

11-1-1945

Veit Ludwig von Seckendorf an Orthodox Defender of Pietists

L. W. Spitz

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm>



Part of the [History of Christianity Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Spitz, L. W. (1945) "Veit Ludwig von Seckendorf an Orthodox Defender of Pietists," *Concordia Theological Monthly*. Vol. 16 , Article 70.

Available at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm/vol16/iss1/70>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Print Publications at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Concordia Theological Monthly by an authorized editor of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

and large they considered his teachings just the rantings of a political orator, who would cool off if he ever got into power. We know now that they made a big mistake. The whole theory of purity of race is of course so much nonsense when viewed scientifically. Hitler and the members of his party adhered to it fanatically and acted upon it. The war therefore was more than a mere struggle for territory. What concerns us more vitally than the political implications is the fact that Nazi ideology struck at the very heart of Christian teaching. The *voelkische Weltanschauung*, as taught by Hitler and his party, was diametrically opposed to the Christian view of life, as must be evident to anyone who has given the matter even a little thought. It was simply pagan, plainly opposed to the will of God as revealed in His holy Word. Surely, it is not mixing Church and State if we expose the anti-Christian teachings of a powerful organization, no matter who its members are.

Our brief review of the world scene has not been too encouraging. We are living in times of strife and turmoil. As leaders in the Church it behooves us to be alert and to face the future with faith and courage. In a world of confusion we need not be confused. Our task is plainly outlined by the Lord Himself. We must go on preaching, teaching, serving. If we are faithful in that, we need not be dismayed, no matter how dark the clouds that appear on the horizon may seem, for we have the blessed Savior's assurance that He will be with us always and that "the gates of hell shall not prevail against" His Church.

Edmonton, Alberta, Can.

A. GUEBERT

Veit Ludwig von Seckendorf an Orthodox Defender of Pietists

The Thirty Years' War, which had caused the Holy Roman Empire to disintegrate into several hundred little despotic states, virtually destroying the sentiment of national unity and creating a state of chaos in its social and economic life, was equally desolating in its effects upon religion. By way of contrast with this deplorable condition of the empire, France had its day of military and social glory. No wonder that for decades to come German men and women, disgusted with conditions in their homeland, were fascinated by the splendor of their illustrious neighbor across the Rhine. Under such circumstances it was only natural that religion, too, would be exposed to influences emanating from France. "Enlightenment" was the favorite watchword of that period.

Some of the German princes, like Duke Ernest the Pious, made an effort to stem the tide of religious indifferentism which threatened to engulf their states. Under the religious settlement of the Peace of Westphalia this was their privilege. Seckendorf tells us in the preface to his *Christen-Stat* that Duke Maurice of Saxe-Weitz would not tolerate atheists and despisers of religion at his court; but the very publication of this book shows that such persons appeared there. It was in the course of his discussions with people who held irreligious views that Seckendorf gathered the material for the first part of his book, which is against atheists. In praise of Duke Maurice the baron says that when he entered the latter's services as privy councilor and chancellor more than twenty years before, he found to his great pleasure that the duke not merely adhered to the outward form of worship, but according to all appearances also firmly believed the Christian truth; for the duke, he said, earnestly confessed it on every occasion and defended it according to his ability. The duke, however, as Seckendorf admits, was not a great scholar. This left the matter of Christian apologetics largely in the hands of his able privy councilor.

The situation at the ducal court suggested the writing of the *Christen-Stat*. In a letter to Leibniz, written in 1683, Seckendorf acknowledges his indebtedness to Pascal's *Pensées* for the idea of the *Christen-Stat* and introduces the name of Philipp Jakob Spener as one of those who encouraged him to proceed with this work.¹ Leibniz in reply refers to the prevailing impiety, especially at the courts, and explains why such a work produced by a man of Seckendorf's stature would be particularly influential in combatting it.²

The great German philosopher was not to be disappointed in the finished product. The *Christen-Stat* is not only an apology for Christianity, but a practical effort to raise the spiritual level of the Church.³ The first part is directed against atheists; the remainder of the book is devoted to Christian exhortation and spiritual edification. Seckendorf has here assumed the role of a Lutheran bishop, issuing a pastoral letter for the spiritual welfare of his flock. His aim is to make of the people faithful and sanctified Christians; for he is convinced that as such they will be excellent either as rulers or as subjects, according to their respective stations. True citizenship he seeks in heaven; the earth is merely a miserable and temporary dwelling place.⁴ Leibniz was delighted with it, considering it the best book of its kind in the German language. He wrote to Seckendorf: "I could not refrain from running through it at once from cover to cover, with the greatest delight."⁵

In the foreword to his *Christen-Stat*, as well as in the letter to Leibniz, Seckendorf mentions Spener. The latter, too, was profoundly distressed over the low ebb of spirituality within the Church, but — more than that — was also determined to do something about it. Philipp Jakob Spener, known as the father of Pietism, was one of the most remarkable personages in the Church of the seventeenth century. In his first charge at Strassburg he labored with such signal success as preacher and professor that within three years he received a call to become the senior minister at Frankfort-on-the-Main. There those who accepted his application of the Scriptures met with him in private for further instruction and strengthening of their spiritual life. Thus there originated in 1670 the *ecclesiolae* which were to become one of the distinct characteristics of Pietism. The first nine years of Spener's activity at Frankfort were generally peaceful. During this time he established his reputation as a loyal teacher and defender of the Lutheran doctrines. The calm was broken when, in 1675, he published his *Pia Desideria*.

The hostility aroused by these indeed sprang largely from the *collegia pietatis*, by which name Spener's groups of laymen for mutual edification became known, and was intensified when such meetings were inaugurated elsewhere. Theologically Spener followed the beaten path of the Lutheran Confessions. Where he parted from them, the deviation, as Albrecht Ritschl remarks, was quite concealed. His purpose was to improve the Christian life of the Church.⁶

In 1686 Spener received a call to Dresden. Some time before, when Lucius — the court preacher and confessor of John George III, the elector of Saxony — was dangerously ill, the latter had commissioned his privy councilor, Seckendorf, to inquire of Spener whether, in the case of a vacancy, he would be inclined to accept the position of court chaplain, and Spener had replied that he would if God so willed it.⁷ In accepting the call to Dresden, Spener assumed what was considered the highest ecclesiastical post in the Lutheran Church of Germany. Seckendorf may not have suggested the idea of calling Spener to Dresden, but he persuaded him, when he was hesitant about going to Dresden, to accept the call.⁸ The baron was being drawn into the stirring fortunes of the Pietists.

Spener came to Dresden with some apprehension; his misgivings were not to deceive him. He had indeed entered a larger field of activity but also one of combat. The Saxon clergy and some court officials soon adopted a course of systematic opposition to the new court chaplain.⁹ Efforts were made to induce him to resign his pastorate, but this he refused to do. However, when

he received a call to the court of Brandenburg, he accepted it and, in April, 1691, removed to Berlin, where he served as consistorial councilor and provost of St. Nicolai Church.

In the same month in which Spener removed to Dresden (July, 1686) August Hermann Francke and Paul Anton inaugurated their so-called *collegium philobiblicum* at the University of Leipzig. After some time, however, the faculty, after a formal investigation, prohibited his lectures and forced Francke, together with Anton, to leave the city. Francke repaired to Erfurt, where he joined his friend Joachim Justus Breithaupt. On September 27, 1691, after only a brief ministry there, he was driven from Erfurt.¹⁰

But he was now to enter upon the richest period of his eventful life. He received and accepted a call to the newly founded university in Halle, first as professor of Greek and oriental languages and later of theology. At the same time he assumed the pastorate of the church at Glaucha, a suburb of Halle. Arriving in Halle on January 7, 1692, he opened there an era of Christian philanthropy which will ever remain an object of admiration to all who have a heart for the destitute.

Seckendorf had a hand in getting Francke to Halle, as he had in getting Spener to Dresden. On the first Sunday in Advent of the preceding year, Francke had preached for Provost Lütken in Berlin. Seckendorf, who had just arrived in that city, persuaded the then all-powerful minister von Danckelmann to go to hear him. Von Danckelmann attended the service with a number of privy councilors. Having heard Francke, they resolved unanimously to retain him.¹¹

Thus at various times and places Seckendorf is found involved in the affairs of prominent Pietists. The questions may then be asked: What was Seckendorf's relation with the Pietists? Was he one himself? How did Pietism, if at all, affect his writing of history? It is self-evident that a statesman whose activities took him to the various German states would have to come in contact with Pietists and could not avoid, at one time or another, having to deal with their program of proposed church reforms. Again, it must be remembered that he lived in the very age and area which produced Pietism. Gustav Kramer thinks that Pietism was the reaction of the Christian soul against the generally prevailing formalism and externalism of the ecclesiastical life. However, not all men who were interested in a functional Christianity joined the Pietistic movement.

In tracing Seckendorf's connection with the Pietists, one may begin with his attendance at the *gymnasium* in Gotha. The instruction which he there received in the years 1641 and 1642, according to A. Bräm, at that time already breathed the spirit of the

ideas and aspirations of a dawning Pietism, as they appeared in the *Schulbericht* of Duke Ernest the Pious.¹² Seckendorf, who had already been trained by his God-fearing mother to lead a sanctified life, freely imbibed the spirit of piety which prevailed in the company of such men as Reiher, Glass, and Bronchorst. Although Glass lived only to the beginning of the Pietist movement, he may be regarded in particular as of a kindred spirit to Spener. It should be remembered that Francke had also been a pupil of the pious pedagogs at Gotha. This may explain Seckendorf's sympathy with his pedagogical principles at Halle.¹³ A. Tholuck speaks of the court at Gotha as "a Spener circle before Spener," but adds: "and yet not quite, for piety was still afraid to deviate by the breadth of a finger from the existing arrangements and traditions in doctrine and life, and believed that there were channels and means for the revival of the Church without any innovations in the constitution of the existing State Church."¹⁴ At this point it may be well to remember that piety and what has become historically known as Pietism are not one and the same thing. It will not be possible to determine accurately how much Seckendorf was responsible for the spiritual and ecclesiastical conditions obtaining in Saxe-Gotha during his eighteen years of service there, nor how much the court of Ernest the Pious, or "Bet-Ernest," as he was also called, contributed to his spiritual development; but it is certain that Seckendorf continued to the end of his life to work for the kind of Christianity which was practiced at the Gotha court.

The beginnings of Spenerian Pietism are to be found in the period of Seckendorf's services under Duke Maurice of Zeitz. Three years after the publication of the *Pia Desideria*, Seckendorf seems to have come into more direct contact with Pietism for the first time. The wife of Landgrave Lewis VI of Hessen-Darmstadt was Elisabeth Dorothea, a daughter of Ernest the Pious. She brought to Darmstadt a measure of that devoutness and religious sincerity for which Duke Ernest and his pious councilor were known. Spener's ideas had been favorably received in Darmstadt and at first welcomed with enthusiasm by Dr. Balthaser Mentzer, but the *collegia pietatis* changed his mind. In January, 1678, he succeeded in persuading the aging landgrave to issue an edict forbidding them.¹⁵ Just then Seckendorf came to Darmstadt. Spener feared that under those circumstances the baron did not get a good impression of him. He spared no pains to dispel any prejudices which Seckendorf might have against him, since he hoped that through the *patrocinium* of so dear a man in Saxony the suspicions which at that time were being spread about by his opponents might be effectively counteracted.¹⁶ Indeed, the

Duchess Sophie Elisabeth, wife of Duke Maurice, may have contributed much to that end. She was the daughter of the duke of Holstein-Sonderburg and had as a girl attended Spener's *collegia pietatis* in Frankfort. Both Spener and Seckendorf praised the efforts of the duke and the duchess towards a functioning and practical Christianity.

Spener's first letter to Seckendorf is dated July 22, 1681. It cannot be definitely established what brought about this improved relationship between the two men. Seckendorf, on his part, mentions his acquaintance with Spener's writings. Spener's aims were too much like his own not to engage his interest; both strove for a practical Christianity. Already in his first letter to Spener, Seckendorf suggested that they discuss things "which redound to the glory of God and the welfare of the Church."¹⁷

The first specific subject of their correspondence was the improvement of the ministry. Both were convinced that the clergy were primarily to blame for the prevailing low state of the spiritual life in the Lutheran Church. Accordingly they thought it necessary to reach an agreement on how to raise the standards of the clergy. Seckendorf planned to support with practical measures Spener's efforts to reform from within. Persuaded that the academic life at the universities was not conducive to true spirituality, he suggested training the clergy in a special theological seminary and accordingly prepared a memorial, dated at Zeitz on February 11, 1680, to that effect. Spener approved the plan.¹⁸ Nothing came of it, probably owing to the death of Duke Maurice and the chancellor's subsequent retirement to Meuselwitz. Unfortunately Seckendorf's letters from his correspondence with Spener, with one exception, have not been preserved. They must have been quite numerous.¹⁹ Spener speaks of "*tot epistulae*."²⁰

The ties binding the two friends were strengthened when Seckendorf in August, 1682, met Spener personally at Frankfort. It is quite probable that one of the subjects of their conversation was Spener's projected *Tabulae catecheticae*, which were dedicated to Seckendorf and published in the following year. On his journey from Frankfort to his new post in Dresden, Spener visited his friend at Meuselwitz. There Seckendorf was at leisure to concentrate on his program of reform, which in many ways closely conformed to Spener's. One result of his meditation on the ills of the estates and how to cure them has already been noted—his *Christen-Stat*. The similarity of the objectives of this book and the *Pia Desideria* leaves little doubt as to its influence in furthering the spread of Pietism. The Pietists were not slow to recognize in Seckendorf a champion of their cause. Spener quite naturally found in the *Christen-Stat* an arsenal for his own purposes; he

frequently quoted it with approval. He commended, for example, to a university what Seckendorf has to say about the need of studying the Scriptures.²¹ Spener advocated returning the power of church discipline to the entire Church and was pleased to find that "in the Christian statesman's, Herrn von Seckendorfs, *Christen-Stat*" this right of the Church is so often defended.²² In speaking of the difficulty of getting "truly converted and godly *Theologi*" for vacant pastorates, he referred to the recommendations of this "Christian politician" in his *Christen-Stat*.²³ To support his claim that philosophy is harmful to the Church and true theology, he again cited the *Christen-Stat*.²⁴ Spener was pleased that Seckendorf included his opinion on excommunication in the *Additiones* appended to his *Christen-Stat*, though he also noted Seckendorf's opinion that the members of the Church must first be instructed how to use beneficially their right to excommunicate.²⁵ Seckendorf, on his part, showed the high esteem in which he held Spener by translating into Latin a number of his sermons which had been delivered in 1676 and 1677 and later published under the title: *Des tätigen Christentums Notwendigkeit und Möglichkeit*.²⁶

Seckendorf had hoped to find rest and quiet at his beloved Meuselwitz; but his connections with the leading public men in Church and State were too extensive and his domicile was too close to electoral Saxony for him to escape being drawn into the religious controversies of the time. During Advent of the year 1689, Francke, who had just been expelled from the University of Leipzig by its theological faculty, visited him at Meuselwitz. The baron had him preach for his resident pastor, M. Hermann, who was at the time a candidate for the position of court preacher at Zeitz. It is possible that Seckendorf considered Francke for the possible vacancy at Meuselwitz. At any rate, this visit may have laid the foundation for the affection which thereafter bound them together until the baron's death.²⁷ Spener likewise was Seckendorf's guest at Meuselwitz (July 3—6, 1691) on his way from turbulent Dresden to his new charge in Berlin.²⁸ No one was more competent to acquaint Seckendorf with the burning religious questions of that period than Francke and Spener; both were veterans directly from the field of combat.

Francke's troubles at Leipzig and Spener's at Dresden opened the floodgates for an outburst of controversial literature on the subject of Pietism. The most notorious of the many writings to appear in print was an anonymous one which originated in the orthodox camp. Johann Georg Walch ascribes it to Albrecht Christian Roth, pastor in Halle, who for a time was vesper preacher in the Thomas Church in Leipzig. Having been first

published in Latin, it is known as the *Imago pietismi*. Later it was issued in a German translation under the title: *Ebenbild der Pietisterey, die zwar lächerlich; doch vielleicht nicht wider Billigkeit also beniemet wird sich finden sollen*.²⁹ The *Imago pietismi* raises a number of accusations against Pietism, some of them being of a rather personal nature and directed against its spiritual originators and leaders. Having listed the abuses of Pietism in nine groups and its errors in eleven, the author comes to the conclusion: "Therefore Pietism thus described constitutes a sect which can be tolerated neither by the Church nor by the State."³⁰

Such an attack could not go unchallenged. Various replies to its accusations appeared. The most noteworthy of these was that by Seckendorf, who from this moment is found to take an active part in the defense of the Pietists. Like the attack which it was to meet, Seckendorf's reply appeared anonymously, though no one seemed to doubt its authorship. The manuscript arrived in Berlin in January, 1692, bearing the title: "Bericht und Erinnerung auf eine im Druck lateinisch und deutsch ausgestreute Schrift, im latein *Imago pietismi*; zu deutsch aber, *Ebenbild der Pietisterey* genannt. . . ." ³¹ It cannot now be determined to what extent, if any, Seckendorf was actuated by any direct request from some higher authority to publish this apology. As a matter of fact, however, it appeared at a time most convenient for the Elector of Brandenburg to ward off any damage that the *Imago pietismi* might possibly do to the new university at Halle. Ernst Lotze, who has made a thorough study of Seckendorf's connection with Pietism, considers it unlikely that the baron—dignified, peaceable, and reserved as he was—would of his own accord have mixed into theological quarrels of such a "trivial" nature.³² In Berlin, where the manuscript was censored and approved by the privy council, it was decided to withhold the author's name in order to avoid the suggestion that Pietism was being officially sponsored by the court of Brandenburg. Spener, who traced the history of Pietism from the disturbances at Leipzig to date in the foreword (dated: Berlin, February 16, 1692), did not hesitate to affix his name to it.* Already on February 25 Spener was able to report to Francke that the printing was under way, but that it might still be eight days before the job would be finished. Speed was essential, for the plan was to present the apology to the ensuing diet at Dresden in defense of the Pietists, who were being subjected to serious criticism in electoral Saxony.³³

Seckendorf's reply to the *Imago pietismi*, like all of his writ-

* Spener named Seckendorf as the author in his *Gründliche Beantwortung*. In the second edition (Halle, 1713) Seckendorf is given as the author.

ings, is dignified and considerate. It reveals an intelligent grasp of the points of controversy. As the Jesuit Maimbourg's history of Lutheranism is presented and refuted section by section in Seckendorf's *Commentarius*, so the *Imago pietismi* is presented in sections ("Bericht"), and to each section is added the refutation ("Erinnerung").³⁴ Inasmuch as the author of the *Imago pietismi* challenged not only the Pietists, but also other "cordatos et historiae pietisticae gnaros," Seckendorf, as a "cordatus" and "honest" man, who is acquainted with some—and not the least—of those who have been attacked under the hateful name of Pietists, would disclose this or that in reply to it. Having in a thorough and objective manner examined the "abuses" and "errors" of which the Pietists had been accused, he reached the same conclusion as Spener in the foreword: Pietism is anything but a new sect or heresy. As such it is a mere fiction, a false rumor, for which the malice of certain theological circles and the ignorance of the stirred-up people are to blame; perhaps also the indiscreet forwardness of certain pietistically inclined people. Seckendorf professed his readiness to confer more explicitly with the author of the *Imago pietismi*, but in the spirit of the "Erinnerungen," of whose truthfulness and justice he was convinced. For his judgment was based, he said, on what he himself had seen and heard of those whom he considered innocent of the insinuations against them in the *Imago pietismi*—trusting that they were honest with him. Should they, on the other hand, have dealt treacherously with him and sooner or later have come forth with visions and fanaticism ("Schwärmereyen"), he would, with God, be one of the first to lament their deceit and regard them as such, as they should then in their guilt have revealed themselves.³⁵

Seckendorf's apology did not fail to make an impression. The reading public quite correctly surmised who its famous author was. It was also honorably introduced by a highly respected personage—Spener. This eminent divine here for the first time stepped forth as the literary defender of Pietism. The pleasure with which Seckendorf's writing was received by the Pietists can readily be imagined. Spener, for his part, expressed the hope that it might appeal the more to all impartial thinkers, in as much as the author had no personal interest in the whole matter and had written merely for his love of the truth and the peace of the Church. He had a good reason for hoping this, for the accusations in the *Imago pietismi* were directed against him. Seckendorf had become a defender of Spener and his cause.³⁶ Soon he was to vindicate also his friend Francke at Halle.

Already in 1690 the Elector of Brandenburg, Frederick III—soon to become King Frederick I of Prussia—was thinking of

founding a new university in Halle. On June 30 the elector, who was then in Cleves, ordered the founding of the university, and on August 30, 1692, he issued a decree appointing Seckendorf as its first chancellor. It was significant that for intellectual leadership at the new school he selected men like August Hermann Francke, Samuel Pufendorf, and Christian Thomasius. The latter, like Francke, but not for the same reason, had been driven out of Leipzig. The resolution of the elector, to make Seckendorf his privy counselor and to place him at the head of the university in Halle as chancellor, fully demonstrated of what importance this institution was to become to Pietism. Seckendorf's call to Halle was, as Lotze points out, no less than a call to the battlefield of Pietist controversy.³⁷

In a letter to Spener, dated Meuselwitz, May 30, 1692—the only extant writing of Seckendorf to that friend—the baron wrote: "Gott wird das Werk fördern, wo seine ehre durch mich alten schwachen mann annoch in einigen Dingen befördert werden soll; denn solchen Zweck suche ich, und finde sonst weder Ruhm noch Nutzen dabey."³⁸

As chancellor, Seckendorf was to supervise both instructors and students, pointing out to each his respective duty. Once or twice a week he was to hold a meeting in his house or at the most convenient place, confer diligently with the professors, and faithfully show the students how to plan their studies and future journeys. And to the best of his ability he was to help establish good order at the university and cause it to flourish. The elector clearly showed in his commission to Seckendorf what he expected for his new school from a man with the baron's reputation and talents.³⁹

Students were already arriving, and everything seemed ready for the beginning of instruction, when the faculty of the school and the ministry of the city became involved in a controversy which threatened the position of Francke at the University. The latter's strict church discipline as pastor at Glaucha incited some of his church members to bring complaints against him. His clerical opponents in the orthodox camp supported the dissatisfied laymen, and the strife was on. For once in his troubles Francke was to have the government on his side. His appeal for assistance met with a ready response in Berlin. Already on July 26, 1692, an electoral rescript created a commission to deal with Francke's difficulties. The members of this body were to be the chancellor of the university at Jena, who was to serve as chairman, the jurist Kaspar Kreuzing of Halle, and Seckendorf, who had previously gained some experience in a similar affair at Halberstadt. For some unknown reason the chancellor of Jena declined to serve.

This placed the chief responsibility in this matter on Seckendorf. The latter also spent the week of August 14 to 21 in Halle to prepare for his removal to that city and to act in Francke's case. On August 18 he gave Francke and his complaining parishioners a hearing. The next day he sent a report to the elector. With a clear understanding of the issues, he prevailed upon the elector to order a thorough investigation of all the questions involved and was thereby instrumental in obtaining for Francke a measure of consideration and justice which had been denied him in Leipzig and Erfurt. In response to Seckendorf's report the elector in September, 1692, issued a rescript which resulted in a fair trial of the case and the peaceful solution of the problems involved.⁴⁰ A new commission was appointed to act in the case. It consisted of the following members: Seckendorf; Dr. Lütkens, the provost of St. Peter's in Berlin; and the Herren von Platen and von Diesskau. The sessions, held from November 18 to 27, were conducted with great deliberateness and care.⁴¹ At their conclusion, Seckendorf drew up a compact of peace which was approved by the elector and ordered read from all the pulpits in the churches of Halle.⁴²

Great was the joy of the Pietists, as well as that of Seckendorf, over the reconciliation of the estranged parties. Spener regarded it as "a special grace of God that preserved Herr von Seckendorf, when the stone had so weakened him, long enough to complete this task."⁴³ Indeed, this work of peace was to be Seckendorf's last. While he was still conferring with the elector regarding the establishment of the university, his old malady, the stone, cast him upon his bed for what proved to be his last illness. He died on the very day on which his compact of peace was read from the pulpits in Halle.⁴⁴

The grief of the Pietists over Seckendorf's unexpected death was widespread and sincere, and rightly so. With his pen Seckendorf had appeared as a defender of Spener; with his prestige as a statesman and scholar he had prepared the ground for Francke in Halle, and as an arbiter had made it possible for him to continue his beneficent work there. No wonder that Spener lamented the baron's untimely death and that Francke mourned over it as over the death of a father. Seckendorf's death meant an irreparable loss to the cause of Pietism.⁴⁵

The question whether Seckendorf himself was a Pietist is sufficiently involved to admit a difference of opinion. This question is a difficult one, because there is no simple criterion for reaching an all-embracing definition of Pietism or Pietists. Pietism was not the same thing at all places and during all periods of its development. The Pietism of Spener and Francke was not the same.

The definitions of partisans and foes have always differed widely. Preserved Smith flatly calls Seckendorf a Pietist.⁴⁶ Kurt Guggisberg, speaking of the baron's delight over the fact that the Protestant confessions agree in so many fundamental points, refers to him as one "in whom the Pietist aurora dawns."⁴⁷ Martin Spahn, however, intimates that not all who joined the Pietist movement were Pietists. Without any reflections on Seckendorf's motives, he says that not a few learned men drew near to the young community of Pietists, not only persons like the now aged Seckendorf, who within his limited sphere was still as busy as a bee and who was then writing his *Christen-Stat* (1685), but also such pugnacious natures as the Leipzig Christian Thomasius. However, he continues, quite soon it became evident that it was no longer religious sympathy, as in the sixties, which induced the leading intellects to join a religious society, but that, coincidentally, the enmity of the clergy against both groups occasioned the alliance. It is quite obvious that not all who co-operated with the Pietists or were even in sympathy with many of their aims need be classified as Pietists. If a religious liberal like Thomasius could sympathize with the Pietists, an orthodox Lutheran might defend them for very different reasons. Kolde asserts that it is scarcely permissible to call Seckendorf a Pietist.⁴⁸ Lotze agrees with Kolde. After a thorough investigation of the historian's connections with Pietism, he reaches the following conclusion:

Devoted to a living and practical Christianity, averse to separatism and mysticism, Seckendorf belongs to Pietism only according to one side of his being. Although his share in the Pietist movement is not a small one, we, too, do not number him with the representatives of a genuine Pietism, but, with Tholuck, place him in the ranks of the enlivening witnesses of the Lutheran Church of the seventeenth century—of those few but eminent and sympathetic personalities to whom we owe it that in a time of churchly decline the pulse of Lutheran doctrine and life did not stop.⁴⁹

Of one thing there can be no doubt—of Seckendorf's fundamental orthodoxy. If, therefore, he himself was not a Pietist, he was most assuredly an orthodox defender of Pietists.

The question is now in order: How, if at all, did Seckendorf's intimate relation with the Pietists affect his writings as a church historian? It was to be expected that a widespread and dynamic spiritual movement such as Pietism would be revolutionary in its effect on historiography, as is evident in the case of Gottfried Arnold; but a study of Seckendorf's *Commentarius* bears out the correctness of Gustav Wolf's observation: "In his personal opinions Seckendorf already approaches closely to Pietism, but without

being directly influenced by it in the *Commentarius*."⁵⁰ However, the degree of objectivity attained by Seckendorf in his historical writings is a broad subject for another study.

Concordia, Mo.

L. W. SPITZ

REFERENCES

¹ Preussische Akademie der Wissenschaften, *Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz Sämtliche Schriften und Briefe. Erste Reihe. Allgemeiner Politischer und Historischer Briefwechsel*. (3 vols.; Leipzig: K. F. Köhler Verlag, 1923—1938), III, 566 f.

² *Ibid.*, p. 572.

³ Seckendorf's *Christen-Stat* is reviewed in the *Acta eruditorum*, 1685, pp. 343—49.

⁴ J. C. Bluntschli, *Geschichte des allgemeinen Staatsrechts und der Politik. Seit dem sechzehnten Jahrhundert bis zur Gegenwart* (2d ed.; München: Literarisch-artistische Anstalt der J. G. Cotta'schen Buchhandlung, 1867), p. 134.

⁵ Preussische Akademie der Wissenschaften, *op. cit.*, p. 547.

⁶ Albrecht Ritschl, *Geschichte des Pietismus* (3 vols.; Bonn: Adolph Marcus, 1880—1886), II, 125 ff.

⁷ J. B. Trautmann and K. A. E. Kluge, *Geschichte der christlichen Kirche* (3 vols.; Dresden: Justus Naumann, 1857), III, 276.

⁸ Ernst Lotze, *Veit Ludwig von Seckendorf und sein Anteil an der pietistischen Bewegung des XVII. Jahrhunderts. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Pietismus* (Quedlinburg: H. Klöppels Buchdruckerei, 1911), pp. 28 f.

⁹ Wilhelm Hossbach, *Philipp Jakob Spener und seine Zeit* (2 vols.; Berlin: Ferdinand Dümmler, 1828), I, 214 f.

¹⁰ E. A. W. Krauss, *Lebensbilder aus der Geschichte der christlichen Kirche* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1912), pp. 603—5.

¹¹ Gustav Kramer, *August Hermann Francke. Ein Lebensbild* (2 vols.; Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1880), I, 102.

¹² A. Bräm, *Der gothaische Schulmethodus. Eine kritische Untersuchung über die ersten Spuren des Pietismus in der Pädagogik des 17. Jahrhunderts* (Dissertation, Erlangen; Berlin, 1897), cited by Lotze, *op. cit.*, p. 13. Lotze's book is the most authoritative work on the subject of Seckendorf's relation with Pietism.

¹³ Lotze, *ibid.*, p. 13.

¹⁴ Quoted by Lotze, *ibid.*, p. 17.

¹⁵ Johann Georg Walch, *Historische und theologische Einleitung in die Religions-Streitigkeiten, welche sonderlich ausser der Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirche entstanden* (10 vols.; Jena: bey Johann Meyers Wittwe, 1730—1739), Parts IV and V, 1102—9.

¹⁶ Philipp Jakob Spener, *Theologische Bedencken und andere briefliche Antworten auf geistliche/ sonderlich zur Erbauung gerichtete Materien* (4 vols., 3d ed.; Halle: in Verlegung des Waisen-Hauses, 1712—1715), III, 460.

¹⁷ Lotze, *op. cit.*, pp. 24 f.

¹⁸ Cf. *Theol. Bedencken*, IV, 526—35.

¹⁹ Lotze, *op. cit.*, 25 f.

²⁰ Spener, "Foreword," *Tabulae catecheticae*, quoted *ibid.*, p. 27.

²¹ *Theol. Bedencken*, I, 398.

²² *Ibid.*, III, 613.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 651.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, IV, 185.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 289.

²⁶ Cf. Theodor Kolde, "Veit Ludwig von Seckendorf," *Realencyklopädie für prot. Theol. u. Kirche*, ed. Albert Hauck, 3d ed., Vol. XVIII (1906): *Capita doctrinae et praxis christianae insignia ex 59 illustribus N. Test. dictis deducta et evangelis dominicalibus, in concionibus a. 1677, Francof. ad Moen. habitis applicata a. P. J. Spenero 1689.*

²⁷ Lotze, *op. cit.*, p. 37.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 37 f.

²⁹ Walch, *op. cit.*, Parts IV and V, 1149.

³⁰ Lotze, *op. cit.*, p. 40.

³¹ Walch, *op. cit.*, Parts IV and V, 1151 f.

³² *Op. cit.*, p. 41.

³³ *Ibid.*, pp. 41 f.

³⁴ The title page ends with the words: "Gedachte Schrift/ oder sogenanntes Ebenbild/ ist in gegenwärtigem Tractat von Wort zu Worte stückweise eingerücktet/ die Beantwort—und Erinnerung aber mit andern Litern darunter gesetzt/ zu befinden." Quoted *ibid.*, pp. 42 f.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 43 f.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 44 f.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 38.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 58.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 59.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 59—63.

⁴¹ Kramer, *op. cit.*, I, 115.

⁴² Rambach (ed.), *op. cit.*, p. 311.

⁴³ *Theol. Bedencken*, III, 721.

⁴⁴ Rambach (ed.), *op. cit.*, p. 311. Kramer, *op. cit.*, I, 117.

⁴⁵ Cf. Lotze, *op. cit.*, p. 69.

⁴⁶ Preserved Smith, *A History of Modern Culture* (2 vols.; New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1930—1939), II, 242.

⁴⁷ Kurt Guggisberg, *Das Zwinglibild des Protestantismus ein Wandel der Zeiten* (Leipzig: Verlag von M. Heinsius Nachfolger, 1934), p. 89.

⁴⁸ Theodor Kolde, "Veit Ludwig von Seckendorf," *Realencyklopädie für prot. Theol. und Kirche*, ed. Albert Hauck, 3d ed., Vol. XVIII (1906).

⁴⁹ Lotze, *op. cit.*, pp. 87 f.

⁵⁰ Gustav Wolf, *Quellenkunde der deutschen Reformationsgeschichte* (3 vols.; Gotha: Friedrich Andreas Perthes, 1915—1923), I, 10.

The Lord's Prayer, the Pastor's Prayer

The Seventh Petition

'Αλλὰ ῥῶσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ. But Deliver Us From Evil.
Matt. 6:13; Luke 11:4.

Jesus acknowledges the existence of evil and the reality of deliverance from it. Since the Father is to be implored, it follows that there is deliverance with Him and that He is not involved in, but ever opposed to, the evil. The Deliverer is mightier than the evil. This petition would have no purpose if His children were not