenders of this traditionalist viewpoint in Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel were Johann Caspar Velthusen (Professor of Theology at Helmstedt),⁵⁸ his colleague Heinrich Philipp Conrad Henke (director of two seminaries),⁵⁹ and August Christian Bartels (the Abt of Riddagshausen).⁶⁰ Representing the same position in Kurhannover were such churchmen as Gottfried Less (Professor of Theology at Göttingen and a *Consistorialrat*),⁶¹ Christoph Friedrich Ammon (director of the seminary at Göttingen),⁶² and Johann Konrad Achatz Holscher (court chaplain in Hannover).⁶³

All proclaimed that civic and this-worldly duties must not be allowed to become the *raison d'être* of the clergy; at most, they could be allowed in a supplemental capacity. This majority view was upheld, not by a few fossils from the period of seventeenth-century Orthodoxy, but by theologians representing the mainstream, even the advance guard, in theological Enlightenment. Of the six leading churchmen enumerated above, the most conservative, Less, was attacked on grounds of heterodoxy by a specialist in these matters, Johann Melchior Goeze;⁶⁴ while the most completely enlightened of them, Henke, is customarily cited by historians of dogma as an extreme Rationalist because he went so far as to criticize excessive veneration of Jesus Christ as a superstition.⁶⁵

These theologians all attempted to show how important the religious part of their calling was. Their ways of making this point deserve examination, for their proofs show how unreliable most historiography on these matters is. Anti-Enlightenment ecclesiastical, Idealist, and Romantic historians, depicting post-Napoleonic the-

ological conservatism as the one savior of clerical integrity, have customarily suggested that the sceptical and cynical Enlightenment churchmen completely ignored Herder's criticism of excessive clerical utilitarianism as well as his efforts to magnify the importance of the religious element in the ministry.⁶⁶ This impression is altogether misleading. In 1774 Herder had exalted the importance of the pastor's religious role by connecting it with one of his central ideas, the theme of a divine *Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts*. He had gone on to reject Rousseau's civil religion and the political manipulation of the clergy by asserting that the pastor's main responsibility was to the religious needs of the *Mensch*, not to the *Bürger* as a citizen of this world.⁶⁷ (In so doing, Herder had utilized the standard Enlightenment natural law distinction between *der Mensch* as a member of human society and *der Bürger* as a member of that civil society constituted by the state; thereby he was able to show that the main clerical responsibility was to an eternal purpose weightier than anything based on social contract.)⁶⁸ Both of Herder's techniques for defending clerical integrity were in fact utilized by the leading churchmen in Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel and Kurhannover after 1785. For example, in 1790 Less at Göttingen based his defense of the pastor's importance as a religious figure on the pastor's role in furthering the divine *Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts*.⁶⁹ In the same year Henke at Helmstedt took up Herder's use of the natural law distinction for the same defensive purpose: in Henke's view, the clergy, far from being a "Teil der Dienerschaft des Staats," were instead servants of the religious needs of the *Mensch* performing a service "viel erhabner und göttlicher als jeder bürgerlich nützliche Dienst."⁷⁰

These churchmen, unlike Herder, did not confine their defense of professional integrity to issuing polemical treatises. On the contrary, they combined polemic with effective institutional measures. In Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel in the years 1787–1790 the leading churchmen took effective action against the immediate threat. Two Lutheran abbots, the consistory, and the ecclesiastical ministry of the city of Braunschweig allied with the acting committee of the assembly of estates so as to force the duke to abandon the planned reorganization of the school system in a more secular direction and Campe's plans for a radical secularization of the rural clergy. At one point the duke's opponents went so far as to threaten him with a suit in the imperial courts.⁷¹

In Kurhannover we find a similar defense against loss of professional integrity. The mounting aversion of the theology students at Göttingen to exegetical and academic theology, and their growing fondness for practical exercises in preaching, teaching, and counselling the sick indicated that radical professional ideas (i. e., ideas based on utilitarian, cameralist, and Philanthropist principles, and hence ideas tending to further the redefinition of the clerical *raison d'être* in a secularizing direction) were gaining ground among future pastors.⁷² This impression was strengthened by the activity of one Göttingen theology professor, who not only uncritically incorporated large chunks of Thomas Abbt's pro-cameralist ideas almost verbatim into his syllabus on pastoral theology (a step never taken by Miller), but also spent a large amount of his energy encouraging the foundation of clerically-supervised industry schools.⁷³ In the decade beginning in 1790 the Göttingen theology faculty and the consistory in Hannover dealt with the potential threat constituted by these circumstances: they initiated a coherent program of institutional measures⁷⁴ regulating theological education and providing criteria by which the consistory would evaluate the performance of parish pastors considered for advancement to parishes under governmental patronage.. By encouraging the study of the ancient languages and academic theology, and by reasserting the consistory's commitment to the centrality of the pastor's religious duties, these steps helped prevent theology students and young pastors from adopting a radically secular model for ministry which would have made them increasingly susceptible to potential future manipulation by the secular government. This program tried to safeguard the traditional primacy of theological concerns over this-worldly duties, and furthermore sought to ensure that the pastor's duties to the state and society would assume no more than a subordinate place.

This basic motive behind the program emerges clearly from its most important measure, the new *Pastoral-Instruction* issued by the consistory in 1800. It was directed at young pastors who might be leaning in a radical direction, and left no doubt that the consistory discouraged any secular remodelling of the clerical role. It cautioned that peripheral concerns must never overshadow the profession's basic religious aims, nor cause the pastor to meddle in medical or other affairs not pertaining to his profession.⁷⁵

Leading theologians associated with this set of measures sounded

a decisively anti-statist note in denouncing any attempt to manipulate the clergy for secular purposes, whether that attempt might come from pro-absolutist reformers, revolutionary movements, or theology students eager to try out progressive ideas. In their opposition to such secularizing trends, the leading Enlightenment churchmen in Kurhannover asserted—as one put it—that the basic purpose of the clergy was to provide mankind with an ‘antidote’ to the moral ‘poison’ with which the state inevitably corrupts humanity. This idea was used to demand that the state itemize all its civic requests made of pastors, and that such tasks be carried out separate from worship.⁷⁷ Furthermore, it was held that pastors might undertake such civic duties only “insofern [der Staat] selbst den Supremat der Menschheit und sich im Dienste derselben anerkennen muß.”⁷⁸ Thus both the *Pastoral-Instruction* itself and the clerical discussion surrounding its appearance were an outgrowth of a basic drive to demand the subordination and separation of the pastor’s civic role:⁷⁹ though the leading churchmen did not repudiate their responsibilities to the state, they attempted to keep them in a place of secondary importance.

In both territories the leading churchmen took two further steps in self-defense. First, in each territory a journal was founded with the aim of rebuilding clerical self-esteem by fostering better pay and training.⁸⁰ Second, in both territories there were published compilations of ecclesiastical law to aid in the juridical defense of clerical rights.⁸¹ These measures furnish yet another example of the zeal with which the clerical estate tried to protect its integrity. The raising of their own *esprit de corps*,⁸² the improvement of their reputation through better training, and the defense of the financial and legal basis for their professional autonomy against Enlightenment criticism⁸³ were all obviously intended to help protect the clerical estate against undue manipulation in the service of temporal ends. These churchmen truly believed—as one of these compilations of privileges puts it in its opening sentence of text—that “die Religion ist keine Erfindung der Politik.”⁸⁴

V

At the beginning of this paper allusion was made to the image of Enlightenment Germany evoked by Saine. That image can be re-evoked in a few phrases: absolutism triumphant—and exposed to no

significant challenge;⁸⁵ a populace outside the highest governmental circles long since reduced to political passivity, and little inclined to question the wisdom of remaining in this pitiable state;⁸⁶ a single school of learned political philosophy dominant throughout Germany and unanimous in its glorification of absolutism, centralism, and *dirigisme*.⁸⁷ and a Protestant clergy reduced to the status of marionettes manipulated by the secular government in order to serve the crasser interests of *raison d'état*.⁸⁸ To what extent is such a total assessment of Enlightenment Germany congruent with what we have seen above?

Such a view of eighteenth-century Germany is first of all misleading because it fails to take into account the way in which many traditionalist and particularist social groups (e. g., citizens in towns, assemblies of estates, nobles) continued to exercise real and important influence in public life. A wealth of recent studies emphasizes how very one-sided it is to suppose that most of the political life in eighteenth-century Germany was devoted to, or controlled by, the needs and interests of central governments. Furthermore, this recent scholarship stresses that traditionalist and particularist forces during the later eighteenth century were often successful in checking attempts by central governments to regiment society; the role of the imperial courts in this connection is emerging in recent research as especially weighty.⁸⁹ Finally, it cannot rightly be held—as Saine, for example, does—that in Enlightenment Germany there was no discussion about the political power of the citizen, and that cameralism represented the only variety of political and administrative thought, a circumstance which allegedly provided no counterweight to that “hierarchisches Denken” which supposedly taught the citizen “wenig, außer die Kniee zu beugen” before absolutist régimes.⁹⁰ A glance at this matter as it is treated by one scholar specializing in traditionalist forces in eighteenth-century Germany will show how indefensible such an assertion is.

In truth, during the eighteenth century Germany was the scene of a debate between two distinct schools of thought about the nature and purpose of government. One school was, of course, that constituted by the cameralist theorists of enlightened absolutism and their Philanthropist followers. Representatives of this centralist school (e. g., Christian Wolff and the Göttingen professor J. H. G. von Justi) extolled the value of Reason in politics. In Geraint Parry's words, they regarded government “as a machine designed to produce

happiness with the maximum of efficiency."⁹¹ Proponents of this doctrine, looking at matters from the point of view of the governments that employed them, favored "the effective use of the wide-ranging centralized governmental power conceived of as being necessary in order to impose on social action a fixed hierarchy of priorities."⁹²

Had members of this school been the only significant writers on politics in eighteenth-century Germany, it would then be correct to suggest (as Saine tends to do) that the citizen's exercise of political power was neither discussed nor encouraged in Enlightenment Germany. Such was, however, not the case. A second school of thought (nowhere treated in Saine's essays⁹³) levelled severe criticism at the centralism and the emphasis on theoretical reason implicit in the doctrines of the cameralist school. This traditionalist or particularist position numbered among its intellectual progenitors Vico, Montesquieu, and Hume. In Enlightenment Germany, it was represented by Herder, Justus Möser in Osnabrück, J. J. Moser in Württemberg, and the Kurhannoverians August Wilhelm Rehberg and Ernst Brandes. Stressing the importance of regional differences in societies, these writers regarded the political views of the absolutist school as being what Parry terms "inherently tyrannical"; for in trying "to shape society towards a single end," such a political system implied a "large-scale standardization imposed from above."⁹⁴ Such regimentation, when put into practice in a rigorous fashion, would (according to members of the anti-centralist school) introduce what Parry terms "rigidity" into society that would distort "the natural, spontaneous and gradual development of social relationship . . . thereby impair[ing] liberty" and ultimately leading to despotism.⁹⁵

The political thought of this latter school was, then, in large measure directed against what Parry has described as "the anti-libertarian quality" inherent in cameralist and enlightened absolutistic political philosophy.⁹⁶ It is important to note that this particularist school of political thought treated in some detail the need for political participation on the part of a citizenry actively engaged in public life. Stressing the inadequacies of absolutist governmental bureaucrats and administrators, writers of the latter school called for a greater degree of local self-administration by people aware of local needs and problems.⁹⁷ Hence there is good cause to challenge the claim that the total milieu of Germany during the later eight-

PROPERTY LIBRARY

eenth century did virtually nothing toward rousing the Unpolitical Germans from their passivity.

It is thus clear that traditionalist elements in German life were not only able to assert themselves in the face of absolutist pressures, but also were anything but devoid of a theoretical basis for such self-assertion. This fact is particularly well illustrated by both the behavior and the publications of the leading Lutheran churchmen in late Enlightenment Kurhannover and Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel. To begin with, their vigorous and varied efforts to preserve the autonomy of the clerical estate can scarcely be taken as indicative of political passivity on the part of the churchmen when faced with pressures pushing them toward a cameralistic or absolutistic definition of their *raison d'être*. True, up to the 1780's the leading churchmen experimented with strategies of compromise with such pressures in the belief that they could perhaps find a working arrangement that would not endanger their professional identity and self-interest; but when these pressures proved to constitute an unrelenting threat to that identity and self-interest, the churchmen did not hesitate to utter a firm refusal to submit to further pressures pushing them toward total identification of clerical *raison d'être* with temporal *raison d'état*. This refusal was, as we saw above, not limited to ineffective protests: as the case of Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel shows, the churchmen were quite as able to utilize the threat of action in the imperial courts in order to block pro-absolutist plans as were any of their lay contemporaries.

Furthermore, this clerical refusal was not simply an ill-considered tactic of obstructionism, but was rather action undertaken on the basis of a carefully thought-through position. This point becomes evident when one considers the two divergent schools of political and social thought sketched immediately above. When they are taken into account, it becomes obvious that, after 1785 or so there stood confronted, not simply two different positions on the purpose of the Christian ministry, but two positions on ministry which were logical outgrowths of the two diametrically opposed schools of political thought in Germany at the time. The position of Campe and Bahrdr on the clergyman's role is, of course, that of the cameralist, centralist, and Philanthropist school. That of Herder, Velt-husen, Henke, and the other churchmen discussed above is an outgrowth of the entire view of society and government characteristic of the anti-centralist school.⁹⁸ This latter point is abundantly

established—e. g., by the way in which the anti-centralist Rehberg criticized Philanthropist reform plans to deprive the clergy of training in the classical languages, or by the fact that the like-minded Brandes cited the phraseology of Velthusen when launching a vigorous attack on attempts to transform the clergy into consulting medics and practical agronomists.⁹⁹

But the clearest sign of the manner in which the churchmen's self-defense campaign constituted an affirmation and elaboration of the anti-centralist position on politics and society is probably to be found elsewhere—namely, in the churchmen's use of the distinction between man and citizen. The churchmen, like many late-eighteenth-century critics of cameralism and Philanthropism, subordinated governmental and societal needs (the demands of the *Bürger*) to the goal of promoting the unfolding of the individual and eternal personality of the *Mensch*. That is, the leading Enlightenment churchmen in Kurhannover and Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel came to recognize a potential conflict of interest between man and citizen, and furthermore went on to identify their primary professional *raison d'être* as service to the man rather than to the citizen.¹⁰⁰ Such a move meant in practice that the churchmen, like their lay allies, were not prepared to give unquestioning allegiance to the key tenet in centralist theory—namely, the cameralist claim that the individual's search for happiness was totally congruent with, and only realizable within, a perfectly-regulated society so ordered by central planning on rational principles as to promote the greatest happiness for the greatest number.¹⁰¹ Given this attitude on the part of the churchmen, it is hardly surprising that they refused to allow the proponents of cameralist centralism to dictate to them what the purpose of church and ministry ought to be. It is thus correct to say that the clerical opponents of absolutism were just as capable of putting forward an intellectually coherent basis for an activist stance as were their better-remembered lay allies in the anti-centralist school of social and political thought.

There is, however, yet to be discussed a whole second set of reasons why one cannot let a view of Enlightenment Germany such as Saine's go unchallenged. Even if one leaves out of consideration particularist and traditionalist forces, and instead focuses on the classic theme of enlightened central governments and their relationship to the ever-rising bourgeoisie (bzw. emergent *Beamtentum* bzw. *Bildungsbürgertum*), then one still cannot rightly maintain

that the *Aufklärung* as a movement—or its Protestant clergymen—exercised no significant influence in the political realm other than that of promoting a generalized passivity. Quite the contrary: on the basis of current scholarship, one may assert that the incipient *Bildungsbürgertum*, wishing both to consolidate its own position and to enlighten the less educated, sought and achieved a certain process of intellectual and social change which can, in the long run, be characterized as emancipatory in its effects precisely with regard to the issue of participation by the citizenry in public life.¹⁰² This statement, it seems to me, holds for both the question of pressure for broader participation in central government and for the related issue of applying the pressure of public opinion so as to restrain the caprice of central governments. True, one must admit with Vierhaus that it is inexact to term the *Aufklärung* a “bürgerliche Emanzipationsbewegung;”¹⁰³ but at the same time one must also admit with Vierhaus that the promoters of Enlightenment in Germany not only recognized a need to exert the pressure of public opinion on central governments, but also helped to popularize an ideal image of what might rather loosely be termed liberal political community which came to play a significant role in nineteenth-century political life.¹⁰⁴ In general, then, the entire German Enlightenment may safely be said to have widened the political horizons of many in the population; and here the churchmen were anything but passive onlookers. As the studies by Alexandra Schlingensiepen-Pogge and Hans Rosenberg suggest, the churchmen of the later *Aufklärung* were deeply involved in the bourgeois attack on noble privilege and played a not inconsiderable role in the general widening of political vision which occurred in the decades after 1780.¹⁰⁵

Thus in examining Germany between 1770 and 1820 or so, one may distinguish two quite distinct—yet, I would hold, on occasion coincident¹⁰⁶ rather than inevitably antagonistic—forces: on the one hand the pressure of traditionalist, particularist, anti-centralist groups (e. g., the nobles, the assemblies of estates, the clergy considered as a *pouvoir intermédiaire*); and on the other, the humanizing and ultimately emancipatory pressure of the emergent *Bildungsbürgertum* (clamoring for some variety of political and social recognition while increasing its actual influence over governmental bureaucracies).

◀ A view of the German Enlightenment such as the one held by Saine does not, it seems to me, take proper account of either of these

two forces. First, as suggested above, such an account of the *Aufklärung* has nothing to say about that criticism of absolutism voiced by the anti-centralist school—a serious defect if one takes into account the relationship of this criticism to the thought of Montesquieu and Herder. Second, by ignoring the existence of political aspirations of any sort on the part of non-noble social groups, it eliminates all trace of the political implications of the German Enlightenment, thereby summarily reducing it to the status of a mere social and intellectual movement. In fact, a look at the way in which the non-nobles in late Enlightenment Germany extended their influence over governmental bureaucracy (and over educational policy) will amply show how a social and intellectual phenomenon of this kind had any number of political consequences.¹⁰⁷ In short: both 'particularist' and "progressive" social forces could, during the period 1770–1820 or so, at times act in ways which opposed and restrained governmental centralism and its attendant drive toward social regimentation. Leaving this restraining tendency exercised by both forces out of consideration means that one will necessarily regard the German *Aufklärung* as far more apolitical and servile than the European Enlightenment as a whole.

Moreover, it is clear that these two distinct social forces at times found themselves in temporary conjunction, and hence on occasion acted together. This phenomenon is, for example, especially noticeable in connection with proposed reforms in the field of education. Representatives of both traditionalist¹⁰⁸ and "socially emancipatory"¹⁰⁹ forces came forward at the end of the eighteenth century, not simply to obstruct the educational plans of pro-cameralist Philanthropists, but also in order to ensure that educational reforms might take a humanizing and potentially emancipatory, rather than a socially regimenting direction. The result was of course the Neo-humanistic emphasis on the value of the classical languages, a point deliberately stressed in opposition to the narrowly career-oriented training favored by the Philanthropists. As recent scholarship has established, this new emphasis on humanistic training was at its inception conceived of as a means of expanding rather than restricting the freedom of the individual.¹¹⁰

The same peculiar conjunction of traditionalist and "socially liberating" forces can, I think, be found elsewhere. For example, the churchmen discussed above represented in themselves precisely that same conjunction of forces, and on that account felt embold-

ened to assert themselves against the pressure of centralization and regimentation. On the one hand, these churchmen were still legally and socially one of the privileged traditional estates in society. On the other hand, as has been shown recently,¹¹¹ during the eighteenth century the enlightened clergy increasingly tended to identify themselves with the demand of the *Bildungsbürgertum* for greater influence on the direction of state and society. This new-found solidarity is nicely symbolized in the clerical fondness for that distinction between man and citizen which was—as Reinhart Koselleck has demonstrated—the most powerful means used by the bourgeoisie in order to call into question the political legitimacy of the *Ancien Régime* in its absolutist guise.¹¹² Only when the Enlightenment clergy are considered in their double capacity as representatives of a traditional *Stand* fighting for its life and as allies of a newly-emergent *Bildungsbürgertum* does it become possible to see how and why they set very definite limits to their co-operation with secular governments, and hence to see the entire ecclesiastical *Aufklärung* as a phenomenon a good deal more complex than a mere Rococo celebration of the Secular City.¹¹³

We are still very far from arriving at a proper assessment of the German Enlightenment as a whole. We need to push forward, all the while operating with what Saine calls “an inclusive rather than an exclusive definition” of the German Enlightenment¹¹⁴ that will allow us to take new and proper note of both traditionalist and “emancipatory” elements rather than sweeping them into the dustbin of historiography. Without a doubt it is—again in Saine’s words—“time to be militant and to retake the territory that has been sliced away from the Enlightenment by such salami tactics.”¹¹⁵

Yale University

This paper is the result of research generously financed by the Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst, the Yale Concilium on International und Area Studies, the Yale Council on West European Studies, and the Max-Planck-Institut für Geschichte. I owe a debt of gratitude to Profs. Robert Berdahl, Peter Gay, Jaroslav Pelikan, Paul Raabe, and Rudolf Vierhaus for many suggestions, and to Mr. Rand Henson for advice on points of style.

¹ Cf. the famous examples of Lessing in the controversy about the Wolfenbüttel Fragments and of Kant’s difficulties with the censor in 1792–93 concerning his *Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der bloßen Vernunft*. That the German eighteenth century as a whole is widely interpreted as an Age of Absolutism Triumphant is clear from the general fascination with the theme of “enlightened despotism.” Nonetheless, there is good reason to suppose that central

governments had far less impact on the majority of people than historians oriented toward the nation-state have believed—see for example Dietrich Gerhard, "Regionalismus und ständisches Wesen als ein Grundthema europäischer Geschichte," *Historische Zeitschrift*, CLXXIV (1952) 307–337; and Mack Walker, *German Home Towns: Community, State, and General Estate 1648–1871* (Ithaca, New York, 1971), pp. 62–72, 151 ff., 173. It seems to me desirable at the outset to call attention to my scepticism on this general point (i. e., Absolutism Victorious): for the more limited the power of central governments in the Old Régime is admitted to have been, the more plausible will appear my particular claim that the Protestant clergy were not to the last man overrun by the absolutist juggernaut.

² See, for example, the remarks on unpolitical Germans in Wolfgang Martens, *Die Botschaft der Tugend. Die Aufklärung im Spiegel der deutschen moralischen Wochenschriften* (Stuttgart, 1968), p. 325, as cited on p. 336 of Thomas P. Saine, "Was ist Aufklärung? Kulturgeschichtliche Überlegungen zu neuer Beschäftigung mit der deutschen Aufklärung" [hereafter: Saine, "Aufklärung"] in Franklin Kopitzsch, ed., *Aufklärung, Absolutismus und Bürgertum in Deutschland*, Nymphenburger Texte zur Wissenschaft Modelluniversität, 24 (München, 1976). Martens writes: "Bei allem Engagement der Moralischen Wochenschriften für das gemeine Beste, bei aller hier spürbaren Initiative zur Förderung des öffentlich-gesellschaftlichen Lebens ist indessen eines zu sagen: Die deutschen Wochenschriften führen ihre Leser nicht ins Feld des Politischen in dem Sinne, daß der Bürger, der sich für sein Gemeinwesen einsetzt, auch verantwortlich über die Struktur dieses Gemeinwesens befinden und dessen Schicksal auf der Ebene des Staats mitbestimmen sollte. Der 'Patriotismus', zu dem der Bürger aufgerufen wird, ist wesentlich ein unpolitischer Gemeinsinn. Die potentiellen demokratischen Elemente, die einem bürgerlichen Engagement für das Gemeinwesen innewohnen — sie entfalten sich z. B. in der Neuen Welt in der Initiative Benjamin Franklins —, treten im deutschen Bereich nicht hervor. Aus dem gemeinnützigen Bürger wird kein Citoyen." Cf. also the work by Junkin cited in n. 7 below.

³ Saine, "Aufklärung," pp. 319–344 and Saine, "Scholarship on the German Enlightenment as Cultural History: An Essay" [hereafter: Saine, "Scholarship"], *Lessing Yearbook*, VI (1974), 139–149. Clearly Saine's judgments about alleged political passivity in eighteenth-century Germany are in good measure an outgrowth of his belief that in German religion and philosophy hindered the development of an "Auseinandersetzung um den Menschen," which ought to have been "auf der gesellschaftlich-politischen Ebene in aller Öffentlichkeit . . . ausgetragen," but was not because it was "in die Seele zurückprojiziert," with the result that it could only manifest itself in "der frömmelnden Phantasie" (Saine, "Aufklärung," p. 339). This remark, and Saine's comments on the failure of German Protestantism to stand up to temporal governments (cf. "Aufklärung," p. 333 and esp. p. 336 on the lack of anything more than a doctrine of passive resistance), as well as well Saine's approving citation of the passage from Martens (n. 2 above), strongly suggest that Saine locates the basic explanation for German "political passivity" or "apoliticism" in what has often been called the "inward" or "unworldly" character of German Protestantism, especially Lutheranism. Martens himself on the page facing the one cited by

Saine (i. e., on p. 324) goes so far as to claim that "das lutherische Element" was "im Allgemeinen bürgerlicher Initiative zum Wirken in die Welt und ihre Ordnungen wenig günstig." As Martens is aware (cf. Martens, p. 324, n. 66), this claim is a variant on the opinion of Ernst Troeltsch and his followers that Calvinism in Western Europe tended to encourage a progressive (note Martens' reference to Ben Franklin) and potentially democratic attitude (culminating in the doctrine of armed resistance to tyranny espoused by Beza and Knox), whereas Lutheranism tended to encourage "patriarchal" absolutism (and failed to produce any doctrine of armed resistance). This opinion has long since attained to the status of a dogma (cf. Troeltsch, *Die Bedeutung des Protestantismus für die Entstehung der modernen Welt*, 3. Aufl., Beiheft 2 der Historischen Zeitschrift [München, 1924], pp. 55 f.; Gerhard Ritter, "Die Ausprägung deutscher und westeuropäischer Geistesart im konfessionellen Zeitalter," *Historische Zeitschrift*, CXLIV [1934], 240-252; George H. Sabine, *A History of Political Thought*, 3rd ed. [London, 1963], pp. 354-385; Salo Wittmayer Baron, *Modern Nationalism and Religion*, Rauschenbusch Lectures for 1944 [New York, 1947], pp. 117-163; William Montgomery McGovern, *From Luther to Hitler: The History of Fascist-Nazi Political Philosophy* [Cambridge, Mass., 1941]; Carl G. Gustavson, "German Lutheranism: A Psychological Study," *Journal of the History of Ideas*, XI [1950], 140-158; and William Shirer, *The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich* [New York, 1960], p. 91). However, this entire line of approach has been discredited by scholars who have shown that Calvinism functioned rather well as an ideology tailored to the needs of absolutism, and who have moreover shown that, while in fact the sixteenth-century doctrine of a legitimate armed resistance to tyranny is a German Lutheran invention, such armed resistance was *not* affirmed by Calvin himself. On the basis of this new scholarship one must call into question the basic assumptions underlying the view of German history held by Troeltsch, Martens, and (it would also appear) Saine. See against Troeltsch and his followers: Hajo Holborn, "Machtpolitik und lutherische Sozialethik," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, LVII (1966), 23-32; Rudolf von Thadden, *Die Brandenburgisch-Preussischen Hofprediger im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert*, Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte, 32 (Berlin, 1959), pp. 142 f.; Hermann Vahle, "Calvinismus und Demokratie im Spiegel der Forschung," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, LXVI (1975), 182-272, esp. p. 205; Otto Hintze, "Kalvinismus und Staatsräson in Brandenburg zu Beginn des 17. Jahrhunderts," *Historische Zeitschrift*, CXLIV (1931), 229-286; Gerhard Oestreich, "Politischer Neustozismus und Niederländische Bewegung in Europa und besonders in Brandenburg-Preußen, in his *Geist und Gestalt des frühmodernen Staates* (Berlin, 1969), pp. 101-156; Ekkehart Fabian, *Die Entstehung des Schmallkaldischen Bundes und seiner Verfassung 1524/29-1531/35*, Schriften zur Kirchen- und Rechtsgeschichte, 1 (Tübingen, 1962), pp. 116-125; Oliver K. Olson, "Theology of Revolution: Magdeburg, 1550-1551," *Sixteenth Century Journal*, III (1972), 56-79, citing Irmgard Hoess, "Zur Genesis der Widerstandslehre Bezas," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, LIV (1963), 198-214 and Mijo Mircović, *Matija Vlačić Ilirik* (Zagreb, Jugoslavenka Akademija, 1960); Wilhelm Bofinger, "Zur Rolle des Luthertums in der Geschichte des deutschen Ständeparlamentarismus," in *Geist und Geschichte der Reformation. Festgabe Hanns Rückert*, Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte, 38 (Berlin, 1966), pp.

397-417; cf. Ephraim Fischhoff, "The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism: The History of a Controversy," *Social Research*, XI (1944), 54-77.

It is, in fact, clear that recent scholarship emphasizes the importance of Lutheran Orthodoxy as an opponent of incipient absolutism: for a particularly clear statement, see Martin Greschat, *Zwischen Tradition und neuem Anfang: Valentin Ernst Löscher und der Ausgang der lutherischen Orthodoxie*, Untersuchungen zur Kirchengeschichte, 5 (Witten, 1971), esp. pp. 152 ff. However, some scholars of this school then go on to declare that Enlightenment churchmen as a whole tended to display far more servility vis-à-vis the state than had their Orthodox predecessors, pointing in particular to the proto-Enlightenment theological tradition at Helmstedt which was inaugurated by Georg Calixt; see, for example, Johannes Wallmann, "Zwischen Reformation und Humanismus," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, LXXIV (1977), 570. This conclusion seems to me a drastic oversimplification on Wallmann's part, particularly with regard to the two territories in which the Helmstedt theology had the most influence—Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel and Kurhannover. The behavior of the Enlightenment churchmen in those two territories, as the present paper argues, suggests that Wallmann's conclusion on the political consequences of the Helmstedt tradition during the Enlightenment may need some revision.

⁴ See Werner Schütz, "Die Kanzel als Katheder der Aufklärung," in *Wolfenbüttler Studien zur Aufklärung. Im Auftrag der Lessing-Akademie*, ed. Günter Schultz, I (Wolfenbüttel, 1974), 137-171.

⁵ Saine, "Aufklärung," p. 333. The term "national" can intelligibly be applied to the ecclesiastical institutions (or anything else) in German-speaking Europe of the eighteenth century only when one specifies exactly what is thereby implied—a clarification not supplied by Saine. It seems to me that this term, if **not carefully qualified**, is likely to introduce needless additional confusion into a period already bedevilled by too many anachronistic hindrances to evaluating it on its own terms.

⁶ See for example the summary of nineteenth-century scholarship on the Enlightenment clergy in Christian Tischhauser, *Geschichte der evangelischen Kirchen Deutschlands in der ersten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Basel, 1900), pp. 125-269.

⁷ Edward Dixon Junkin, *Religion versus Revolution: The Interpretation of the French Revolution by German Protestant Churchmen, 1789-1799* (Theol. Diss., Basel, 1968; Austin, Texas, 1974), II, 708 f. On the alleged abandonment of Biblical [i. e., pro-revolutionary, pro-working class, and pro- "Third World"] content on the part of clergy, see II, 709 f., which assumes that late Enlightenment clergy had long since surrendered their integrity; cf. II, 852 ff. This work was kindly called to my attention by Miss Jane Abray.

⁸ Junkin, II, 480 f., erroneously attributing these views to Heinrich Philipp Conrad Henke at Helmstedt. See n. 70 below.

⁹ Dagobert de Levie, "The Patriotic Sermons of Christian Ludewig Hahnzog, Germany, 1785," *The Journal of Modern History*, XXVI (1954), 36.

¹⁰ Saine, "Scholarship," pp. 144-147; Saine, "Aufklärung," pp. 322 f.

¹¹ Besides Tischhauser and Junkin, II, 700-713, see for example Georges Pariset, *L'État et les Églises en Prusse sous Frédéric Guillaume I^{er}* (1713-1740) (Thèse, Paris, 1896); Gerd Heinrich, "Amtsträgerschaft und Geistlichkeit: Zur Problema-

tik der sekundären Führungsschichten in Brandenburg-Preußen 1450–1786," in Günther Franz, ed., *Beamtentum und Pfarrerstand 1400–1800*, Deutsche Führungsschichten in der Neuzeit, 5 (Limburg/Lahn, 1972), pp. 179–238; Erich Foerster, *Die Entstehung der Preussischen Landeskirche unter der Regierung König Friedrich Wilhelms des Dritten* (Tübingen, 1905, 1907, 2 vols.); Johannes Beste, *Geschichte der Braunschweigischen Landeskirche von der Reformation bis auf unsere Tage* (Wolfenbüttel, 1899), pp. 282–592; and Johann Karl Fürchtegott Schlegel, *Kirchen- und Reformationsgeschichte von Norddeutschland und den Hannoverschen Staaten*, II (Hannover, 1832), 129, 163, 290–323, 353–363.

- ¹² Martin Schmidt, "Mosheim," *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, 3rd ed., IV (Tübingen, 1960), cols. 1157 f. It should be noted that ecclesiastical life in Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel was more centralized than in Kurhannover. For the sake of simplicity, when dealing with Kurhannover I shall treat only the policies of the most important agency of ecclesiastical administration, the consistory in Hannover, leaving out of account the consistory in Stade.

- ¹³ This general impression is given in Reinhard Krause, *Die Predigt der späten deutschen Aufklärung (1770–1805)*, Arbeiten zur Theologie, 2. Reihe, 5 (Stuttgart, 1965); also Junkin, II, 700–713, citing specific state edicts without adequate background showing their roots in radical anti-clericalism. On the general problem of church-state relations in this period, see Hermann Conrad, "Staat und Kirche im aufgeklärten Absolutismus". *Der Staat*, XII (1973) 45–63.

- ¹⁴ See for example Hans Leube, *Die Reformideen in der deutschen lutherischen Kirche zur Zeit der Orthodoxie* (Leipzig, 1924); Arnold Schleiff, *Selbstkritik der lutherischen Kirche im 17. Jahrhundert*, Neue Deutsche Forschungen, Abt. Religions- und Kirchengeschichte, 6 (Berlin, 1937); Helmut Obst, *Der Berliner Beichtstuhlstreit: Die Kritik des Pietismus an der Beichtpraxis der lutherischen Orthodoxie*, Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Pietismus, 11 (Witten, 1972); Martin Greschat, *Zwischen Tradition und neuem Anfang*. Valentin Ernst Löscher und der Ausgang der lutherischen Orthodoxie, Untersuchungen zur Kirchengeschichte, 5 (Witten, 1971); Hans-Martin Rotermond, *Orthodoxie und Pietismus*. Valentin Ernst Löschers 'Timotheus verinus', Theologische Arbeiten, 13 (Berlin, ca. 1954); Johann George Walch, *Historische und theologische Einleitung in die Religionsstreitigkeiten der evangelischen lutherischen Kirchen*, II (Jena, 1730–1739), 465; Jürgen Büchsel, *Gottfried Arnold: Sein Verständnis von Kirche und Wiedergeburt*, Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Pietismus, 8 (Witten, 1970); Erik Wolf, *Große Rechtsdenker der deutschen Geistesgeschichte*, 4th ed. (Tübingen, 1963), pp. 397–414; Martin C. Battestin, "Apology for the Clergy," in his *The Moral Basis of Fielding's Art: A Study of Joseph Andrews* (Middletown, Conn., 1959), pp. 130–149; David Hume, "Of National Characters", in his *Essays Moral and Political*, 3rd ed. (London, 1748), esp. pp. 269–272; Claude Arien Helvétius, *A Treatise on Man I* (1810 trans. of *De l'Homme*, 1772; reprint, New York, 1969), 36–49, 61; and Felix Arndt, *Zur Publizistik über Kirche und Staat vom Ausgang des 18. bis zum Beginn des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Teildruck, Inaug.-Diss., Kiel, 1918), pp. 13–39. On the questions of the loss of clerical privileges and the pressure to put the clergy under ever-greater temporal control (considered in long-term perspective under the general heading of church-state relations), one may find much of value in Bernd Moeller, "Kleriker als Bürger," in *Festschrift für Hermann Heimpel*, Veröffentlichungen des Max-Planck-Insti-

tuts für Geschichte, 36/II, II (Göttingen, 1972), 195–224; Moeller, *Pfarrer als Bürger*, Göttinger Universitätsreden, 56 (Göttingen, 1972); and Ernst-Wolfgang Böckenförde, "Die Entstehung des Staates als Vorgang der Säkularisation," in *Säkularisation und Utopie. Ebracher Studien. Ernst Forsthoff zum 65. Geburtstag* (Stuttgart, 1967), pp. 75–94.

¹⁵ See Gerhard Masur, "Naturrecht und Kirche. Studien zur evangelischen Kirchenverfassung Deutschlands im 18. Jahrhundert," *Historische Zeitschrift*, CXLVIII (1933), 29–70; cf. Karl Dietrich Erdmann, *Das Verhältnis von Staat und Religion nach der Sozialphilosophie Rousseaus (Der Begriff der "religion civile")*, *Historische Studien*, 271 (Berlin, 1935); and Robert Derathé, "La religion civile selon Rousseau," *Annales de la Société Jean-Jacques Rousseau*, XXXV (1959–1962), 161–180.

¹⁶ Masur, p. 39.

¹⁷ Johann Lorenz von Mosheim, *Allgemeines Kirchenrecht der Protestanten. Nach dessen Tode herausgegeben und mit Anmerkungen versehen von Christian Ernst von Windheim* (Helmstedt, 1760), pp. 591 f., 594 f.; cf. p. 191.

¹⁸ On all this see the works cited in nos. 11, 14, and 25 here; and also Robert M. Bigler, *The Politics of German Protestantism. The Rise of the Protestant Church Elite in Prussia, 1815–1848* (Berkeley, 1972); and Martin Hasselhorn, *Der altwürttembergische Pfarrstand im 18. Jahrhundert*, Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für geschichtliche Landeskunde in Baden-Württemberg, Reihe B, 6 (Stuttgart, 1958), pp. 66 ff., esp. p. 66: "Auch in Altwürttemberg bestand um 1700 die Tendenz, die Kirche in ihrer bevorrechteten Stellung innerhalb der Staatsverwaltung zurückzudrängen." On the other hand, see the remarks in Hans Liermann, "Laizismus und Klerikalismus in der Geschichte des evangelischen Kirchenrechts," *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte*, LXX, Kan. Abt. XXXIX (1953), 1–27, esp. p. 18, on the growth of a clerical *esprit de corps vis-à-vis* the secular government.

¹⁹ Dagobert de Levie, "Patriotism and Clerical Office: Germany 1767–1773," *Journal of the History of Ideas*, XIV (1953), 622–627; Curt Horn, "Die patriotische Predigt zur Zeit Friedrichs des Großen," *Jahrbuch für Brandenburgische Kirchengeschichte*, XIX–XX (1924–1925), 78–128 and 134–160; Abbt, *Vom Tode fürs Vaterland*, in his *Vermischte Werke*, 1. Teil, esp. "Einleitung" and pp. 199–234, 260 f., 276–280.

²⁰ "Nachricht von U-Pang," *Deutsches Museum*, Band II: ii, Jahrgang 1782, Stück 9, Herbstmond, pp. 220–236. The title appears to be a play on Albrecht von Haller's *Usonia* (Bern, 1771). This anonymous piece of anti-clericalism elicited a refutation in Friedrich Germanus Lüdke, *Gespräche über die Abschaffung des geistlichen Standes, nebst Untersuchung: ob derselbe dem Staate entbehrlich, ja so gar schädlich sey* (Berlin and Stettin, 1784). See also *Ueber das Schädliche des Predigerordens und desselben Abänderung. Ein Sendschreiben an alle jüngerliche und insonderheit an die, die sich den Wissenschaften widmen* von M. C. C. R. (Halle, 1773), calling for the abolition of the paid clergy and their replacement by lay preachers.

²¹ Moses Mendelssohn, *Jerusalem: A Treatise on Religious Power and Judaism*, tr. Isaac Lesser, Published as a Complement to the *Occident*, vol. IX (Philadelphia, Penn, 5612), p. 30; Alexander Altmann, *Moses Mendelssohn: A Biographical Study* (University, Alabama, 1973), pp. 527 ff., nos. 88–92, p. 843.

- tuts für Geschichte, 36/II, II [Göttingen, 1972], 195–224; Moeller, *Pfarrer als Bürger*, Göttinger Universitätsreden, 56 [Göttingen, 1972]; and Ernst-Wolfgang Böckenförde, "Die Entstehung des Staates als Vorgang der Säkularisation," in *Säkularisation und Utopie. Ebracher Studien. Ernst Forsthoff zum 65. Geburtstag* (Stuttgart, 1967), pp. 75–94.
- ¹⁵ See Gerhard Masur, "Naturrecht und Kirche. Studien zur evangelischen Kirchenverfassung Deutschlands im 18. Jahrhundert," *Historische Zeitschrift*, CXLVIII (1933), 29–70; cf. Karl Dietrich Erdmann, *Das Verhältnis von Staat und Religion nach der Sozialphilosophie Rousseaus (Der Begriff der "religion civile")*, Historische Studien, 271 (Berlin, 1935); and Robert Derathé, "La religion civile selon Rousseau," *Annales de la Société Jean-Jacques Rousseau*, XXXV (1959–1962), 161–180.
- ¹⁶ Masur, p. 39.
- ¹⁷ Johann Lorenz von Mosheim, *Allgemeines Kirchenrecht der Protestanten. Nach dessen Tode herausgegeben und mit Anmerkungen versehen von Christian Ernst von Windheim* (Helmstedt, 1760), pp. 591 f., 594 f.; cf. p. 191.
- ¹⁸ On all this see the works cited in nos. 11, 14, and 25 here; and also Robert M. Bigler, *The Politics of German Protestantism. The Rise of the Protestant Church Elite in Prussia, 1815–1848* (Berkeley, 1972); and Martin Hasselhorn, *Der altwürttembergische Pfarrstand im 18. Jahrhundert*, Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für geschichtliche Landeskunde in Baden-Württemberg, Reihe B, 6 (Stuttgart, 1958), pp. 66 ff., esp. p. 66: "Auch in Altwürttemberg bestand um 1700 die Tendenz, die Kirche in ihrer bevorrechteten Stellung innerhalb der Staatsverwaltung zurückzudrängen." On the other hand, see the remarks in Hans Liermann, "Laizismus und Klerikalismus in der Geschichte des evangelischen Kirchenrechts," *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte*, LXX, Kan. Abt. XXXIX (1953), 1–27, esp. p. 18, on the growth of a clerical *esprit de corps vis-à-vis* the secular government.
- ¹⁹ Dagobert de Levie, "Patriotism and Clerical Office: Germany 1767–1773," *Journal of the History of Ideas*, XIV (1953), 622–627; Curt Horn, "Die patriotische Predigt zur Zeit Friedrichs des Großen," *Jahrbuch für Brandenburgische Kirchengeschichte*, XIX–XX (1924–1925), 78–128 and 134–160; Abbt, *Vom Tode fürs Vaterland*, in his *Vermischte Werke*, 1. Teil, esp. "Einleitung" and pp. 199–234, 260 f., 276–280.
- ²⁰ "Nachricht von U-Pang," *Deutsches Museum*, Band II: ii, Jahrgang 1782, Stück 9, Herbstmond, pp. 220–236. The title appears to be a play on Albrecht von Haller's *Usong* (Bern, 1771). This anonymous piece of anti-clericalism elicited a refutation in Friedrich Germanus Lüdke, *Gespräche über die Abschaffung des geistlichen Standes, nebst Untersuchung: ob derselbe dem Staate entbehrlich, ja so gar schädlich sey* (Berlin and Stettin, 1784). See also *Ueber das Schädliche des Predigerordens und desselben Abänderung. Ein Sendschreiben an alle jüngerliche und insonderheit an die, die sich den Wissenschaften widmen* von M. C. R. (Halle, 1773), calling for the abolition of the paid clergy and their replacement by lay preachers.
- ²¹ Moses Mendelssohn, *Jerusalem: A Treatise on Religious Power and Judaism*, tr. Isaac Lesser, Published as a Complement to the *Occident*, vol. IX (Philadelphia, Penn, 5612), p. 30; Alexander Altmann, *Moses Mendelssohn: A Biographical Study* (University, Alabama, 1973), pp. 527 ff., nos. 88–92, p. 843.

- ²² Johann Erich Biester, "Vorschlag, die Geistlichen nicht mehr bei Vollziehung der Ehen zu bemühen," in *Was ist Aufklärung? Beiträge aus der Berlinischen Monatsschrift*, ed. Norbert Hinske (Darmstadt, 1973), pp. 95-106, esp. pp. 99, 102 = *Berlinische Monatsschrift* II, 265-276.
- ²³ Carl Friedrich Bahrdt, *Ueber das theologische Studium auf Universitäten* (Berlin, 1785). On the term "Volkslehrer," cf. Enno Fooken, *Die geistliche Schulaufsicht und ihre Kritiker im 18. Jahrhundert*, Probleme der Erziehung, 5 (Wiesbaden-Dotzheim, 1967), p. 111.
- ²⁴ Bahrdt, *Rechte und Obliegenheiten der Regenten und Untertanen in Beziehung auf Staat und Religion = System der moralischen Religion zur endlichen Beruhigung für Zweifler und Denker*, III (Riga, 1792), pp. 251-300.
- ²⁵ Beste, *Geschichte der Braunschweigischen Landeskirche*, pp. 483-494; Friedrich Koldewey, "Campe's Vorschläge zur Verbesserung des braunschweigischen Schulwesens," *Braunschweigisches Magazin*, II (1896), 97-103; cf. Theodor Ballauff, *Pädagogik: Eine Geschichte der Bildung und Erziehung*, II = *Orbis Academicus*, Abt. 1, 12 (Freiburg, 1970), p. 341.
- ²⁶ Joachim Heinrich Campe, *Ueber einige verkannte, wenigstens ungenützte Mittel zur Beförderung der Industrie, der Bevölkerung und des öffentlichen Wohlstandes*, *Erstes Fragment* (Wolfenbüttel, 1786), pp. 31-36; 41 f.; 44-64; 71-81.
- ²⁷ Koldewey, pp. 98 f.; point 5 under Campe's second *Vorschlag*, taken in context, implies clearly that pedagogues operating on Philanthropist principles should get the best jobs (p. 99).
- ²⁸ Jacob Mauvillon, *Das einzige wahre System der christlichen Religion* (Berlin, 1787), pp. 1-3, 110 f., 304 f., 332-339, 357 f., 455-457, 527 f., 548 f., 550, 552-569, 572-584. On Mauvillon see Leser, "Mauvillon," *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie* XX (1885; reprint, Berlin, 1970), 715 f. and Karl Steinacker, *Abklang der Aufklärung und Widerhall der Romantik in Braunschweig*, Werkstücke aus Museum, Archiv und Bibliothek der Stadt Braunschweig, 10 (Braunschweig, 1939), pp. 13 f.
- ²⁹ For clerical supporters of the radical model of ministry, see Fooken, pp. 96-99; n. 73 below; and [with reservations] Christoph Johann Rudolph Christiani, *Ueber die Bestimmung, Würde und Bildung christlicher Lehrer* (Schleswig, 1789). Among churchmen holding posts in Kurhannover and Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel, support for this position was quite rare.
- ³⁰ On Miller see Wagenmann, "Miller," *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, XXI, 749 f.
- ³¹ Johann Lorenz von Mosheim, *Sitten-Lehre der Heiligen Schrift*, 8. und 9. Theil, *Verfasset von D. Johann Peter Miller* (Göttingen and Leipzig, 1767, 1770): "heilsam," IX, 4; patriotism, IX, 535 [cf. IX, 13 and VIII, 19-29]; Bayle and Rousseau, VIII, 8 f. [Hereafter: Miller, *Sitten-Lehre*].
- ³² Johann Martin Miller, *Briefwechsel drey Akademischer Freunde*, 2nd ed. [Ulm, 1778-1779], I, 113.
- ³³ J. P. Miller, "Vorrede," in Johann Heinrich Ress, *Der patriotische Landprediger*, Erstes Stück (Leipzig, 1779), p. xxii.
- ³⁴ Cf. for example Hans Hubrig, *Die patriotischen Gesellschaften des 18. Jahrhunderts*, Göttinger Studien zur Pädagogik, 36 (Weinheim, 1957) and Miller, *Sitten-Lehre*, IX, 6; Ress, *Landprediger*, Viertes Hauptstück, p. 565 n.

- ³⁵ Miller, "Vorrede" (no. 33 above), pp. iii-xlvi, esp. pp. xiv-xvi. On Ress's share in the controversy with Lessing, see for example Carl Bertheau, "Lessing," *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, ed. Albert Hauck, 3rd ed., XI (Leipzig, 1902), 411.
- ³⁶ Ress, *Landprediger*, Erstes Stück, pp. 3-12. The article begins with a discussion of the "Verachtung" with which clergy are treated (p. 3).
- ³⁷ Ress, *Landprediger*, Erstes Stück, pp. 4-9, reprinting pp. 276 ff. of the 3rd ed. of Abbt's *Vom Verdienste*. For the influence of Abbt on Miller, see Miller, *Sitten-Lehre*, IX, 16 f. and J. P. Miller, *Ausführliche Anleitung zur weisen und gewissenhaften Verwaltung des evangelischen Lehramts* (Leipzig, 1774), p. 9.
- ³⁸ Ress, *Landprediger*, Drittes Hauptstück, "Vom Verdienste des Predigers um den zeitlichen Wohlstand seines Orts," pp. 565-702.
- ³⁹ According to Miller, *Sitten-Lehre*, IX, 17, the church is a "geistliche Gesellschaft" which Jesus Christ "samlet, erhält mit übernatürlichen Kräften seines Geistes durch die Gnadenmittel begnadigt und vermehret . . ."
- ⁴⁰ Miller, *Sitten-Lehre*, IX, 17 f.
- ⁴¹ Miller, *Anleitung*, pp. 23 f.
- ⁴² Miller, *Anleitung*, p. 23.
- ⁴³ Thus I regard as misleading the judgment in Alexandra Schlingensiepen-Pogge, *Das Sozialethos der lutherischen Aufklärungstheologie am Vorabend der Industriellen Revolution*, Göttinger Bausteine zur Geschichtswissenschaft, 39 (Göttingen, 1967), p. 14, according to which Miller's anthropology resulted in a fundamentally this-worldly orientation in his conceptualization of the pastor's role. On the contrary: although Miller "optimistically" stressed the importance of shaping people for activity in this world, he never failed to join that emphasis with a heavy stress on preparing the soul for eternity (cf. *Anleitung*, pp. 8 f.). Schlingensiepen-Pogge does not adequately perceive that for Miller the expanding of this-worldly duties had an apologetic or instrumental purpose.—In this matter, as in most points touching theology, Schlingensiepen-Pogge's book must be used with caution. Thus, for example, her basic picture of Enlightenment Lutheran theology and ethics needs modification in many respects so as to take into account the findings of Joseph Schollmeier on the extent of Reformed and Anglican influence on eighteenth century Lutheranism; see Schollmeier, *Johann Joachim Spalding. Ein Beitrag zur Theologie der Aufklärung* (Gütersloh, 1967): cf. Schlingensiepen-Pogge, pp. 194 ff.
- ⁴⁴ Miller, "Vorrede," p. xxii (no. 33 above).
- ⁴⁵ Miller, "Vorrede," pp. xxvif.
- ⁴⁶ Miller, "Vorrede," p. xxviii.
- ⁴⁷ Miller, "Vorrede," p. xxviii.
- ⁴⁸ See for example Miller, *Sitten-Lehre*, VIII, 9; IX, 386 ff. ("Von den besondern Pflichten gegen die Kirche"); IX, 68 ff. ("Daß die Obrigkeit über die Religion selber keine Gewalt habe"). *Religion selber* here is, of course, an inner matter. But it seem clear enough that such a notion of religion has not, contrary to a prevalent misconception, necessarily led to political docility and quietism; cf. Koselleck as cited in no. 112 below, which at least demonstrates that such a notion has on occasion led to the opposite.
- ⁴⁹ Cf. Miller, *Sitten-Lehre*, IX, 65; Masur, pp. 51-54.
- ⁵⁰ Miller, *Sitten-Lehre*, IX, 68; cf. pp. 63, 65.

⁵¹ Reinhard Krause, "Der Übergang zu reinen Natur- und Zeitpredigten, zu politischen und ökonomischen Kanzelreden als konsequente Fortentwicklung der praktischen und sozialen Leitgedanken," in his *Predigt* (no. 13 above), pp. 116-142. Krause's study makes no effort to evaluate such preaching in the territorial setting in which it evolved, and makes surprisingly little effort to put it within the framework of the ongoing argument about the purpose of the clerical estate.—This is the logical place to meet a possible objection to my first counterthesis: given that Miller and Röss did not effect a radical secularization of the ministry, is it not still possible that many of their contemporaries in the 1770's did so? Krause's study is instructive. The only truly pro-Enlightenment theology of the ministry which he considers in adequate detail comes, not from the 1780's and 1790's (as do most of his examples of radically secular sermons), but from the 1770's—namely, Johann Joachim Spalding's infamous *Über die Nutzbarkeit des Predigtamts und deren Beförderung* (1st ed., Berlin, 1772). Krause is forced to admit, p. 21, that for Spalding the "besondere" and "erste" task of the preacher is "die Sorge für das Seelenheil seiner Gemeindeglieder im Hinblick auf die Ewigkeit" and that Spalding cautioned against giving this-worldly economic or political concerns anything other than a subordinate place (p. 116). Had Krause examined other theologies of the ministry in depth, he would have discovered that very few late Enlightenment theologians abandoned Spalding's reserve in these matters. In short: most scholars on these matters content themselves with a look at Spalding without drawing in other examples of pastoral theologians (cf. Hirsch, cited n. 65 below, IV, 20f.). By looking at the example of Miller, I have in effect increased the data on Enlightenment pastoral theology by 100%: we now have two examples from the 1770's, and neither Spalding nor Miller can be reckoned among the radical secularizers of the ministry.

⁵² I have in mind the works by Saine, Martens, and Junkin cited above, all of which seem to me not to show so full an awareness as is desirable of the limitations which local conditions imposed on the power of central governments to do as they wished. Equally illustrative of this tendency are the one-sided remarks on the Protestant clergy as supporters of the wishes of the government made in Robert Minder, *Das Bild des Pfarrhauses in der deutschen Literatur von Jean Paul bis Gottfried Benn*, Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Abhandlungen der Klasse der Literatur, Jg. 1959, Nr. 4 (Mainz, 1959), p. 56 = p. 4. On the power of these local forces and conditions, see Kurt von Raumer, "Absoluter Staat, korporative Libertät, persönliche Freiheit," *Historische Zeitschrift*, CLXXXIII (1957), 55-96, esp. 61-69; and Gerhard, "Regionalismus." Saine, "Aufklärung" (e.g., p. 334) furnishes a good example of how the power of absolutist ruler to stifle all but pro-centralist forces can be overestimated. Similarly exaggerated is the claim in Saine, "Scholarship," p. 139, that "the German states of the Holy Roman Empire, between the end of the Reformation and the Congress of Vienna, were ruled as abominably as any collection of peoples to be found in world history." Rousseau, on the other hand, valued the German tradition of government and administration so highly that he "im Deutschen Reich, dem an Weisheit kein andres Gemeinwesen gleich komme, geradezu das Modell eines Zukunftseuropas sehen konnte," according to von Raumer, p. 76; see also the comments on reform and administration in Rudolf Vier-

haus, "Deutschland im 18. Jahrhundert: soziales Gefüge, politische Verfassung, geistige Bewegung," in Kopitzsch, ed., *Aufklärung*, pp. 182 f., supplementing Saine's somewhat misleading picture. Nor is Saine correct in implying ("Aufklärung," pp. 334 f.) that the only significant reflection on the state in Enlightenment Germany came from pro-absolutist cameralist thinkers; see Geraint Parry, "Enlightened Government and its Critics in Eighteenth-Century Germany," *The Historical Journal*, VI (1963), 178-192.

⁵³ See for example, von Raumer, pp. 55-96; Otto Brunner, "Die Freiheitsrechte in der altständischen Gesellschaft," in *Aus Verfassungs- und Landesgeschichte: Festschrift für Theodor Mayer* (Lindau, 1954), pp. 293-303; Gerhard, "Regionalismus," pp. 307-337; Rudolf Vierhaus, "Deutschland im 18. Jahrhundert," pp. 182 f.; and Helen P. Liebel, *Enlightened Bureaucracy vs. Enlightened Despotism in Baden, 1750-1792*, Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, N. S., LV: 5 (1965).

⁵⁴ Cf. Rudolf Vierhaus, "Montesquieu in Deutschland. Zur Geschichte seiner Wirkung als politischer Schriftsteller im 18. Jahrhundert," in *Collegium Philosophicum. Studien Joachim Ritter zum 60. Geburtstag* (Basel and Stuttgart, 1965), pp. 403-437, esp. pp. 427 f. with reference to *De l'esprit des lois*, II, 4; cf. Alexis de Tocqueville, *L'ancien régime et la révolution*, Oeuvres complètes, IV, 165 f. (Paris, 1887): "Les prêtres, qu'on a vus souvent depuis si servilement soumis dans les choses civiles au souverain temporel . . . et ses plus audacieux flatteurs . . . formaient alors l'un des corps les plus indépendants de la nation . . . Je n'entreprends point de juger cette ancienne constitution de l'Eglise; je dis seulement qu'elle ne préparait point l'âme des prêtres à la servilité politique."

⁵⁵ Cf. for example Johann Karl Fürchtegott Schlegel, *Churhannöversches Kirchenrecht*, 5 Theile (Hannover, 1801-1806); Johann Christoph Stübner, *Historische Beschreibung der Kirchenverfassung in den Herzogl. Braunschweig-Lüneburgischen Landen seit der Reformation* (Goslar, 1800). On the willingness of the Protestant clergy to defend their self-interest and independence, see Bofinger (cited in n. 3 above); Liermann cited in n. 18 above; and Theodor Woltersdorf, "Zur Geschichte der evangelisch-kirchlichen Selbständigkeits-Bewegung," *Protestantische Monatshefte*, ed. Julius Websky, IX (1905), 41-54, 91-110, 135-155.

⁵⁶ Mosheim, *Kirchenrecht* (no. 17 above), p. 605.

⁵⁷ Gottfried Less, *Ueber Christliches Lehr-Amt Dessen würdige Führung, Und die Schikliche Vorbereitung dazu* (Göttingen, 1790), pp. v-ix, 80-93; and Philip Meyer, "Die theologischen Prüfungen in der lutherischen Kirche Calenberg-Göttingens und Lüneburgs bis zum Jahre 1868. II," *Jahrbuch der Gesellschaft für Niedersächsische Kirchengeschichte*, LIII (1955), 84-85.

⁵⁸ Velthusen, *Ueber die nächste Bestimmung des Landpredigerstandes. Ein durch Herrn Campens Fragmente veranlaßten Beytrag zur Pastoraltheologie* (Helmstedt, 1787).

⁵⁹ Henke, *Beurtheilung der Klagen über Geringschätzung des Predigerstandes. Eine Rede, bey der Einführung eines neuen Priors des Kloster Michelstein am achten Sonntage nach Trinitatis 1790* (Helmstedt, 1790), pp. 32-39; Henke, *Frohe Aussichten für die Religion in die Zukunft. Eine Rede, bey der Einführung Herrn August Christian Bartels, als Abt zu Riddagshausen, am 8ten Jen-*

ner 1790 [Neue Auflage, Helmstedt, 1801], pp. 16 f.; Henke, "Rede bey der Einführung des Herrn D. Ant. Aug. Heinr. Lichtensteins, Generalsuperint. und Prof. der Theol. als ersten Pastors zu St. Stephani in Helmstädt, gehalten am 17ten Febr. 1799. von dem Herausgeber," *Eusebia*, ed. Henke, III (1800), 157–176, esp. 162 f., 170 f.

⁶⁰ Bartels, *Ueber den Werth und die Wirkungen der Sittenlehre Jesu. Eine Apologie derselben gegen das sogenannte einzige wahre System der christlichen Religion* I, (Hamburg, 1788), 254–269, makes it clear that Bartels (however considerable his personal loyalty to Campe and his interest in utilitarian matters as a peripheral pastime of the clergy) nonetheless flatly rejects a this-worldly version of the pastor's chief *raison d'être* such as that proposed by Campe.

⁶¹ Less, *Ueber Christliches Lehr-Amt*, esp. pp. 15 (arguing that the clergy are not deceivers of the people), 17 ff., 34, 80–86.

⁶² Ammon, *Ideen zur Verbesserung der herrschenden Predigtmethode als Ankündigung einer neuen Königlichen Prämie für die beste von einem der hier zu Göttingen studierenden Theologen in der Universitätskirche jährlich zu haltende Predigt* (Göttingen, 1795), esp. p. 6.

⁶³ Holscher, *Versuche über den Landprediger. Für einige Leser der Fragmente des Herrn Raths Campe. Erstes Stück* (Hannover, 1787).

⁶⁴ Wagenmann und Tschackert, "Leß," *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, 3rd ed. XI [Gotha, 1896–1913], 404–406, esp. p. 406. Also important for the evaluation of the tone of mainstream theology in this area is the Helmstedt professor Johann Caspar Velthusen. His theology represents on the whole a moderately enlightened reworking of Lutheran Orthodoxy akin to that carried out by Mosheim; see Vitus Dettmer, "Abt D. Velthusen," *Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für niedersächsische Kirchengeschichte*, XXIII (1918), 1–94. On Velthusen's involvement with freemasonry, see the perhaps too simplistic comments in Rudolf Steinmetz, "Die Generalsuperintendenten in den Herzogtümern Bremen-Verden," *Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für niedersächsische Kirchengeschichte*, XI (1906), 33.

⁶⁵ E. g., Emanuel Hirsch, *Geschichte der neuern evangelischen Theologie, im Zusammenhang mit den allgemeinen Bewegungen des europäischen Denkens*, V (Gütersloh, 1954), 11. If Henke (whose company was valued by Goethe) cannot be called enlightened, then I fear no thinker in Germany before Fichte can be. On Henke see Goethe, *Tag- und Jahres-Hefte*, 1805 = *Goethes Werke*, 1. Abth., XXXV [Weimar, 1892], 233–238.

⁶⁶ See for example Gustav Frank, *Geschichte der Protestantischen Theologie*, 3. Theil = *Geschichte des Rationalismus und seiner Gegensätze* (Leipzig, 1875), pp. 190–263; Tischhauser [n. 6 above], pp. 131–138, 161 f.; Rudolf Haym, *Herder nach seinem Leben und seinem Werken*, I (Berlin, 1877), 571–594; Hirsch, IV, 18–22, 527; V, 145–231; Krause [n. 51 above], pp. 21–27, 34, 116–142; and Erich Beyreuther, *Die Erweckungsbewegung. Die Kirche in ihrer Geschichte*, 4 : R : 1 (Göttingen, 1963). — It is certainly worth pointing out that Herder's thought on the desirability of fostering the autonomy and independent *esprit de corps* of the Protestant clergy was by no means so virtually unique a theme as is often assumed. For example, on the matter of *esprit de corps* cf. Justus Möser, *Sämtliche Werke*, ed. Ludwig Schirmeyer et al., IV = *Patriotische*

Phantasien, I (Oldenburg and Berlin, 1943 ff.), 245 f. with Herder in Suphan, VII, 292 f. (for the full reference to Suphan, see no. 67 below).

⁶⁷ Herder, "An Prediger. Fünfzehn Provinzialblätter," in his *Sämmtliche Werke*, ed. Bernhard Suphan, VII, (Berlin, 1884), 173–224, esp. p. 290: the clergy as shapers of the soul, "erkennen . . . weder Bürger, noch Unterthanen, sondern Menschen . . . Glieder der Offenbarung."

⁶⁸ On the man-citizen distinction outside Herder's use of it, and its relationship to religious freedom, see for example Manfred Riedel, "Bürger, Staatsbürger, Bürgertum," in *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe. Historisches Lexikon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland*, ed. Otto Brunner, Werner Conze, Reinhart Koselleck, I (Stuttgart, 1972), 706; cf. Jürgen Schlumbohm, *Freiheit: Die Anfänge der bürgerlichen Emanzipationsbewegung in Deutschland im Spiegel ihres Leitwortes (ca. 1760–1800)*, Geschichte und Gesellschaft, 12 (Düsseldorf, 1975), pp. 119, 121; Josef Bohatec, "Die Vorgeschichte der Menschen- und Bürgerrechte in der englischen Publizistik der ersten Hälfte des 17. Jahrhunderts," in Roman Schnur, ed., *Zur Geschichte der Erklärung der Menschenrechte*, Wege der Forschung, 11 (Darmstadt, 1964), pp. 267–331, esp. pp. 268, 373 f.; cf. no. 89 below.

⁶⁹ Less, *Ueber Christliches Lehr-Amt*, pp. 11, 55. For other adaptations of the ego-gratifying role of *Erzieher des Menschengeschlechts* or something very much like it, see Diana Behler, "Lessing's Legacy to the Romantic Concept of the Poet-Priest," *Lessing Yearbook*, IV (1972), 67–93; cf. A. Leslie Willson, "Dichter-Priester, Bestandteil der Romantik," *Colloquia Germanica*, I/II (1968), 127–136; Rohtraut Bäsken, *Die Dichter des Göttinger Hains und die Bürgerlichkeit: Eine literarsoziologische Studie*, Schriften der Albertus-Universität, Geisteswissenschaftliche Reihe, 6 (Königsberg, 1937), pp. 46 f.; and Klaus Lindemann, *Geistlicher Stand und religiöses Mittlertum. Ein Beitrag zur Religionsauffassung der Frühromantik in Dichtung und Philosophie*, Gegenwart der Dichtung, 5 (Frankfurt a. M., 1971).

⁷⁰ Henke, *Beurtheilung* (n. 59 above), pp. 32, 34; cf. Henke, *Frohe Aussichten*, p. 16, for the argument that, because religion pertains to the eternal affairs of man rather than to the temporal affairs of the citizen, therefore religion must not be defended by hypocritically representing it as "ein unentbehrliches Werkzeug in der Regierung der großen Maschine einer bürgerlichen Gesellschaft. . . ." One could, perhaps, maintain that Henke reinvented this argument independent of Herder's prior use of it. That seems unlikely.—The case of Henke furnishes another example of how slapdash an approach suffices when ecclesiastical historians set about their favorite task of vilifying the Enlightenment. Junkin suggests (II, 480 f.; cf. II, 568 ff., nn. 21 f., 24–26; I, 238 f.; I, 397, n. 85) that for Henke "the primary task of the teacher of religion [= pastor] in a revolutionary era" was that of protecting "society from violent upheaval." Junkin makes this judgment without taking into account any of Henke's three chief, signed statements on the purpose of ministry (see n. 59 above), while wilfully attributing to Henke the anonymous lead article in Henke's journal *Eusebia*, an article which (at least in Junkin's exegesis) expresses sentiments exactly contrary to those in Henke's signed works; see "Ueber die Notwendigkeit der moralischen Verbesserung des Predigerstandes," *Eusebia*, I (1797 [erroneously cited by Junkin as 1796]), 1–141. As n. 59 above shows, Henke signed his per-

sonal contributions to *Eusebia*; hence, his authorship of the lead article is exceedingly dubious. Equally questionable is Junkin's reading of the anonymous lead article: it is a plea for governmental support of the clergy, and it stresses the social utility of the clergy in order to advance this plea; it does not present a complete theology of the ministry. At all events there is no question that Henke repeatedly and publicly criticized any attempt, German or French, to deprive religion and the ministry of their independent worth by using them for crassly political purposes.

⁷¹ With regard to Herder: I detect, at all events, no comprehensive program to preserve clerical integrity on his part in the evidence presented by Ingo Braecklin, "Zur Tätigkeit Johann Gottfried Herders im Konsistorium des Herzogtums Sachsen-Weimar," in Eva Schmidt, ed., *Herder im Geistlichen Amt* (Leipzig, 1956), pp. 54-72. Concerning the events in Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel, see Beste, *Geschichte der Braunschweigischen Landeskirche*, pp. 483-494 and Focken, pp. 145-152. On the significance of the imperial courts in this period as a means for protecting particularism against territorial central governments, see Vierhaus, "Land, Staat und Reich in der politischen Vorstellungswelt deutscher Landstände im 18. Jahrhundert," *Historische Zeitschrift*, CCXXIII (1976), 48. The militancy with which the Enlightenment churchmen in Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel adopted their anti-absolutist stance is well exemplified by the way in which the Helmstedt theologian Velthusen carried out his polemical campaign against Campe in defense of clerical autonomy. Velthusen suggested that Campe was a modern-day counterpart of the Oberhofprediger Johann Funck, an advisor to Duke Albrecht of Prussia who had been decapitated in 1563 on juridical complaint of the Lutheran estates in the course of a long and bitter struggle to protect their traditional authority and doctrinal integrity against the encroachments of the duke. See Beste, p. 489 and Bofinger, pp. 404 f.

⁷² Cf. no 57 above and Universitätsarchiv, Göttingen, Kurat.-Akten 4 II a 31; and [Johann Christoph Salfeld], "Beförderung der humanistischen Studien unter den auf der Universität Göttingen Theologie studierenden Landeskindern," *Neue Beyträge zur Kenntniß und Verbesserung des Kirchen- und Schulwesens in den Königl. Braunschweig-Lüneburgschen Churlanden*, ed. J. C. Salfeld and J. P. Trefurt, II (1810), 14. For the anti-centralist reaction in leading lay circles in Kurhannover, see the scathing criticism of radically cameralist and Philanthropist notions of Christian ministry and the preparation for it intermixed with a more general critique of Philanthropism in August Wilhelm Rehberg, "Sollen die alten Sprachen dem allgemeinen Unterricht der Jugend in den höhern Ständen zum Grunde gelegt, oder den eigentlichen Gelehrten allein überlassen werden?" in *Berlinische Monatsschrift*, ed. F. Gedike and J. Biester, XI (1788), 105-131, 253-275; also worthy of note in this connection is Ernst Brandes, *Ueber den Einfluß und die Wirkungen des Zeitgeistes auf die höheren Stände Deutschlands; als Fortsetzung der Betrachtungen über den Zeitgeist in Deutschland*, Zweite Abtheilung (Hannover, 1810), pp. 178 ff.

⁷³ On all this see Heinrich Philipp Sextroh, *Ueber Pflicht, Beruf und Verdienst des Predigers* (Göttingen, 1786), pp. 30 f., adapting Abbt's thought on *Verdienst*; cf. Abbt's *Vom Verdienste* in his *Vermischte Werke*, 1. Teil [Berlin, 1770]; Sextroh, *Ueber die Bildung der Jugend zur Industrie* (Göttingen, 1785); Horst

Grüneberg, "Die Anfänge des Göttinger beruflichen Schulwesens und der geistige Anteil von Professoren der Universität an dieser Entwicklung," *Göttinger Jahrbuch* 1966, (Göttingen, 1966), pp. 163–199. In the the 1780's the Göttingen theological faculty represented two differing approaches to the purpose of ministry. Sextroh (who was cited with approval by Campe and who accepted a call to Helmstedt in 1788–89 while the Campe controversy was in progress) plainly was in a minority position with his (albeit moderate) pro-cameralist views; on the affinity between Campe's and Sextroh's ideas, cf. Campe, *Ueber einige ... Mittel. Erstes Fragment*, p. 6; see also Johannes Meyer, "Geschichte der Göttinger theologischen Fakultät," *Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für Niedersächsische Kirchengeschichte*, XLII (1937), 102. The majority or anti-centralist position was represented by Gottfried Less (see his *Ueber Christliches Lehr-Amt*, pp. 82–86) and by Christoph Ammon (see n. 62 above). Although the anti-centralist position represented as it were the "orthodox" viewpoint of the consistory in Hannover, nonetheless Sextroh himself and some variety of his industry-school movement continued to be acceptable in Kurhannover (so long as the approach to ministry implied by that movement retained its character as a mere supplement to the traditional clerical role). Whether Sextroh's own position eventually may have moved more toward the middle (mediating between pro- and anti-cameralist views of the ministry) cannot readily be determined, but is suggested by his later connections with Hannover.

⁷⁴ That one has to do with a definite program is made plain by Christian Dassel, "Worin soll die Thätigkeit der Prediger bestehen, und wie kann man diesselbe befördern?" *Eusebia*, III (1799), 530–559. Besides the material in nos. 75, 76, 81, and 82 below, see the following places for texts of the principal measures taken in Kurhannover: "Ausschreiben des Königl. Consistorii zu Hannover, die Candidaten der Theologie betr., vom 28. January 1796," in Christian Hermann Ebhardt, ed., *Gesetze, Verordnungen und Ausschreiben für den Bezirk des Königl. Consistorii zu Hannover, welche in Kirchen- und Schulsachen ergangen sind*, I (Hannover, 1845), 591–593; "Empfohlne theologische Examinatoria. Rescript Königl. Landesregierung an die theologische Facultät zu Göttingen vom 11ten Octb. 1799," in *Beyträge zur Kenntniß und Verbesserung des Kirchen- und Schulwesens in den Königl. Braunschweig-Lüneburgschen Churlanden*, ed. Johann Christoph Salfeld, II (1801), 220–222; "Verordnung die Errichtung eines theologischen Ephorats zu Göttingen betr., vom 21. August 1800," in Ebhardt, I, 782–791; [J. C. Salfeld], "Beförderung der humanistischen Studien," [cited n. 72 above], pp. 1–55; Heinrich Wilhelm Rotermund, *Handbuch für Candidaten, die ins Predigtamt treten* (Hannover, 1802); Salfeld, *Beyträge*, II (1801), 195–202; "Aus einem Cons. Ausschreiben vom 15. Jan. 1799," Salfeld, *Beyträge*, II (1801), 200 f. and also pp. 195–200; and Johann Conrad Achatz Holscher, *Praktisches Handbuch für Ephoral- und kirchliche Geschäfte*, 2 Theile (Hannover, 1800, 1805).

⁷⁵ See the introduction and the text proper, printed as "Ausschreiben des K. Consistorii zu Hannover, die Bekanntmachung einer Pastoral-Instruction betr., vom 1. Juli 1800," and "Pastoral-Instruction für die unter dem Hannoverschen Consistorio stehenden Prediger," in Ebhardt, I, 819–835, esp. p. 822 (stressing the need to keep supplementary matters subordinate to the "eigentlichen Zweck" of the ministry, as well as the importance of exegetical study, and

pp. 824 f. [against meddling in legal and medical matters]. Note the way in which the *Pastoral-Instruction* groups the pastor's duties into those pertaining to the man [pp. 821 ff., with reference to the religious *Bedürfnisse der Menschheit*] and citizen [pp. 825 ff., treating the duties which are not those of the clergyman "im engern Sinne," that is, the pastor's duties "als Hausherr und Staatsbürger"; the man-citizen distinction, though not employed formulaically, is clearly built into the basic structure of the *Pastoral-Instruction*]. The clerical stress on humanistic and religious rather than excessively utilitarian or Philanthropist approaches to ministry, which permeates this entire program, was also shared by the leading lay critics of enlightened absolutism in Kurhan-nover; see Rehberg, "Sollen die alten Sprachen . . .," *Berlinische Monatsschrift*, XI (1788), 105-131, 253-275, esp. pp. 107, 111, 117 f., 235 f.; and Brandes, *Ueber den Einfluß und die Wirkungen des Zeitgeistes*, 2. Abtheilung (Hannover, 1810), pp. 178-192.

⁷⁶ Carl Georg Schuster, "Ueber die Nothwendigkeit eines Lehr- und Predigerstandes in jedem vollkommeneren Staate," Salfeld, *Beyträge*, II (1801), 274-335, esp. p. 329 for *Gift* and *Gegengift*. For Schuster's influential role as a leader in the reform of training for clergy at this time, see Fr. Schultzen, "Geschichte des Klosters: Das Hospiz wird zum Predigerseminar. 1732-1830," in *Zum Jubiläum des Klosters Loccum* (Hannover, 1913), pp. 141-179, esp. pp. 154-158, 168.

⁷⁷ Schuster, pp. 314-318.

⁷⁸ Schuster, p. 335.

⁷⁹ A similar drive to separate and subordinate the pastor's civic role is briefly noted for Württemberg by Hasselhorn (n. 18 above), p. 57.

⁸⁰ This is clearly the aim of Henke's *Eusebia* (founded in 1797 at Helmstedt) and of Salfeld's *Beyträge* (founded in 1800 at Hannover).

⁸¹ Besides the works noted in n. 55 above, see Mosheim, *Allgemeines Kirchenrecht der Protestanten. Zuerst mit Anmerkungen herausgegeben von Christian Ernst von Windheim. Nun neu bearbeitet und fortgesetzt von D. Christian August Günther, Herz. Braunsch. Lün. Hofrath und Professor der Rechte zu Helmstädt* (Leipzig, 1800); Johann Friedrich Christoph Gräffe, "Das allgemeine protestantische Kirchenrecht in Deutschland," in his *Die Pastoraltheologie nach ihrem ganzen Umfange*, II (Göttingen, 1803), 223-354; on the defensive purpose of these publications, cf. Gräffe, "Vorrede," *Pastoraltheologie*, II, viii and Schlegel, *Kirchen- und Reformationsgeschichte* (no. 11 above), III, 505 f.; D. Busse, "Ehrenrettung der Prediger-Accidenzien und Stolgebühren, gegen die mancherlei Angriffe neuerer Schriftsteller und Prediger," *Göttingisches Museum der Theologie und Literatur*, ed. Dr. Johann [von] Horn, 1:2 (Hannover, 1805), 143-160; and A. L. Mirow, *Der Prediger in seinen verschiedenen Verhältnissen* (Hannover, 1808), pp. 242 f.

⁸² Horn's shortlived *Göttingisches Museum* (Hannover, 1804-1805) provides a good example of a semi-official attempt (the first number is dedicated to Ernst Brandes, a tireless champion of anti-centralist particularism and traditionalism) to raise morale among theological students; see Horn's "Ankündigung, nebst einer Nachschrift," in the opening issue (1804), pp. 1-30, esp. pp. 25-29; cf. Horn, "Verfassung der Göttingischen Societät für theologischen Wissenschaften," *Neues Hannöversches Magazin*, XIV (1804), cols. 129-136. Note also the establishment of prizes in homiletics at Göttingen (n. 62 above).

- ⁸³ The attempt to preserve the economic basis of clerical self-sufficiency can already be detected in Ress, *Landprediger*, Drittes Hauptstück, pp. 456-474 (ca. 1780).
- ⁸⁴ Gräffe, *Pastoraltheologie*, I, 3.
- ⁸⁵ E. g., Saine, "Aufklärung," p. 337.
- ⁸⁶ E. g., Saine, "Aufklärung," pp. 336-339.
- ⁸⁷ E. g., Saine, "Aufklärung," pp. 334-336.
- ⁸⁸ E. g., Saine, "Aufklärung," pp. 324 ff., 333.
- ⁸⁹ Cf. the studies by Gerhard, Walker, and Vierhaus cited in nos. 1 and 71 above; besides the works cited in nos. 52-54 and no. 68 above, see also Werner Conze, "Staat und Gesellschaft in der frührevolutionären Epoche Deutschlands," *Historische Zeitschrift*, CLXXXVI (1961), 1-34, esp. pp. 9 f.; and Vierhaus, "Die Landstände in Nordwestdeutschland im späteren 18. Jahrhundert," in Dietrich Gerhard, ed., *Ständische Vertretungen in Europa im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert*, Veröffentlichungen des Max-Planck-Instituts für Geschichte, 27 (Göttingen, 1969), pp. 73-93, esp. 91-93.
- ⁹⁰ Saine, "Aufklärung," pp. 336, 334.
- ⁹¹ Parry (cited n. 52 above), p. 182; cf. p. 181.
- ⁹² Parry, p. 182.
- ⁹³ One is, let it be noted, not justified in concluding that Saine's version of *Aufklärung* is defined so as to include only German thinkers up to 1775 or so, or only the most "rationalistic" promoters of Enlightenment. On the contrary, Saine explicitly argues in favor of an "inclusive" definition of Enlightenment which would include Hamann and Herder (see "Scholarship," p. 145). Such a position has, of course, many advantages; and precisely because he holds such a broad definition of *Aufklärung*, Saine's lack of attention to the anti-centralist school of thought (closely associated with Herder; cf. Parry, p. 185, n. 35) appears to me inexplicable.
- ⁹⁴ On the roots of the anti-centralist position, see Parry, pp. 181, 185 f. For the quotations from Parry, see p. 187.
- ⁹⁵ Parry, p. 187.
- ⁹⁶ Parry, p. 188.
- ⁹⁷ Parry, pp. 188-191.
- ⁹⁸ The way in which the two positions on Christian ministry correspond to the two competing views on government and society at this time can well be seen by examining the anti-centralist criticism of deism, of Philanthropism, of despotism, and of the radical Enlightenment (i. e., centralist) attempts to achieve control over the proclamation of the Christian religion as that criticism was voiced by Johann Georg Schlosser in his *Über die Apologie des Predigtamts des Deismus* (Frankfurt a. M., 1789), pp. 131 f., 137 f. Schlosser's tract can only be understood against the background of the controversies (especially the controversy with Campe) then in progress. Schlosser's tract was written as an explicit refutation of an article in the *Braunschweiger [!] Journal*, 1789, 5. Stück. On Schlosser and his criticism of Physiocracy and despotism, see R. Jung, "Schlosser," *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, XXXI, 544-547; and cf. for the broader background the work by Liebel cited in n. 53 above.
- ⁹⁹ See the works by Rehberg, esp. pp. 111 f. and Brandes, pp. 178-183, esp. p. 180 on "eine schädliche Polypragmosine"; cf. with Brandes the material on Funck and Velthusen presented in Bofinger and Beste (cited in no. 71 above).

- ¹⁰⁰ Cf. nos. 68, 70, and 75 above; Schuster [no. 76 above], pp. 319–322; Vierhaus, "Bildung," *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe*, I, 508–551, esp. 519 f.; Karl-Ernst Jeismann, *Das preußische Gymnasium in Staat und Gesellschaft*, Industrielle Welt, 15 (Stuttgart, 1974), pp. 135 f., 141–143; Volker Sellin, "Friedrich der Große und der aufgeklärte Absolutismus," in Ulrich Engelhardt et al., eds., *Soziale Bewegung und politische Verfassung. Festschrift Werner Conze*, Industrielle Welt, Sonderband (Stuttgart, 1976), pp. 83–112, esp. pp. 109 f.
- ¹⁰¹ My judgment is based on the materials cited above (e.g., no. 100). On the cameralist claim and its bizarre implications in the Holy Roman Empire, see Walker, pp. 145–184.
- ¹⁰² See Vierhaus, "Bildung"; Jeismann; Hans Rosenberg, *Bureaucracy, Aristocracy and Autocracy: The Prussian Experience 1660–1815*, Harvard Historical Monographs, 34 (Cambridge, Mass., 1958); Rosenberg, "Theologischer Rationalismus und vormärzlicher Vulgärliberalismus," *Historische Zeitschrift*, CXLI (1930), 497–541; Vierhaus, "Politisches Bewußtsein in Deutschland vor 1789," *Der Staat*, VI (1967), 175–196, esp. pp. 178 f.; Vierhaus, "Zur historischen Deutung der Aufklärung: Probleme und Perspektiven" *Wolfenbütteler Studien zur Aufklärung*; and Manfred Baumotte, *Theologie als politische Aufklärung*, Studien zur evangelischen Ethik, 12 (Gütersloh, 1973), pp. 90 ff.
- ¹⁰³ Vierhaus, "Zur historischen Deutung der Aufklärung."
- ¹⁰⁴ Thus Vierhaus, "Zur historischen Deutung der Aufklärung," writes: "Die bürgerliche Gesellschaft in der politischen Verfassung eines vernunftgeleiteten Gesetzes- und Rechtsstaats, in dem freie öffentliche Meinungsbildung möglich ist, ist das an den Liberalismus des 19. Jahrhunderts weitergegebene politische Leitbild der deutschen Aufklärung gewesen. Als die ihm entsprechende politisch-soziale Praxis galt einerseits das streng rechtmäßige Handeln einer aufgeklärten, reformwilligen Administration, in der Männer wirken, die den Wissens- und Bewußtseinsstand der Zeit repräsentieren, andererseits das patriotische, also das gesellschafts-orientierte Verhalten aufgeklärter, in politischer Verantwortung erzogener Bürger." Rudolf Vierhaus, "Zur historischen Deutung der Aufklärung: Probleme und Perspektiven," in *Judentum im Zeitalter der Aufklärung* = *Wolfenbütteler Studien zur Aufklärung*, IV (Wolfenbüttel, 1977), 39–54; the quotation is from pp. 52 f.
- ¹⁰⁵ See Schlingensiepen-Pogge [n. 43 above], pp. 40–53, who stresses how Enlightenment clergy served as spokesmen for the rising *Bürgertum* in its struggle against the barrier of noble privilege; and Rosenberg, "Rationalismus," pp. 505 f., 511, 527 f.; Baumotte, pp. 110–120; cf. Vierhaus, "Bildung," p. 521, on the *Gebildeten* as a challenge to existing society; also Johanna Schultze, *Die Auseinandersetzung zwischen Adel und Bürgertum in den deutschen Zeitschriften der letzten drei Jahrzehnte des 18. Jahrhunderts (1773–1806)*, Historische Studien, 163 (Berlin, 1925); Fritz Martiny, *Die Adelsfrage in Preußen vor 1806*, Beiheft 35 zur Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte (Stuttgart, 1938).
- ¹⁰⁶ The unpublished researches of Mr. Hanno Schmitt (Marburg) show that Campe's failure in Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel was due, not merely to resistance by traditionalist forces, but also to lack of support from another quarter as well, namely, the enlightened *Bildungsbürgertum*. Thus the case of the ducal reforms in Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel illustrates very plainly how

traditionalist and "bourgeois" forces could at times work together to check the power of centralism.

¹⁰⁷ See Rosenberg, *Bureaucracy* and Jeismann.

¹⁰⁸ See Rehberg (no. 72 above).

¹⁰⁹ See the argument in Jeismann, pp. 309-315 in connection with his comments on p. 142.

¹¹⁰ See for example Jeismann, pp. 309-315, 324-327.

¹¹¹ Cf. Schlingensiepen-Pogge as cited in no. 105 above.

¹¹² Reinhart Koselleck, *Kritik und Krise: Ein Beitrag zur Pathogenese der bürgerlichen Welt*, *Orbis academicus*, 5.1 (Freiburg i. Br., 1959), pp. 29, 42-45, 55, 81, 83, 99, 107, 133-137; pp. 162 ff., no. 52.

¹¹³ Cf. Rosenberg, "Rationalismus," which ought to have set students of the Enlightenment clergy to thinking long ago about the bounds to clerical enthusiasm for co-operation with the policies of secular government; and Klaus Scholder, "Grundzüge der theologischen Aufklärung in Deutschland," in Kopitzsch, ed., *Aufklärung*, pp. 294-318, which, however, overestimates the liking of enlightened theologians for enlightened absolutism (p. 313).

¹¹⁴ Saine, "Scholarship," p. 145.

¹¹⁵ Saine, "Scholarship," p. 146.