Title
Spirit of Power: Bunsen and the Anglo-Prussian Axis of Protestantism, 1815-1860

Author
Keeley, Samuel Blaine

Publication Date
2019

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Los Angeles

Spirit of Power:

Bunsen and the Anglo-Prussian Axis of Protestantism, 1815-1860

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the

Requirements for the degree Doctor of Philosophy

in History

by

Samuel Blaine Keeley Jr.

2019

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Spirit of Power:

Bunsen and the Anglo-Prussian Axis of Protestantism, 1815-1860

by

Samuel Blaine Keeley Jr.

Doctor of Philosophy in History

University of California, Los Angeles, 2019

Professor David Sabean, Chair

This dissertation examines the role and status of Protestant religious belief in the middle decades of the nineteenth century, as it was harnessed and deployed by a network of diplomats, theologians, and missionaries in Prussia. Domestically, religious practice was being reconfigured by the Prussian state to foster social cohesion as they dealt with an influx of Catholic subjects after annexing new territories in the wake of Napoleon's defeat. Beyond Prussian borders, officials sought to promote Protestant strength on the global stage, as a counter against Prussia's Catholic rivals in Austria, France, and Italy, while attempting to strengthen ties with the other major Protestant superpower of the era - England.

Drawing upon evidence from British and Prussian archival sources in Germany and England, I reconstruct the transnational network that formed around its central figure: the diplomat Christian Carl Josias von Bunsen, a powerful and pious Prussian ambassador to the

Vatican and to England between 1817-1839 and 1840-1854, respectively. I look at the projects of Bunsen and his allies to protect the faith of German Protestants living beyond German territory, and their attempts to inject a new flavor of revivalist religious sentiments via a re-worked liturgy and hymnbook for the German churches. At the same time, the network was used as the basis for a bilateral, transnational alliance between Prussia and England in the 1840s. This culminated in the establishment of a colonial, jointly-run Anglican-Lutheran Protestant Bishopric in Jerusalem in order to convert Jews and other non-Protestant Christians to Protestantism.

This dissertation reveals a robust and lively network of elites bound together by eschatological, millenarian, and revivalist theological ideas, with official positions within the Prussian and English administrative apparatuses of both state and church, university faculties, missionary, social-welfare, and philanthropic institutions. Crucially, these findings show that a small group of elites were able to wield enormous influence over the configuration of religion in society, and attempted at every turn to steer both nations towards each other, while also promoting spiritual revival based on dramatic, emotional inner conversions. With these studies, I challenge the narrative of secularization and disenchantment that once characterized the historiography of the nineteenth century, in order to argue that enthusiastic religious beliefs had lasting consequences on statecraft, diplomacy, and colonial ambitions well into the latter decades of the century.

The dissertation of Samuel Blaine Keeley Jr. is approved.

Margaret C. Jacob

Caroline Cole Ford

Carla G. Pestana

David Sabean, Committee Chair

University of California, Los Angeles

2019

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Figures

List of Abbreviations

GStA-PK - Geheimes Staatsarchiv Preußischer Kulturbesitz (Berlin, Germany)

LJS - London Jews Society, or London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews

CMS - Church Missionary Society (Anglican)

GBC - Gesangbuch Commission

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My journey to complete this dissertation has been a long one. I took a somewhat unconventional path through graduate school by first getting a Master's degree from Humboldt Universität zu Berlin before entering the History program at UCLA. Every graduate student faces hardships, be they emotional, financial, academic, or personal in nature, but my scholarship and well-being were supported by a large number of people, and I will attempt to thank them here. Aware that brevity is a gift the author gives to his readers, and cognizant that to thank too many people would be to dilute the impact of the thanks, I must nevertheless allow myself to indulge a bit.

I feel immense and sincere gratitude for my experiences as a graduate student at UCLA, and the relationships that I have formed with many of its faculty who have helped guide and shape not only this dissertation, but also the way that my mind works. I accepted the offer to join UCLA's graduate program without the promise of a stipend. Therefore, my material survival was supported by the generous support of various scholarships, grants, and fellowships, which I would like to recognize. Summer research trips taken to Europe every year were supported by UCLA's International Institute's Fieldwork Fellowship, the Center for European and Russian Studies, and numerous stipends from the History Department: funding provided by the Peter H. Reill Chair in European history and by an endowment left by Professor Eugen Weber to the Department of History chief among those. From UCLA's Graduate Division, a dissertation completion fellowship allowed me to write this manuscript. Summer travel stipends were often funded by Don Eversoll, to whom I am grateful.

I am especially grateful for my dissertation chair, David Sabean, who is objectively one of the best *Doktorväter* of all time, and I count myself lucky to have slipped into the vast,

expansive club of his former students just a few years before his retirement in 2018. David arranged for a research fellowship during my first year that allowed me to stay afloat before I could begin teaching. He opened his home to me and other students for unforgettable weekly dinners and writing groups. His guidance with this dissertation, his patience with my comma placement, and his unyielding advocacy on my behalf have not only given me reasons to be grateful, but also act as a model to which I aspire to be as a teacher and colleague.

Caroline Ford was a later addition to my committee, but an inspirational colleague throughout my program. To Caroline, I am most grateful for her model as to how to run an undergraduate course. Having worked as her teaching assistant multiple times, I learned how best to organize and handle the complexities of the classroom. She also has become a good friend, and someone who has also tried to ensure that I had ample funding opportunities. Similarly, Peg Jacob is to be thanked especially for her help with preparation for my comprehensive exams, and for the crucial insight that I should visit the archives at Lambeth Palace in London. Carla Pestana, now the chair of the department, attended my prospectus defense and offered some important comments, and also became a good friend as we frequently attended the same yoga classes.

Other faculty members deserve special attention. The German historian Jürgen Kocka taught a very influential seminar in social history and our subsequent meetings in Berlin were most helpful in terms of navigating the German archival terrain and historiography. Seminars in intellectual history with Perry Anderson on nationalism and the Enlightenment were unforgettable and challenging, especially as to my thinking of the German *Kulturkampf*. Seminars, lunches, and coffees early in my career with Ra'anan Boustan were also unparalleled

in their help with my thinking of religion as a historical subject and for navigating the American academy.

Through David Sabean, I also met some wonderful senior professors who have each become close friends and interlocutors at the annual German Studies Association conferences. Of these, I would like to specifically name Jared Poley, Jason Coy, Britta McEwan, David Luebke, and Mary Lindemann. Most of all from this group, I would like to acknowledge Ben Marschke, who showed me the ropes of conference panel organization and whose family has also become good friends of mine. Belonging to an intellectual community of this caliber is something that I constantly have to pinch myself in order to believe, but I am glad to know and be known by all of them.

Another group too often goes unsung, namely the administrative staff of UCLA's History department. Current and former members of the staff have all been most helpful over the years, especially Hadley Porter, Eboni Shaw, Katherine Aquino, Hayley Safonov, and Asiroh Cham. My relationships with all of these people transcended simple bureaucratic need to genuine fondness and friendship, and I appreciate each of them.

Among my peers at UCLA, there are many wonderful and collegial friendships that formed within the seminar rooms and hallways, and it is quite difficult for me that I cannot name them all. Nevertheless, I would like to single out Grace Ballor, Max Flomen, Adam Woodhouse, and Jack Wilson. Conversations, meals, and laughter with these friends were irreplaceable during my time at UCLA. Beyond UCLA, I would like to recognize Prof. Jake Fraser, now at Reed College, who has proofread many of my writings in over a decade of friendship, and who has been a stalwart friend and source of inspiration for my academic achievement. I would also like to thank Shane Barber, Alex Annis, and James Mula for their friendship and moral support

during this journey. Special thanks are also reserved for my partner Jennifer Gómez, whose love and patience have been a source of inspiration and joy during my time at UCLA.

My undergraduate students over five years of teaching at UCLA have been wonderful to work with. I especially want to acknowledge the students of my seminar course on religion and revolution in nineteenth-century Germany during the 2017-2018 academic year, with whom I discussed several of the themes that appear in this dissertation. These students have confirmed for me that I have truly found my calling in the classroom, and working with them has made me feel more optimistic about the future.

I would also like to thank my parents and my entire family, nuclear and extended, for their love and support throughout my life and during the writing of this project. The most special mention here belongs to my mother, Katherine, to whom I dedicate this dissertation. Her tireless work (to this day!) as a physician, and as a mother, are a wellspring of inspiration and comfort to me, and I hope that this will make her proud. I would not have been able to make it this far without her unwavering belief in my abilities.

VITA

EDUCATION

2016 **C. Phil.**, History, University of California, Los Angeles

2012 **M.A.**, History, Humboldt Universität zu Berlin, Germany
Thesis: "Images of the Land of Freedom: Previous Knowledge of German Emigrants to the U.S. in the Nineteenth Century"

2008 **B.A.**, History with Honors, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL

FELLOWSHIPS & GRANTS

2018-2019 UCLA Dissertation Year Completion Fellowship
2018 UCLA International Institute Fieldwork Fellowship
2018 UCLA History Dept. Weber Chair Research Travel Grant
2018 Laura Kinsey Distinguished Teaching Prize in History
2013-2017 Donald Eversoll Summer Research Travel Grants
2017 UCLA International Institute Fieldwork Fellowship
2017 Center for European and Russian Studies Conference Grant, UCLA
2016-2018 UCLA History Dept. Weber Chair Research Travel Grant
2015 Graduate Research Summer Mentorship, UCLA
2014 Peter Reill Chair Summer Research Travel Stipend

PUBLICATIONS, CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS AND SERVICE:

2019 "The Influence of Bunsen on Friedrich Wilhelm IV: Anglophilia, Diplomacy, and Religious
Toleration in the Prussian Court, 1840-1860," Conference Presentation, at 42nd German Studies Association Annual Conference, Portland (October 2019)

2018 "A New Liturgy: Revivalism & Religious Tolerance in Germany & England, 1818-1854,"
Conference Presentation, at 42nd German Studies Association Annual Conference, Pittsburgh (September 2018)

2018 "Knowing Beliefs: Measuring the 'Epistemic Concept' of Piety in Spaces of Communication" Conference Presentation, UCLA History Department, Historical Epistemology: Four Generations of Graduate Students Reflect on their Craft, Los Angeles (May 2018)

2017 "Protestant Rome? The 1817 Reformation Anniversary as Transnational Site of Prussian Power" Conference Presentation; Organizer of a 5 Panel Series on German Protestantism, bringing together 19 scholars from Germany, Canada and the USA, at 41st German Studies Association Annual Conference, Atlanta, (October 2017)

2017 UCLA Center for the Study of Religion, Graduate Student Conference Co-Organizer, "Performing Devotion: Religious Rituals and Religious Practices"

2016 "Religious Diplomacy and the Boundaries of Belief: The Nineteenth-Century German State and Cross-Confessional Conflict," Conference Presentation, 40th German Studies Association Annual Conference, San Diego, (September 2016)

2016 UCLA Center for the Study of Religion, Graduate Student Conference Co-Organizer, Panel Moderator "Sacred Sites and Landscapes," (May 11-12)

2016 "Statecraft and the Boundaries of Belief: Transnational Religious Diplomacy in Nineteenth Century Germany" UCLA German Dept. Conference, Los Angeles, (April 2016)

TEACHING AND RESEARCH EXPERIENCE

2017-18 Instructor of Record:

- "Introduction to Historical Practice: Religious Awakening, Popular Revolution, and State Power in 19th-Century Germany," Fall 2017, Winter 2018, Spring 2018

2013-17 Teaching Assistant:

- "History of Modern Europe: Era of Total War, 1914 to 1945," Winter 2017
- "Introduction to Western Civilization: 1715 to the Present," Fall 2016
- "Introduction to Western Civilization: 1715 to the Present," Fall 2015
- "Introduction to Western Civilization: 843 to 1715," Winter 2016
- "Introduction to Western Civilization: 1715 to the Present," Fall 2014
- "World History: circa 600 - 1760," Winter 2015
- "Introduction to Western Civilization: 1715 to the Present," Fall 2013, Spring 2014

2012-13 Graduate Student Research Assistantship: with Prof. David Sabean

Introduction

> *Were there but a **spirit of power**, making itself felt among Protestants! not trifling and toying. In our time, as in Martin Luther's, the kernel must be laboriously extracted and contended for; strong and valiant minds are needed, which may God send!*[1]
>
> - Christian Carl Josias von Bunsen, 1817

This project was born out of an interest in the political and cultural roles played by religious piety in modern Germany. Having seen the extent to which religious faith still shapes and informs the cultural and political dynamics of nations still today, I wanted to look back into German history to a time when religious belief still had measurable power within the state, yet when society was unquestionably "modernizing" in a historical sense. I decided to focus on the post-Napoleonic, but pre-unification era of Germany, characterized by restoration, reaction, and revolution, because it was during this period that fit those characteristics: modern, but not necessarily recognizably so when it came to the influence of religion on politics, culture, and society.

In this dissertation, I examine a network of Prussian and English diplomats and their allies who directed expansive, far-reaching initiatives to revive Protestant piety in their own countries and in European colonial settings. During the early decades of the nineteenth century, anti-Catholic discourses led to the marginalization of Catholic populations within Prussia and England, while tensions between religious nonconformists and orthodox ministers and clergy remained high. The Prussian state, eager to flex its increasing muscle after Napoleon's defeat, began to support Protestant communities in Rome and elsewhere beyond

[1] Bunsen to his sister Christina, February 12th, 1817, in: Frances Bunsen, *Memoir of Baron Bunsen: Late Minister Plenipotentiary and Envoy Extraordinary of His Majesty Frederic William IV at the Court of St. James; Drawn Chiefly from Family Papers*, vol. 1 (London: Longmans, Green, 1869), p. 109.

its borders. As Prussia began pivoting towards England in the 1840s, it tried to utilize England's imperial apparatus to serve its own agendas.

In order to explore these issues, the dissertation traces the career and motivations of a unique figure named Christian Carl Josias von Bunsen (1791-1860). Bunsen was a distant second cousin of Robert Wilhelm Bunsen (1811-1899), the chemist and inventor of the eponymous piece of laboratory equipment, the "Bunsen burner."[2] He was born into a modest, pious family in Korbach, which was then in the tiny principality of Waldeck, about 60 kilometers west of Kassel, 70 kilometers north of Marburg, in the modern-day German state of Hessen. His father Heinrich (1743-1820) had been a soldier in a Dutch army regiment. After earning a degree in theology and philology, Bunsen found his way into the Prussian civil service as a secretary to the Prussian Ambassador to the Vatican in Rome, Barthold Georg Niebuhr. Bunsen was a charismatic and learned man, but by no means an aristocrat, and therefore a striking example of a man whose career was truly "open to talent," a newer phenomenon in the early nineteenth century. Bunsen married an Englishwoman in 1817 and was an unapologetic Anglophile, who sought always to foster stronger political and cultural ties between Prussia and England. He admired the English parliamentary monarchy and the Anglican church, and wanted Prussia to emulate what he saw as more perfect systems of church life and state governance.

I have chosen Bunsen as the central figure in this dissertation for several reasons. His visible and earnest piousness as a Protestant Christian allows one to see how religion and religious ideology continued to play a substantial role in Prussia's domestic and international

[2] Indeed, the diplomat Bunsen's relationship to the "burner" is the most common question I receive whenever I explain my dissertation topic. The two men apparently were aware of each other and both would become irritated by being confused for the other.

political arena. As Bunsen was a fervently Protestant Prussian living and working in Rome (between 1816-1838), Bern (1839-1840), and London (1841-1854), an examination of his career offers a window into the shifting landscape of religion in Germany in several crucial ways. We will see how internal theological debates within the Protestant churches of Prussia and England had serious consequences for many of the political choices made by those states regarding the right to marry across confessions, the hiring and firing of university faculty, the sanctioning or prescription of "correct" forms of worship in churches, and the establishment of colonial, imperialistic institutions quite far removed from the metropoles of Berlin, Rome, and London.

The dissertation aims to add a religious valence to the political trajectory of Europe in the middle decades of the nineteenth century, a period characterized by conservative reaction, Romanticism, and nascent nationalism. At the same time, across Europe (and in the United States), a grassroots movement of religious revival known as the *Erweckungsbewegung* was taking hold, as adherents began to emphasize ecstatic, dramatic adulthood conversion experiences and a personal, internal relationship with Christ and God characterized by emotions and feelings rather than dogmatic orthodoxy and clerical hierarchy.[3] As such, this is a dissertation with a strong transnational focus. Prussia, and Germany more broadly, are examined primarily through events that take place *beyond* Prussian borders. Dynamics of exchange, tension, and cooperation across linguistic, confessional, and national boundaries highlight a deeply interconnected view of Europe. As these connections come into view, the dissertation argues specifically that connections based on religious affinity transcended the

[3] The movement in Germany arose roughly contemporaneously to North American "Second Great Awakening" (which historians agree lasted mostly between 1790-1820).

ecclesiastical domain and had profound implications for statecraft, diplomacy, and colonial projects.

I will attempt to unpack these various concerns in a way that has not been sufficiently addressed by historians, especially not in Anglophone historiography. Many historians of the nineteenth century have tried to frame it as a period of secularization, of the inescapable and inevitable Weberian disenchantment that accompanied the rise of mechanized industrialization, political socialism, and party politics. In Germany, amidst all of these important changes, sincere and fervent religious beliefs persisted in both elite and popular society and had significant influence on the lives of many, if not most of the populace.

Church historian Olaf Blaschke has argued that 1817 marked the beginning of a "second confessional era."[4] In Blaschke's framework, the first confessional era was the 150 year period between the Reformation and the Peace of Westphalia in 1648, which was followed by a relatively calm era which lasted until the end of the eighteenth century. In Blaschke's second confessional era, conflicts arose again *within* the confessions, as struggles intensified in all three major German confessions between dogmatic, orthodox loyalists on the one hand, and reformers on the other. Within Catholic dioceses in Germany, the tension growing in this period was whether to integrate or to remain oriented towards their traditional roots of power in Rome. These debates were exported to the political and social realm, bringing significant consequences for the Prussian state which hoped to unify its people under state auspices, while consolidating its power and legitimacy. This confessional and theological turbulence shook institutions: university faculties, hospitals, embassies, and

[4] Olaf Blaschke, *Konfessionen im Konflikt: Deutschland zwischen 1800 und 1970: ein zweites konfessionelles Zeitalter* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002), pp. 13-70.

churches underwent rapid change and upheaval, and even social institutions like marriage were radically impacted.

I approached this dissertation intending to avoid writing a biographical account of Christian Karl Josias von Bunsen. To do so would have required this dissertation to grow two or three times longer than it has become and would have likely still missed out on some crucial issues. In addition to being a Prussian diplomat, Bunsen was also a Classicist, Egyptologist, orientalist, and linguist, and his contributions in those disciplines ought to be taken up by future historians in those respective fields. Nor is this dissertation an explicitly theological examination of his work in that field, although naturally I will discuss theology when it is relevant to the narrative, especially in the fourth chapter. In Germany, scholars that came before me have written about Bunsen, most notably Dr. Frank Foerster, whose monographs, essays, and edited volumes together comprise the most complete and robust biographical account of Bunsen's life and career.[5] By freeing myself from the responsibilities of authoring a comprehensive biography, I have instead been able to selectively focus on those aspects of his career which most interested me: moments of intra- and cross-confessional tension, religious conversion, missionary and colonial ambitions, and the formation of a robust and fascinating, transnational social network.

Ultimately, this dissertation seeks to contribute to the study of confessionalism, nationalism, and imperialism in the nineteenth century. By analyzing networks which were

[5] Dr. Martin Lückhoff's work on the Prussian involvement in Palestine was also groundbreaking, and Prof. Erich Geldbach's essays on Bunsen have also been useful. See: Martin Lückhoff, *Anglikaner und Protestanten im Heiligen Land: das gemeinsame Bistum Jerusalem (1841-1886)* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1998); Erich Geldbach, *Der Gelehrte Diplomat: zum Wirken Christian Carl Josias Bunsens* (Leiden: Brill Archive, 1980); Frank Foerster, *Christian Carl Josias Bunsen: Diplomat, Mäzen Und Vordenker in Wissenschaft, Kirche Und Politik* (Bad Arolsen: Waldeckischer Geschichtsverein, 2001).

central to the relations between the most powerful Prussian and English institutions, I have attempted to show how "awakened" Protestant beliefs persisted in elite circles well into the nineteenth century. These networks operated to coerce monarchs, ministers, and clergymen to make decisions which were in line with their own religious worldview. This dissertation will show how religious affiliation was perceived by both Prussian and English state officials as either a hindrance or a boon for their objectives of national unification and social cohesion.

Archival research for this dissertation was undertaken across several research trips to German and English archives between 2013 and 2018. Materials were gathered in Berlin at the *Geheimes Staatsarchiv Preußischer Kulturbesitz* (GStA-PK) and the *Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin*, and in England at the Lambeth Palace archives, and the British National Archives in Kew, west of London. Fortunately, a significant amount of the Memoir and correspondence of Bunsen and his allies has been published over the years, the most useful of which are the two edited volumes of his letters and journals, *A Memoir of Baron Bunsen: Late Minister Plenipotentiary and Envoy Extraordinary of his Majesty Frederick William IV. at the Court of St. James, Drawn Chiefly from Family Papers by his Widow, Frances Baroness Bunsen.*, published in 1868. The Memoir, autobiographies, and letter collections of Bunsen's associates also provided important context throughout the dissertation.

Most scholarship stands upon the shoulders of the generations of writers and thinkers that came before it, and this dissertation is no exception. Over the years, there have been several serious pieces of scholarship that have inspired or informed this work, especially in the field of Pietism studies. Ulrike Gleixner's *Pietismus und Bürgertum: eine historische Anthropologie der Frömmigkeit, Württemberg 17.-19. Jahrhundert* was influential for how

she framed Würrtemberigan piety using selections from correspondence and diaries, in order to also show the creation of a network of like-minded actors. Michael Kannenberg's *Verschleierte Uhrtafeln: Endzeiterwartungen im württembergischen Pietismus zwischen 1818 und 1848*, which parsed letters in search of religious idioms in order to show how specific apocalyptic sentiments bound together groups of believers in the early decades of the nineteenth century, provided a useful framework for how to deal methodologically with the archival correspondence. Benjamin Marschke's book, *Absolutely Pietist Patronage, Factionalism, and State-building in the Early Eighteenth-century Prussian Army Chaplaincy* was inspirational in how he was able to show that a specific religious group was able to maneuver within existing institutions of the state to increase their own status in the kingdom, as well as the spread of their beliefs.

The specter of confessional tension loomed large over the chapters of this dissertation, especially between Roman Catholicism and evangelical Protestantism. This is reflected in early Prussian fears of losing German-speaking Protestants via conversion to Catholicism both within and beyond the borders of modern-day Germany, in Rome, London, and Jerusalem. The issue of anti-Catholicism is revisited numerous times throughout the dissertation, in order to show that Prussian officials and theologians within their territories were constantly negotiating the balance between religious toleration and state supremacy, while internationally they were concerned with asserting a kind of Protestant strength in order to stand as a bulwark against their Catholic neighbors and rivals in Austria, France, and Italy. Bunsen, as a Protestant diplomat, especially embodies this duality and we often see contradictions between his desire to ameliorate Catholic grievances while also being deeply

suspicious, even hostile towards "papism" and "Jesuitism." At the same time, internal Protestant factions were vying for influence and control within the Prussian and Anglican churches, whereby orthodox conservatives resisted the reforms and liberality of so-called "Broad Church" theologians. In some ways, this work can be seen as fitting within a body of recent scholarship which suggests that the *Kulturkampf* (culture war) of the 1870s between the Protestant German Empire under Bismarck and the Roman Catholic Church must be expanded to incorporate the entire discourse of Protestant/Catholic rivalry in the early and middle decades of the nineteenth century.[6]

The first chapter introduces the origins of the German-speaking Protestant community in Rome as it was built up around the Prussian Embassy through patronage and fundraising from well beyond the Alps to the north. The chapter begins with an examination of the key officials: diplomats, chaplains, and ministers who contributed to that community, as a bold assertion of presence in Catholic Rome. The second section examines the negotiations of Bunsen with the Vatican as the Prussian state clashed with the Catholic church over the rights and status of Catholics in Germany in the post-Napoleonic era, including the contentious issue of inter-confessional marriage between Catholics and Protestants. At the same time, attention will be given to how Bunsen used his platform in Rome to begin creating a disparate and network of allies from across Europe to pursue a shared agenda of religious revival, in order to re-spiritualize and strengthen the Protestant church, which Bunsen and his allies felt

[6] I am thinking here primarily of the work of Michael B. Gross, Manuel Borruta, Ronald J. Ross and Todd H. Weir. See: Manuel Borutta. *Antikatholizismus : Deutschland und Italien im Zeitalter der europäischen Kulturkämpfe* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010); Michael B. Gross, *The war against Catholicism: liberalism and the anti-Catholic imagination in nineteenth-century Germany* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2004); and Ronald J. Ross, *The failure of Bismarck's Kulturkampf: Catholicism and state power in imperial Germany, 1871-1887* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1998).

had fallen into decay because of the apathy of congregations, the complexities of dry orthodox dogmatic theology, the atheistic, revolutionary impulses of Jacobinism, and the encroachment of Roman Catholicism.

While the first chapter focuses on the early career of Bunsen in Rome, the second chapter examines the agenda pursued by his network following his appointment as Prussian ambassador to England from 1841-1854. Firstly, the second chapter shows how Bunsen's network founded a hospital as a missionary institution, while also working within existing missionary institutions such as the Evangelical Alliance, as well as secular institutions such as Royal Literary Fund, in order to elevate sufficiently pious individuals. These institutions worked to revive Christian sympathies on the Continent while working to convert colonial subjects in Jerusalem. A third section focuses on the fault-lines that emerged in English universities and publishing houses between this network and a rival faction of conservatives as they fought over the role of the church in society and the degree to which non-conformists could be allowed to participate fully in bourgeois society.

The third chapter of the dissertation examines the specific ways that Bunsen was able to create, expand, and maintain his network through assiduous labor of letter-writing and face-to-face visitation. Beginning in Rome, Bunsen drew together not only diplomats, but also artists, scientists, missionaries, theologians, students, archaeologists, churchmen, politicians from radically different social milieus in Germany, England, and across Europe. This chapter explores the viability of letters and correspondence as a historical source by examining the correspondence of those in the network. This kind of network analysis shows who does the work to keep the network in place, and how their relationships are mediated

through religious idioms, friendship, and shared philosophies or intellectual interests. This chapter also traces the material patronage as it flowed from wealthy donors, monarchs, nobles, and charities, into initiatives which promoted latitudinarian, reform-minded, or awakened Protestantism. Lastly, the chapter takes a deeper look at the "counter-networks" which developed in opposition to Bunsen and his allies: composed of conservative orthodox churchmen, as well as rationalist theologians who wanted to avoid religious "enthusiasm," and those in both countries who promoted a more chauvinist policy of Protestant supremacy, who worked to impede the relaxation of restrictions against religious dissenters or separatists.

The fourth chapter explores how Prussia's domestic religious mobilization was also a reflection of its ambition to compete on the global stage with its Protestant neighbors across the North Sea, and against Catholic powers to its south. The creation of a standardized, centralized liturgy in 1818 was meant to reflect the strength and unity of a state whose subjects were sufficiently pious and loyal to both throne and altar. Bunsen himself wrote a version of a unified liturgy which would be used for his growing chapel in Rome, but also in several missionary contexts, including a German community in London, the Protestant Bishopric in Jerusalem, and communities in Australia, New Zealand, and the Caribbean. The key details of the liturgy will be explained here to highlight the theological debates between rationalism and "awakened" neo-pietism which bound Bunsen's network of allies together.

The fifth and final chapter focuses on a peculiar project: the founding of a Protestant Bishopric and Church in Jerusalem, funded and jointly administered by the German Lutheran Church and the English Anglican Church. As Prussia attempted to create stronger ties with England, this synthesis of both countries' missionary and colonial ambitions would give

Anglo-Prussian Protestantism a foothold in the Holy Land. The Bishopric project lasted under joint control from 1841 until 1886. This chapter will show that although interest in opening a Bishopric in Palestine pre-dated Bunsen's arrival in England, it was he who ultimately convinced state and church officials in both Prussia and England to bring the political and financial capital of the Prussian state to bear on this endeavor, to the delight of missionaries, orientalists, and theologians from both countries. Key figures, including the bishops at Jerusalem, will be examined to show the extent of Prussia's attempt to piggy-back onto the British Empire's footprint to assert its presence, theologically and politically, on the world stage.

As a historian, I feel a responsibility to do well by the people about whom I have been thinking, reading, and writing for the last seven years. Bunsen, his wife Fanny, and their friends, interlocutors, and enemies in Italy, Germany, and England have occupied a space in my mind for so long that I feel that I have come to know them intimately. This is obviously an illusion. Still, I have tried wherever possible to provide an accurate portrayal of their motivations and deliberations, and to let their words speak for themselves at times. The mediating sentiment, through all of the initiatives undertaken by Bunsen and his allies, was their shared belief that a "spirit of power" ought to be injected into the Protestants of Europe by any means necessary, in order to eventually usher in the Kingdom of God on earth. This led to enormous amounts of organizing, financial and political patronage, thousands of written letters and negotiations, and earned the full attention of two of Europe's most powerful nations in the pursuit of their shared goal. This is a study, and a story, about how the belief in and desire for the "spirit of power," was *itself* a kind of power, able to bring

influential people together, and able to enact cultural, social, and political changes within and beyond the boundaries of Europe.

Chapter 1: The Prussian Legation and Protestant *Gemeinde* in Rome

A Protestant Reformation Tercentenary Celebration in Rome:

In late October 1817, Prussian officials decided to gather all the German Protestants living in Rome for a ceremony to collectively observe the 300th anniversary of the Reformation. The task of hosting and organizing the event fell to the embassy's new young deputy, Christian Carl Josias Bunsen, who had been suggesting the ceremony to his superiors. The service was held adjacent to the embassy in Bunsen's home on October 31st, advertisements for which were posted in the few German coffeeshops in Rome. Bunsen enthusiastically crafted the service for the growing *Gemeinde* (congregation), just weeks after his formal appointment into the diplomatic service. The celebration consisted first of a service adapted and translated from the English daily service, followed by a lecture from Bunsen.

The celebration's liturgy consisted of the usual aspects of a service, prayers, readings from both the Old and New Testaments, Psalms, the recitation of a Litany, and so on. Rather shocking was Bunsen's bold inclusion of a Collect asking for "deliverance from Popery," recited by everyone in attendance.[7] The substance of Bunsen's lecture near the end of the ceremony was perhaps most interesting, because it captured his attitudes on the state of Protestantism in Germany and the "consequences of Reformation." Although he began by speaking of the many blessings brought to Earth by the Reformation, such as "domestic piety, knowledge of the word of God, free Grace through faith and the spreading of the Gospel across the whole earth," Bunsen quickly segued to talk about two sorrows that possessed his

[7] A Collect is a short prayer which asks for one thing, usually protection, cleansing or guidance, which involves "collecting" the petitions or wishes of an entire congregation and offering them up as a single prayer. For a good description of these prayers, see the forward in: C. Frederick Barbee, *The Collects of Thomas Cranmer* (Cambridge: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2006), pp. ix-xii.

mind during the occasion of celebration. First, he expressed deep regret over the separation of Protestants and Catholics from one another, saying that Luther's original intention had been to heal the church and not to cause a split. But now that the two confessions had entirely parted, Bunsen proclaimed that "Salvation can only proceed and develop on that side which 'worships God in spirit and Truth.'"[8] His position was clear, defiantly spoken just two miles away from the Vatican: the Protestant confession is the only legitimate form of Christianity.

Secondly, Bunsen spoke to what he perceived as the "melancholy condition" of Protestantism among Germans, especially in the German Churches. He chastised them for being lacking in faith, lacking in knowledge of the Bible as the book of salvation, and lacking in "Christian works" such as love, faith and hope. Bunsen's sermon was greeted by the embrace of the Prussian Ambassador and the solemn appreciation of about sixty German Protestants in attendance, as well as the startling of a few German Catholics in attendance, not to mention the anger of the Italians which, Bunsen wrote afterwards, "matters not."

This tercentenary ceremony marked Bunsen's arrival on the religious and political landscape, and the themes he mentioned in his speech are ones that I will discuss for the rest of this chapter, firstly, how a group of diplomats and chaplains tried to revive and revitalize the Protestant faith, and how he marshalled the resources of the Prussian state to advance those interests from Rome. At the same time, Bunsen worked as an agent of the Prussian state to advance secular, Prussian law, in an era when Catholic church influence was clashing with secular state governance in Prussia.

[8] An account of the service can be read in: Frances Bunsen, *Memoir of Baron Bunsen: Late Minister Plenipotentiary and Envoy Extraordinary of His Majesty Frederick William IV at the Court of St. James; Drawn Chiefly from Family Papers by His Widow*, vol. 1 (London: Longmans, Green, 1868), pp. 127-128.

This chapter explores several aspects of the Legation's early history. At one level, this is a story of a political struggle between the Holy See and the Prussian state, so I examine major diplomatic endeavors undertaken by Niebuhr and Bunsen on behalf of Prussia. In so doing, I intend to illustrate the political agendas of both powers as they struggled to reposition themselves on the European stage in this age of renewed confessional struggle. This chapter also examines how Bunsen was able to act as a patron himself, elevating like-minded theologians to work on the frontier of German Protestantism, who all went on to lucrative careers afterwards.

* * *

The Prussian embassy was located on the Capitoline Hill in western Rome, west of the Coliseum and just east of a bend in the river Tiber. Wilhelm von Humboldt served as the Prussian ambassador to the *Heiligen Stuhl* from 1802 until roughly 1806, when relations between Prussia and the Vatican deteriorated during the Napoleonic wars. After a decade-long hiatus in diplomatic relations, The Prussian Legation in Rome re-opened in 1816, this time headed by a historian, philologist, and statesman named Barthold Georg Niebuhr. Under Niebuhr's management from 1816-1824, the embassy was the site not only of Prussian state business, but also the center of the nascent, but growing *Gemeinde* of German Protestants in Rome.[9] The area became a beachhead for increasing Protestant activity almost immediately, including the progressive development of regular church services, the foundation of a Protestant Hospital near the embassy, regular burials at a Protestant cemetery, and the usual rituals of weddings, baptisms, funerals, and benedictions for not only its own members, and

[9] I am using *Gemeinde* in this chapter to mean both "community" and "congregation," as both were being built up by Niebuhr and Bunsen beginning in 1819.

not only Germans, but also any visiting Protestants from England, Scotland, the Low Countries or the United States. The embassy, its chapel, and its annexes acted as a Prussian political and confessional enclave within foreign territory, which allowed for a kind of religious practice that differed from its host country. Niebuhr, representing an ascendant Prussia, was well-respected by Pope Pius VII, and therefore a measure of tolerance was afforded to the Protestant community. After Niebuhr's resignation in 1824, Bunsen was promoted as the Minister Plenipotentiary, representing the Prussian state and its interests in Rome.

The Prussian Legation in Rome, then, serves as a unique and fascinating example of increasing confessional tension emerging within, and even emanating beyond Prussia. This applies both in terms of Protestant tensions with Catholicism in the era, as well as within the Protestant faith itself. Through a close examination of correspondence and Memoir, this chapter describes the activities of the figures who worked in the Legation: Not only of Niebuhr and Bunsen, the leaders of the Legation, but also of the four successive embassy chaplains between 1819-1843, in order to give a sense of the theological and ecclesiological threads which bound these men together and built up the *Gemeinde*. Several important members of the community will also be highlighted to show the breadth and scope of the society which grew around the Legation, especially to show how this Prussian enclave enabled young Bunsen to lay the foundations of and create connections within a network of political and religious allies whose work will be examined throughout the subsequent chapters of this dissertation. This chapter serves as an origin point for the kinds of questions I hope to answer throughout the larger project. Specifically, how did Niebuhr and Bunsen operate

strategically to counter Roman Catholicism's influence over Germans - not just in Germany, but in Rome itself? What do those struggles tell us about the early tensions in the relationship between Rome and the idea of "Germany?" At an individual level, how did Bunsen, a peculiar young diplomat of a modest background, use his office to build a network of connections and alliances which would lead to his eventual influence over several European monarchs, positioning him to alter the religious lives of countless people in Germany, England and the Near East?

Bunsen's Haus: Friendship, Piety, Sociability:

> I have seen and known the most distinguished men in my own country, and, wherever I was, I frequented the circles of ambassadors, princes and ministers: I was reckoned *amiable* by some of their ladies, clever by the learned, and *bon enfant* by the men. This cost me some time, but has been a great lesson for me. Almost always in these societies I was liked and valued for that which I ridiculed in myself, and I could not go on in this way without scorning myself and my fellow-creatures too, and without losing that respect for human life and the human species which is indispensable to me; even (I fear when I consider my nature's frailty) without losing my natural horror of the custom, or rather disease, of talking without thinking and without interest.[10]

Bunsen, unlike his mentor Niebuhr, was known for throwing raucous parties, but also hosting meetings of rigorous intellectual exchange. A great many of the friends, acquaintances and colleagues around Bunsen had come together in Rome during the 1820s and 1830s. Throughout this period, Bunsen gathered around him increasing numbers of long-term visitors from all across Europe. The society he drew together in his home adjoining the Prussian Legation, visitors and residents would discuss politics, religion, art, antiquity and more. Bunsen was a gifted entertainer, who arranged musical concerts, Bible studies, and

[10] Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, pp. 133-134. In French, "*bon enfant*" means a good-natured person.

discussions of art in the Prussian Legation and its chapel in order to cultivate friendships and connections. Of primary importance was his friendship with the royal family beginning in 1822 after the Prussian King came to Rome on a tour of Italy, followed by another trip in 1827 - this time with his two young sons. Bunsen became fast friends with the elder prince, the future King Friedrich Wilhelm IV, who was only 4 years younger than Bunsen. Their friendship would last for the rest of both of their lives and afforded Bunsen significant influence in the royal court.

Bunsen's friendship with the Prince earned him respect, and many envious enemies as well. Like Bunsen, the King and his son saw the establishment of a Christian state as crucial to the security of their power.[11] Bunsen impressed the prince with his knowledge of the ancient Church, with his apparently enlightened Christianity, with his love of art and literature and knowledge of the classical world. The Prince came to rely on Bunsen's friendship, even writing to him, "Reading your letters has been a *real* tonic to me."[12]

This relationship, like so many other relationships that Bunsen formed in Rome, was made possible owing to the unique backdrop of the Prussian Legation. As a charismatic and earnest figure, Bunsen was able to use the Legation and his adjoining homes to create a specific social milieu - independent from the rest of German, Prussian society to the north of the Alps. Visiting scholars, theologians, diplomats, artists, and friends could rub shoulders with those outside of their social class or nationality, yet were brought together not just by

[11] The Romantic (or, in the case of Bunsen, and the Prussian monarchs, *Frühromantik*) project of attaching Christianity to the making of a modern German nation is concisely argued by George S. Williamson in: George S. Williamson, *The Longing for Myth in Germany: Religion and Aesthetic Culture from Romanticism to Nietzsche* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2004), p. 4.

[12] David E. Barclay, *Frederick William IV and the Prussian Monarchy, 1840-1861* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), pp. 78.

scholarly interest or religious confession, but also by food, drink, music, and conversation. Bunsen's home and the Legation became a sort of *salon*, and the face-to-face connections through communal studies of scripture or poetry, or talks on art or politics, led to opportunities for social connection and cohesion that were not possible under normal "private" interactions in a regular household, nor in a public square.[13] The Legation provided a space which had the imprimatur of Prussian royal authority, yet the energies unleashed there had more to do with the religious and political leanings of one man, rather than of the other Prussian institutions in the north.

Bunsen arranged a chapel for worship in the embassy. A marble table was arranged with a white cloth and crucifix, with chairs set out in front of a makeshift pulpit. An organist played a used, small organ for the hymns, which were led by three artists of the Nazarene Movement - Julius Schnorr, Theodor Rehbenitz and Friedrich Olivier. These artists lived above Bunsen in the Palazzio Cassarelli, and received a stipend from the Prussian Legation for their work in the Gemeinde. The Nazarene artists, despite many of them having converted to Catholicism, were described as the "main pillars" (*Hauptsäulen*) of the Gemeinde along with the Hanoverian ambassador, Franz von Reden, and Dutch ambassador Johann Gotthard Reinhold, who also became close members of the Gemeinde. This curious mix of Protestant ambassadors and Catholic artists, combined with visiting artisans, students, and scholars, rounded out the contours of the *Gemeinde,* but it was the conversion of Germans away from Protestantism which brought the attention and concern of Prussian officials.

[13] Inken Schmidt-Voges, "Einführung: Interaktion und soziale Umwelt" in *Das Haus in Der Geschichte Europas: Ein Handbuch,* eds. Joachim Eibach and Inken Schmidt-Voges *(*Oldenbourg: De Gruyter Verlag, 2015), pp. 411-416.

State Patronage and Fears of Conversion:

The *Gemeinde* in Rome was supported politically and financially through the patronage of the Prussian monarch Friedrich Wilhelm III, who donated funds from both his personal fortunes and the state treasury. Although the King funded similar Protestant communities in Eastern Europe and South America, he took a particular interest in Rome. Funds from the Prussian state allowed the purchase of an organ, Bibles, hymn books, and the salaries of the embassy chaplain (*Gesandschaftprediger)*, a permanent chaplain position. The addition of the Legation chaplain position allowed for public observances of Prussian worship, bold assertions of non-Catholic identity in the Eternal City.

The roles of the embassy chaplain were many. In addition to holding regular church services, the chaplain was responsible for the spiritual care of the members of the Protestant *Gemeinde*: performing baptisms, marriages, funerals, and benedictions. This chaplaincy represented a chance for the Prussian Evangelical Church to select candidates who possessed sufficient zeal, piety, and theological qualifications to represent the Lutheran church abroad. This was particularly salient in the case of Rome for two reasons. First, the Prussian king and the leaders of the church saw the embassy chapel and its Protestant Gemeinde as representing the heritage of the German Reformation at the geographic capital of the Catholic world, which had opposed it for the prior three centuries. Secondly, beginning in 1817, the Prussian embassy held the only Lutheran church services in Rome at this time and the only Protestant service whatsoever until an Anglican service began in 1825.[14]

[14] A short description of the Anglican chapel, led by Dr. Rev. Burgess, can be found in Robert Baird, *Sketches of Protestantism in Italy, Past and Present: Including a Notice of the Origin, History, and Present State of the Waldenses* (Boston: Benjamin Perkins & Co., 1847) pp. 265-267.

But a deeper reason for the monarch's interest and support for this community was the fear of conversion, a threat to the Protestant faith of an increasing number of Germans who took up residence in Rome. As a direct result of Bunsen's provocative 1817 Reformation Celebration service, a French abbé residing in Rome named Martin de Noirlieu published a pamphlet titled *Voix de l'église Catholique aux Protestants de bonne Foi,* which sought to entice and convert Protestants who felt spiritually unsatisfied with their own confession.[15] Bunsen described it in a letter as a "declamatory effort to drive into the fold the Protestant sheep, here straying far from home."[16] Bunsen blamed these conversions on the "spectacle of insignificance and decay in existing Protestantism" of his day, for which contemporary theologians were at fault. These theologians, thought Bunsen, were overly concerned with "hyper-orthodox subtleties" which remained inaccessible and irrelevant to the laity at large.[17] Still, despite these general concerns regarding the state of the faith, Bunsen's report to Niebuhr and to the Prussian King regarding the conversion of Germans residing in Rome to Catholicism led to the beginning of royal support for the Protestant *Gemeinde* at Rome.

Particularly useful is historian Benjamin Marschke's work *Absolutely Pietist,* an in-depth study of patronage at work in the appointment of chaplains in the eighteenth-century Prussian military. Marschke illustrates how a network of Pietists, trained and educated at the

[15] A brief account of a conversion of one of the German artists living in Rome can be found in: Norbert Suhr, *Philipp Veit (1793–1877): Leben und Werk eines Nazareners. Monographie und Werkverzeichnis.* (Oldenbourg: Walter de Gruyter, 1991), p. 52.

[16] Bunsen to Lücke, 1818 in: Bunsen, *Memoir,* vol. 1, p. 144.

[17] Bunsen's criticism of theology here is that theologians and seminaries focused too much on complicated nuances of academic theological debate, rather than simple articles of faith which emphasized feelings of liberty, joy and freedom associated with Protestant faith as he saw it. This might be understood as both a Pietist and "awakened" critique of orthodox Protestant theology. See Bunsen, *Memoir,* vol. 1, p. 145.

University of Halle, was dominated by August Hermann Francke, the *de facto* spiritual leader of eighteenth-century Pietism. Francke's network was created through theological training and intense discipline. When pupils demonstrated the correct level of piety and loyalty, Francke would then recommend them for valuable chaplaincy posts in the military. The Prussian state, in that instance, was keen on having these well-trained men become chaplains, because they were able encourage obedience to royal and military authority through fear of divine authority. For its part, the Halle Pietist faction was interested in filling those positions in order to secure its influence in the military and across Prussia as chaplains were often promoted to higher positions within the civilian Lutheran church. Francke's good relationship with the Prussian King enabled both men to get something they wanted and allowed Francke's group to circumvent the (not insignificant) power of the orthodox Lutheran church.

Obviously, Bunsen was neither the head of a spiritual movement nor a state monarch; however, he did hold significant power as the representative of Prussia in Rome, and he exercised it by appointing chaplains who were in line with his own views of Christian revivalism. Marschke's work demonstrated a kind of "absolutism through patronage" which, in Marschke's words, acted as a "bureaucratic sheen accidentally draped over pre-existing, unofficial channels of power and communication."[18] Like Francke, Bunsen enjoyed a significant amount of royal favor from two generations of Prussian monarchs, which secured his position in the Prussian diplomatic corps, along with handsome pensions, property, and exposure to new contacts within the court.

[18] Benjamin Marschke, *Absolutely Pietist: Patronage, Factionalism, and State-Building in the Early Eighteenth-Century Prussian Army Chaplaincy* (Halle: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2005), p. 184.

The Chaplaincy at the Prussian Legation (1819 - 1843)

An examination of the correspondences, careers, and writings of the chaplains who came to serve in the office of embassy chaplain enables several crucial insights. First, one can get a sense of the character and texture of the theology of the Protestant community in Rome by looking at what sorts of sermons were given by these preachers. At this time in German church history, bitter struggles were occurring between churchmen, theologians, and laity who wanted more rational, sober forms of worship on one hand, and those of a more Pietistic tenor who emphasized individual feelings of sin, guilt, remorse, redemption, and conversion on the other. The chaplains working in Rome tended towards the latter. Secondly, some attention to the later careers of alumni of the Roman chaplaincy will be discussed to show the ways in which these men leveraged their positions and connections to further some shared goals.

Heinrich Eduard Schmieder (1819-1823)

The first Legation chaplain, Heinrich Eduard Schmieder, was brought to Rome in the summer of 1819. As one of the first graduates from the newly-founded Prussian theological seminary in Wittenberg, Schmieder was unanimously recommended by his university to King Friedrich Wilhelm III for the chaplaincy post in Rome. Schmieder held his first service on June 27th, 1819 at the Prussian legation chapel, which Niebuhr wrote "will be a notable day henceforward in church history; for what Protestant worship there had been in Rome previously, was destitute of all spiritual power."[19]

[19] Barthold Georg Niebuhr, Christian Karl Josias von Bunsen, Johannes Brandis, Johann Wilhelm Loebell, and Mme Dora Behrens Hensler, *The Life and Letters of Barthold Georg Niebuhr* (New York: Harper & Brothers: 1852), p. 379.

Schmieder's sermons made an immediate impression on the Protestant Gemeinde in Rome. Prior to Schmieder's arrival, Bunsen lamented in a private letter that their congregation of about seventy people had been living and working in Rome for up to ten years "without any religious edification or exercise, almost all without Bibles, which (even if they brought such with them) would have been taken away at the frontier."[20] There was an acute sense of anxiety on behalf of Legation officials about the spiritual well-being and confessional integrity of Germans residing outside of Germany. Schmieder's arrival acted to soothe those fears. Bunsen describes his arrival and initial reception:

> Schmieder is in truth a distinguished man, of rare merit: although bred up among unbelievers, he has attained to a genuine Gospel faith in Christ … his hearers are astonished at the preaching in Rome, of a pure Christianity, such as they had seldom or never known at home. Others, however, consider him to be not sufficiently enlightened, and some take him to be an enthusiast.[21]

Bunsen's approving nod to a "pure Christianity" is referring to forms of the awakening movement (*Erweckungsbewegung*) influenced by Pietism and roughly analogous to English Methodism, in which personal conversions and the spiritualization of the believer's whole life is invoked. Schmieder's arrival brought these elements to Bunsen and the rest of the *Gemeinde.* A further description of Schmieder's preaching by Bunsen explains these distinctions: "For instead of giving moral contemplations and sentimental rhapsodies of the beauty of virtue and the goodness of the human heart, his sermons treat of repentance and conversion, of sin and guilt, of the incapacity of the mere human will to attain to regeneration, and the consequent necessity of faith in Christ's all-sufficiency."[22] These

[20] Bunsen, *Memoir,* vol. 1, p. 165.

[21] Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 166.

[22] Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 166.

sermons by Schmieder show that a Pietistic emphasis on inward Christianity began shaping Bunsen himself:

> ...First I thank God, [for] the instructive intercourse by Him granted to me with Schmieder. For since I attained a clear consciousness, **by inward experience,** that there is no way of satisfying the needs of the soul, or tranquilizing the heart's longings but by the inner life in Christ - aspiration after eternal blessedness, and consequent direction of the mind and all its powers towards God - I am aware of an increase of power for the work of my calling… **Nothing external, no learning, no philosophy can help towards the soul's blessedness: it is the inward man … that must with the grace of God accomplish the work.**[23] [emphasis added]

The "aspiration after eternal blessedness" through introspection and devotion began to characterize the lives of those in Roman Protestant *Gemeinde*, many of whom had never experienced this sort of theological current. Indeed, looking at Bunsen's musings on Schmieder, one can almost hear Schmieder's voice, who once wrote: "Ich suchte den lebendigen Gott, und die Philosophie und Theologie meiner Professoren hatte mir ihn nicht gegeben, vielmehr erst recht fern gerückt."[24] The task for Schmieder was to develop in his congregation a sense of a living relationship with God which was inaccessible via standard philosophy or theology.

Aside from his Sunday sermons, Schmieder also did daily visits (*Hausbesuch)*, to visit the sick members of his congregation.[25] Among his duties as chaplain Schmieder recounted performing only a handful of baptisms, weddings, and benedictions during his four years in

---

[23] Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 167. N.B. Throughout the dissertation, I occasionally emphasize the most salient and relevant phrases or sentences within larger passages or quotations by using bolded text.

[24] See "Schmieder" in: Historische Commission bei der Königliche Akademie, *Allgemeine deutsche Biographie* (Duncker und Humblot, 1875). p. 117. "I searched for the living God, and the philosophy and theology of my Professors did not give him to me, rather at first [they] veered me far away [from him]."

[25] Cholera pandemics began spreading through Rome across the 1820s and 1830s, which affected many within the *Gemeinde*. See A.J. Tatem, D.J. Rogers, & S.I. Hay, "Global Transport Networks and Infectious Disease Spread," *Advances in Parasitology*, no. 62 (2006): 293-343.

office, but did perform many funerals -- torchlit processions through the streets of Rome which would attract the curiosity and random participation of the Italian bystanders.[26] Bunsen, Schmieder, and subsequent chaplains seemed to take great pride in these funerals, insofar as they showed the Catholic populace of Rome the dignity (*Würde*) of the Protestant faith.[27]

But as their community grew, particular energy was directed towards the protection of the Protestant beliefs of their members. During those first years of the *Gemeinde* in Rome, instances of typhus, fever, or injury occasionally sent members of the congregation to local Italian hospitals. Of course, in these settings they would be set upon by Catholic nurses and priests to pray. Niebuhr once complained to a friend that "if they [German patients] refused to change their religion, have [been left] for days together without attention or food."[28] Tensions between the Prussians and the Catholic hospitals escalated in 1819 over several instances, when Schmieder would be expelled from the room when he tried to pray with those under his spiritual care. In one case, a young German artist suffering from melancholy attempted suicide and shot himself through the jaw. As he lay dying and unable to speak, Schmieder and other members of the *Gemeinde* attempted to pray with him. The Italian priest in the hospital forbade the Protestant prayers and asked Schmieder and the other Germans to leave. Shortly afterward, the *Gemeinde* received a notification from the hospital that the young man had died and, much to the anger of Schmieder, Bunsen, and the other Germans, that he swore a

---

[26] Heinrich Eduard Schmieder, and Paul Schmieder, *Erinnerungen Aus Meinem Leben: 1794-1823*. (Wittenberg: Wunschmann, 1892).

[27] Friedrich von Tippelskirch, *Friedrich von Tippelskirch: Ein Lebensabriß von Freunden Des Verstorbenen* (Wiesbaden: Riedner, 1867), p. 13.

[28] Niebuhr, *Life and Letters,* p. 382.

deathbed conversion at the hands of the Catholics. Upon learning of these events during a visit to Rome, Baron vom Stein arranged to fund a hospital for the *Gemeinde* with an initial donation of 300 crowns.[29] Substantial funds were raised for the construction of this hospital, which a contemporary account estimated to cost the equivalent of 25,000 dollars, no small sum for the period.[30] The King of Prussia donated 8,000 crowns to the project, with other sums coming from patrons and donors across Germany and England who were also eager to see Prussia erect a hospital for the use of all Protestants who wanted their religious principles to be protected.

The final form of the church service was settled during the visit of King Friedrich Wilhelm III in November of 1822. Nov. 24, 1822, was the first Sunday with the new liturgical agenda. In attendance were General Witzleben and the King's two children. Schmieder gave a sermon about the miraculous faith-healing of the sick woman from the book of Matthew. Just over 5 months later, in May 1823, Niebuhr left Rome, and the protection of the Gemeinde fell to Bunsen, along with the ambassadorial duties of the Prussian state. Only months later, in August of the same year, Pope Pius VII died and the papacy of the more conservative Pope Leo XII began. Under the new regime, some in the *Gemeinde* worried that their practices would not be as tolerated, but in the closing pages of

[29] Schmieder, *Erinnerungen*, pp. 226-228. Baron vom Stein (Heinrich Friedrich Karl vom und zum Stein, 1757 - 1831) was a Prussian statesman whose reforms included the abolition of serfdom, the strengthening of the cabinet and municipal reform. He retired in 1815, and went to Rome frequently, in part to confer with his friend and fellow reform-minded statesman, the ambassador Niebuhr.

[30] Baird, *Sketches of Protestantism in Italy,* p. 267.

his Memoir, the chaplain Schmieder recounted that Bunsen managed to secure protection for the cemetery for the "*Akatholiken*" (Non-Catholics) of the *Gemeinde*.[31]

After Bunsen became the Minister Plenipotentiary of the Legation in Rome, the affairs of this miniature Prussian Protestant territory fell fully under his control. Although the day-to-day affairs of diplomacy occupied some of his attention, Bunsen in general remained mostly invested in religious issues and church politics. After his entrance into Prussian state service, Bunsen often wrote of using his position to build up the Protestant Church in Prussia. He wrote that men in Germany are "unfixed, lost in self-interest and self-contemplation," and found it lamentable that his countrymen were without religious purpose.[32] Bunsen felt that his mission was to bring about a "reformation" in Germany and saw that it was in his power to encourage a renewal of piety by composing a new spiritual guide for the nation (*geistliches Volksbuch*) via a liturgy modeled after the Anglican Book of Common Prayer. Bunsen saw this liturgical project as vital to spiritual renewal, which in turn was necessary for a unified church and stronger nation. I will explore the details of Bunsen's liturgical projects in Chapter 4, but for the purposes of this chapter it is vital to understand that from the beginning of his residence and service in Rome in 1817, Bunsen enlisted the help of each Legation chaplain to assist him with his liturgical project.

[31] "Die strengkirchliche Partei kam ans Ruder; aber gerade damals erlangte Bunsen, was unter der früheren Regierung vergebens angestrebt worden, dass der Gottesacker der Akatholiken eine schützende Umzäunung erhielt." see: Schmieder, *Erinnerungen*, pp. 234.

[32] Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 183.

Richard Rothe (1823-1828)

The embassy's second chaplain, Richard Rothe (1799-1867), arrived in the autumn of 1823. Rothe had studied theology in Heidelberg and Berlin under Schleiermacher and Neander, and was the head of a clerical seminar in Wittenberg from 1820-1822. During his time in Berlin and Wittenberg, Rothe came under the influence of other "awakened" Pietists associated with the *Erweckungsbewegung*, like Hans Ernst von Kottwitz and (future embassy chaplain) August Tholuck. His arrival on the scene in Rome led to increased bible study among the Bunsen family and friends, more suggestive and fiery sermons relating to the end of the world, and deeper research into the original liturgies of the Christian church.

Bunsen wrote to his sister, "How fortunate the acquisition of Rothe!... Should the world revive, it must be with and through the Gospel."[33] Bunsen praised Rothe's sermons has having "the depth of suggestive meaning."[34] Rothe's theology was somewhat contrarian. He eventually identified as theosophist and supernaturalist. Rothe later admired the esoteric and unorthodox theology of mystical figures like Friedrich Christoph Oetinger (1702-1782), Philipp Matthäus Hahn (1739-1790), and Johann Albrecht Bengel (1687-1752). These figures are all widely considered to be among the most influential and original members of radical Pietism, and we can be certain that it was through Rothe that Bunsen was most heavily exposed to millenarian and semi-apocalyptic ideas.

Rothe believed that good and evil spirits were real in this world, and that Christ would come back to Earth in a visible, literal way. The theologian Karl Barth later described Rothe's theology on these eschatological issues at length:

---

[33] Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 231.

[34] Bunsen's diary entry, December 2nd, 1827, in: Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 294.

> To complete the rebirth of the spiritual organism that is developing here some further work is needed in the Beyond, in a kingdom of the dead in which the individual either purifies himself and becomes a light-being or perseveres in his rejection of God and becomes demonic. The return of Christ brings the exclusion and annihilation of the demons, and then there dawns his Kingdom on Earth, the thousand year kingdom, after which there will once again be a transformation and spiritualization, this time even of those who are perfected. All matter will now become destroyed because the earth itself will now become heaven, as a new creation proceeds from the burnt-out ashes of the old world. Rothe himself says of this end-point… that the continuity of creation remains undisrupted.[35]

In Rothe's view, the Kingdom of God was necessarily linked to human spiritualization on Earth and in society, and it is likely through these beliefs that the nature of Bunsen's liturgical production and the tenor of his *Gemeinde* in Rome, gained their "awakened" flavor. Rothe will be seen again in later chapters, but the key thing to know during these early years in Rome was that his introduction radically changed the theological make-up of the community, its sermons, and left a permanent imprint and inclination on Bunsen to identify more closely with other millenarian thinkers.

Friedrich August Gotttreu Tholuck (1828 - 1829)

After Richard Rothe's departure, Bunsen invited Friedrich Tholuck to Rome for one year in 1828. Before taking up office in Rome, Tholuck had studied theology in Berlin and earned an academic appointment as a professor there of Old Testament studies in 1822. A year later, Tholuck published a book about his awakening experience, *Die Lehre von der Sünde und dem Versöhner*, which described his introduction to Pietist circles in Berlin and his lamentations about how Christian identity was becoming an empty term to be used by

[35] Karl Barth, *Protestant Theology of the Nineteenth Century* (Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1959), p. 605.

political leaders, rather than truly spiritual in nature. Tholuck's book argued that the rationalism and reason (*Vernunft*) that was characteristic of most theologians of his day led to distrust in religious feelings of rapture and revelation.[36] He traveled to England in 1825 to give lectures on the Scriptures. Tholuck's "awakened," revivalist outlook was influenced heavily by Methodist classes and meetings in England, after which he sought to export Methodism to Germany.[37]

Bunsen met Tholuck in Berlin in 1827, and was so impressed that he invited Tholuck to replace his chaplain Rothe once Rothe took up academic office. After meeting Tholuck in Rome, the departing chaplain Rothe wrote, "That Tholuck will become my interim replacement here makes me happy for the sake of the Gemeinde" and celebrated Tholuck's passion and piety, hoping that it would allow the Protestants in Rome to realize the merits of awakened Christianity.[38] Tholuck's sermons during his year in Rome, as with those later in his life, emphasized a personal relationship with Christ. After his time in Rome, as Tholuck returned to Halle, where he would reportedly go from room to room in dormitories asking students, "Brother, how it is with your heart?" ("*Bruder, wie steht es mit deinem Herzen?*")[39] This evangelical impulse was at the core of Tholuck's fight against the trappings of church orthodoxy in favor of a more emotional connection to God.

---

[36] August Tholuck, *Die Lehre von der Sünde und vom Versöhner: Die wahre Weihe des Zweiflers* (Hamburg: Friedrich Perthes, 1851), pp. 226-275.

[37] Nicholas Railton, *No North Sea: The Anglo-German Evangelical Network in the Middle of the Nineteenth Century* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), p. 52, and W. L. Doughty, *John Wesley: Preacher* (Eugene: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2015) p. 163.

[38] Leopold Witte, *Das Leben D. Friedrich August Gottreu Tholucks* (Bielefeld: Velhagen & Klasing, 1886), p. 114.

[39] Christian T. Collins Winn, and John L. Drury, *Karl Barth and the Future of Evangelical Theology*. (Wittenberg: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2014), p. 70.

Tholuck saw himself as engaged in a fight against rationalism through the means of philological research into the Old and New Testaments. It was hoped that through careful examination and comparison of the ancient Christian texts, that a more authentic and pure Christianity would be able to revitalize piety and push back against spreading disbelief. Bunsen described this, approvingly: "With the exultation of friendship do I behold you, with Tholuck and others, in the forefront of the battle, for the renewal of Theology by means of a truly scientific system of interpretation . . . Much may perish -- But I stand upon firm ground -- the Rock Christ."[40]

While in England, Tholuck made important English connections with the London Society for Promoting Christianity among Jews, and became a founding member of that society's German analog, the *Berliner Gesellschaft zur Beförderung des Christentums unter den Juden.* After returning to Germany in late 1825, he was appointed to the Theological faculty at the University of Halle, which Tholuck complained had become overrun by faithlessness (*Unglaube*) and rationalist professors who taught and wrote that Christianity was merely but one amongst many religions. More damning, was the rationalist claim that Christ was a simply good role model (*Vorbild*), but not literally the divine savior of mankind. Tholuck (and Bunsen) believed in the literal divinity of Jesus, and that Christianity was the only true religion and means of salvation for mankind.

In the years ahead, Bunsen, Tholuck, and their allies saw themselves as standing against opponents like the rationalist theologian David Friedrich Strauss (1808-1874), whose 1835 book *The Life of Jesus* (German: *Das Leben Jesu*) famously questioned the divinity of

[40] Bunsen to Lücke, 1833 in: Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, pp. 382-3.

Christ. Tholuck's attack on Strauss, *Die Glaubwürdigkeit der evangelischen Geschichte,* argued that the miracles of the New Testament were not only possible, but provable through philological research.[41] Bunsen later described the stakes of these debates:

> Neander and Tholuck have published their works on the *Life of Jesus* against Strauss, which I am most anxious to obtain and to read. Perhaps people will now feel more the want of an improved harmony of the Gospels, when pressed by so outrageous an adversary as Strauss: whose work is the voice and organ of the unbelief of the day in Germany. The historical faith has long since become very weak, by far more than I believe you suppose.[42]

Although Tholuck's time in Rome was short -- just one year -- his connection within Bunsen's network and his stature as a titan of awakened, evangelical theology remained strong for decades after his experience in Rome. Most significantly, missionary groups and theologians in North America and Great Britain looked to Tholuck as a forefather of modern evangelism. He was a founding member of the Evangelical Alliance, a pan-Protestant organization which sought to strengthen ties between the English and German speaking countries, which I will explore further in Chapter 2.

Friedrich von Tippelskirch (1829-1835)

Tholuck's successor was Friedrich von Tippelskirch, who was invited by Bunsen just after he finished studying law and theology in Königsberg and Berlin. Bunsen described him as "an enlightened Christian, the more so as he is thoroughly learned, and devoted to the

---

[41] Friedrich August Gottreu Tholuck, *Die Glaubwürdigkeit der evangelischen Geschichte, zugleich eine Kritik des Lebens Jesu von Strauß, für theologische und nicht theologische Leser dargestellt* (Gotha: Perthes, 1838), and "Tholuck" in Donald K. McKim, *Historical Handbook of Major Biblical Interpreters* (Westmont: InterVarsity Press, 1998) pp. 373-376.

[42] Bunsen to Arnold, Feb. 1837, GStA-PK, FA Bunsen, B.63 vol. 2, pp. 32-33.

calling of a teacher of the Gospel."[43] Like Bunsen and the previous chaplains in Rome, Tippelskirch was a fierce anti-rationalist who preached sermons about the cultivation of an inner relationship with Christ. However, Bunsen also wanted Tippelskirch as a tutor for his children and research assistant for his liturgical project. While all of the chaplains assisted Bunsen with his work, Bunsen sent Tippelskirch on a year-long mission prior to his arrival in Rome, necessitating Tholuck's interim placement in the chaplaincy office: "He will make a tour through Germany, to collect for me all the ancient German liturgical publications … He is a real gain to me, and it is truly providential to have found a helper, without whom I could hardly accomplish the work before me."[44]

In his Memoir, Tippelskirch described the *Gemeinde* as a curious mix of artisans, students, artists, and aristocrats who would spend winters in the relatively milder climate of Rome.[45] Tippelskirch's diaries also offer a look at how the *Gemeinde* served many functions. It was simultaneously an artists colony, an intellectual center of research, a theological workshop and a mission for the poor. Tippelskirch described waves of impoverished Germans who came to Rome in the early 1830s, mostly handworkers and craftsmen, who were supported by the *Armenkasse* of the *Gemeinde.*[46] The chaplain gave spiritual guidance alongside material support, and offered sermons in German, but also occasionally in French and Italian for some Swiss Protestants who came to the Legation, and he even began "early morning" service in an attempt to draw more people into the *Gemeinde*. Illness eventually led

[43] Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 311.

[44] Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 311.

[45] Tippelskirch, *Ein Lebensabriß,* p. 11.

[46] Tippelskirch, *Ein Lebensabriß,* p. 13.

him to give up his office in 1835.

Like Tholuck, Tippelskirch went on to become a deeply influential figure in the German political and religious landscape. Following his time in Rome, in 1844 he founded the *Volksblatt für Stadt und Land zu Belehrung und Unterhaltung,* a Christian conservative weekly newspaper which has been seen by some historians as the first such conservative press organ in Germany.[47] The *Volksblatt* had Tippelskirch at its editorial helm from 1844-1848, and it went on to survive the Revolutions, though with a different editor. The paper reached a high of 3,500 subscriptions across Germany, and featured content which attempted to revitalize Protestant faith in Germany. Tippelskirch published full-length sermons from his predecessors Tholuck and Schmieder, as well as articles which drew attention to missionary projects such as Johann Wichern's Kaiserswerth hospital, and Bunsen's hospital in Rome.[48] In 1852, Tippelskirch became the chaplain at the Charité hospital in Berlin, where he built a sizeable community of followers. In the end, Tippelskirch was a major figure in Christian social conservatism and revivalism associated with the Inner Mission in Germany.

Once again, we can see how Bunsen was able to secure appointments for chaplains who he felt had the "correct" qualities. Theologically, he favored candidates who preached awakened Christianity emphasizing inner feeling and the heart. Politically, he wanted chaplains who were unafraid to step away from the staid rituals of orthodox Lutheranism, but who were themselves conservative when it came to patriotic fervor and loyalty to the monarchical Prussian state. These men, both in Rome, and afterwards in their careers, worked

---

[47] Lothar Dittmer, *Beamtenkonservativismus und Modernisierung: Untersuchungen zur Vorgeschichte der Konservativen Partei in Preussen 1810-1848/49* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1992), p. 232.

[48] See: Friedrich von Tippelskirch, *Volksblatt Für Stadt Und Land Zur Belehrung Und Unterhaltung,* Volume 2 (Halle: Mühlmann Verlag, 1845).

to revive what they saw as "true faith," and stood against what they saw as opponents to those causes: rationalists, republicans, atheists, Jacobins and Democrats, but also Catholic clergymen and ultramontane agitators. Insofar as Bunsen was responsible for choosing these candidates, a look at his mentor and predecessor is necessary to understand the origins of his political and religious thought.

The Influence of Niebuhr

The intellectual and moral father for Bunsen and his closest allies was Barthold Georg Niebuhr, who had served as the Prussian Ambassador to the Vatican from 1816-1823, and convinced Bunsen to join him there as his secretary. Bunsen wrote that Niebuhr was "essentially the person to form me into a thorough man and citizen of my country."[49] Bunsen wrote the final essay in Niebuhr's published Memoir, a tribute that was almost hagiographic in its reverence. Bunsen described Niebuhr as a man deeply concerned with the common weal and the woes of society, who found solace in the study of antiquity.[50]

Niebuhr's political philosophy is important in order to understand the influence he had over his most ardent disciples. Even after his death in 1831, Niebuhr's legacy and reputation were repeatedly attacked and supported by various factions within German and English society. Niebuhr's greatest literary work was his two-volume *Römische Geschichte,* the first editions of which were published in 1812, and then rewritten and published again in 1827. While it may have been true that Niebuhr sought comfort in the study of antiquity from the

[49] Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 103.

[50] Niebuhr, *The Life and Letters,* p. 545.

political turbulence and upheavals of his age (he was a 13-year-old boy at the outset of the French Revolution), his choice of Roman history as the subject of scholarly inquiry was anything but apolitical. Niebuhr's work on Rome aspired to show several important themes. First, he wanted to use Rome as a model of how political change occurs in a unit over a long period of time. Secondly, he interpreted in Roman antiquity a parallel identity with his ideal German identity as religious, virtuous and devoted to an agrarian social system.

Historian Peter Reill characterized Niebuhr's political leanings as someone grounded in the German Enlightenment tradition of dedication to the *Ständestaat*, in which the corporate orders would act to harmonize the tensions between the aristocracy, the mob and the agrarian middle classes.[51] Reill's most important characterization of Niebuhr's politics was reserved for a footnote in which he describes Niebuhr as equally venomous towards revolutionaries and restorationists, who became ever more disillusioned and estranged from party politics towards the end of his life.

Niebuhr was a reform-minded conservative monarchist, who looked to Great Britain as a model for Germany. He abhorred radicals and distrusted the nobility, but also believed that any attempt to veer away from a society of orders would be reckless, risking inevitable revolution as had occurred in France. Still, while some reformers and radicals were just as interested in combating social injustices, Niebuhr believed that the solutions were to be found in unity via increased Christian religiosity, a dedication to learning and scholarship and fervent patriotism and a sense of duty to the state. It is this stance where we can point to Bunsen and his allies and notice striking familiarity. Like Niebuhr, Bunsen and his allies

[51] See Peter Hanns Reill, "Barthold Georg Niebuhr and the Enlightenment Tradition," *German Studies Review* 3, no. 1 (1980): 9-26, especially pages 22-26.

harbored a distrust for the radical or revolutionary movements gripping Europe in the early decades of the nineteenth century. Niebuhr wrote disapprovingly of the Protestant students who demonstrated in 1817:

> The coarse proceedings on the Wartburg, mingled as they are with religious comedy, have deeply distressed me. They exhibit our youth as empty, self-conceited and vulgar. Freedom is quite impossible when the youth of a country are devoid of reverence and modesty. If I wrote according to the dictates of my heart, they would burn me also in effigy, and yet I know that all the genuine republicans of all ages would subscribe to my doctrines…[52]

Niebuhr acted in the hearts and minds of this circle of friends as a kind of saint, to be revered and idolized after his death and whose work needed to be protected and propagated. Indeed, two English clergymen, Connop Thirlwall and Julius Hare, translated his opus into the English "The History of Rome" in 1828, shortly after their respective early trips to the Prussian Embassy in Rome. The friends engaged in vigorous public debates with Niebuhr's detractors and spoke of him with deep reverence. In a 1844 letter to his wife, while traveling in Prussia, Bunsen wrote "Then I flew by railway to Bonn, and by one o'clock was on my pilgrimage to the monument of Niebuhr, which I beheld with unspeakable emotion."[53] Julius Hare wrote a letter to Bunsen in 1833 that he had placed a bust of Niebuhr over the entryway of his library, and that he kept a cast of his body after his death.[54] Bunsen wrote to Hare in

---

[52] Niebuhr on the Wartburg festival, 13th December, 1817, in: Niebuhr, *Life and Letters*, p. 355.

[53] Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 2, p. 48.

[54] Hare to Bunsen, November 20th, 1833, in: GStA-PK, VI, HA Familienarchive und Nachlässe, FA von Bunsen, B.II no. 80, p.21: "Christ I have let into the wall over the chimneypiece in my library: it looks grand there, and stands between casts of The Holy Family, and Christ with the Children, from [Danish sculptor Bertel] Thorvaldsen's Font. Between the windows stands the bust of Minerva: and over the entrance door I mean to put a bust of Niebuhr; over a door that goes from the library into a greenhouse I have found a place for you. Thus I shall be surrounded by grand and dear memorials. All the rest of the room is covered with books. When will you come and look at yourself and Niebuhr in it . . . I could not resist the temptation of having any remembrances of him . . . I have a cast also taken from his body after his death, which, though tearfully sad, is very beautiful."

1844 that he reads Niebuhr's lectures with his family every night. These actions, years and decades after his death, show the extent to which Niebuhr remained a presence in their thoughts, feelings and political leanings.

Publicly, these acolytes of Niebuhr defended him against those who sought to besmirch his reputation. In England, Niebuhr's work came under attack in the pages of Tory publications such as the *Quarterly Review*, which charged him with materialism and atheism, as well as intellectual laziness. Conservative critics of Niebuhr saw him as a representative of a German intellectual school which led to a more liberal interpretation of both the texts of the classical world as well as the Scriptures, which was perceived as inimical and dangerous to orthodox theology and conservative Anglican practice. These charges were vociferously countered by Julius Hare in his 1829 publication "A Vindication of Niebuhr's History of Rome from the Charges of the Quarterly Review."[55]

Anti-Catholicism: Tensions, Negotiations, Neighbors

> The thought which for many years I cannot dismiss, that our children will witness wars of religion, came so strongly before my soul, that the accompanying visuals disturbed my nightly sleep. You know my opinion as to the final result of such a struggle, but I shudder at the amount of misery that must attend it.[56]

The last section of this chapter will focus explicitly on the tensions that arose between the Prussian state and the Roman Catholic Church, through an examination of a series of diplomatic negotiations between the two powers conducted by Niebuhr and Bunsen. Some

[55] Julius Charles Hare, and Barthold Georg Niebuhr, *A Vindication of Niebuhr's History of Rome from the Charges of the Quarterly Review* (Cambridge: John Taylor, 1829).

[56] This quote exemplifies how Bunsen, writing to his mentor Niebuhr in 1824, would have liked to see Protestantism eventually triumph in a struggle against Catholic faith, yet was tormented to think about how it could ever be attained without violence. See: Bunsen, *Memoir*, p. 243.

historians have framed these tensions within grand narratives of modernization. Volker Berghahn has suggested that religious struggles in Germany should be seen as between the forces of modernization and traditionalism, represented by Liberal Protestants and Catholics, respectively.[57] As evidence for his argument, Berghahn points out that Catholic participation in education was lower than that of Protestants, that Catholics were mostly rural, were more superstitious, and belonged to lower economic classes than their Protestant countrymen. Similarly, David Blackbourn framed this tension as a competition between "progress and piety," between liberals and backward Catholics, who had lost land and power during the Napoleonic era in Germany.[58] Blackbourn has argued that German liberals saw the nation-state as the harbinger of progress, in education, culture, communication, and science, while Catholics were thought to be provincial, dangerously transnational (and thus subversive to the Prussian-led nation-building project), and even lazy or unclean.[59] The narratives offered by Berghahn and Blackbourn also focus on issues of class, with both suggesting that Liberal disdain for Catholics was tied to bourgeois animus towards the masses.

There is probably some truth to these arguments, but additional context is necessary to add nuance to these narratives. While class-based analysis has its merits, the reduction of the tension between the Prussian state and its Catholic population to one between the forces of progress and piety is perhaps too simplistic. Indeed, as Bunsen and his allies saw the world, working to increase piety and revive the Protestant church was itself the very definition of

---

[57] Volker R. Berghahn, *Imperial Germany, 1871-1914: Economy, Society, Culture, and Politics* (Providence: Berghahn Books, 1994), p. 91.

[58] David Blackbourn, *Populists and Patricians: Essays in Modern German History* (London: Routledge Press, 2014), p. 144.

[59] Blackbourn, *Populists and Patricians*, p. 148.

progress. To try to frame piety as simply backward and ignorant erases the evident zeal and devotion of Protestants like Bunsen and his allies: diplomats, academics, and ministers who, far from being backwards or uneducated, came to occupy elite positions of political power. Instead, we might think of Bunsen as representative of a kind of awakened Protestantism which sought to strengthen and unify a German nation under the auspices of a more robust church life, guaranteed by a benevolent (Christian) monarch.

Bunsen and Niebuhr met with German artists and students in Rome, some of whom had converted to Catholicism, who described their disgust at the indifference and infidelity of German Protestants. His early writing from Rome show that Bunsen was somewhat skeptical and distrustful of these Catholics: "I have told these new friends, that [I] shall never become Catholic, but that [I] honor them in their conviction, more than such as believe nothing."[60]

In early 1817, however, Bunsen began to overcome his preconceived prejudices against Catholics, describing how he had "soon perceived that [they] were of honest mind, and many of them capable of a deep consciousness of the real and the great in every department."[61] He even wrote of their zeal with envy, "Were there but a spirit of power, making itself felt among Protestants!"[62] Bunsen, influenced by his mentor Niebuhr, would soon come to not only tolerate but appreciate Catholics. Indeed, Bunsen wrote that Niebuhr opposed state surveillance of Catholics within Prussian territory.[63] Furthermore, Niebuhr

[60] Bunsen, *Memoir,* vol. 1, p. 108.

[61] Bunsen, *Memoir,* vol. 1, p. 109.

[62] Bunsen, *Memoir,* vol. 1, p. 109.

[63] In the Napoleonic Era, the Catholic church in Germany had lost land, power and resources. But during the restoration period that followed the Congress of Vienna, Catholicism experienced a revival in piety and popular enthusiasm. The Prussian state naturally viewed this with unease, as they had already been

disagreed with the increasingly popular Prussian sentiment that the Catholic church inside Prussia should separated from Vatican influence and thus more friendly with the Prussian state, and also disagreed with some who argued that Prussia should cease diplomatic relations or negotiations with Rome altogether.[64] Despite charges from critics at home of being too sympathetic to the Vatican, Niebuhr felt that sympathy for his "fellow citizens" of the Catholic church was actually a form of the deepest patriotism, and that the only guarantee of unity in Germany was to foster peace between the confessions. Niebuhr also empathized with the disproportionate poverty suffered by Catholics and believed that the government was bound to provide institutional support for their dioceses and parishes. The best way to achieve this harmony was to continue negotiations with the Roman court, and those negotiations were carried out on behalf of Prussia by both Niebuhr, and then Bunsen, between 1816 through 1838.[65] In this way, these diplomats were always operating between the tension of wanting to preserve peace on the one hand, but advance Prussian interests on the other, which became increasingly more difficult.

Bunsen interfered when he thought Catholics were experiencing particular injustices at the hands of the Prussian state. For instance, in 1827, he spoke to his friend the Crown Prince of his concerns about the enforcement of compulsory Protestant church attendance for Prussian soldiers stationed in the Rhineland and Westphalian territories. After the Prussian victory in the Napoleonic wars, the state continued an eighteenth-century ritual in which

---

assuming increasing control over the church by dictating sermon length and flexing control over ecclesiastical office appointments.

[64] Niebuhr, *Life and Letters*, p. 559. The *Alt-Katholische Kirch*e (Old Catholic Church) in Germany would eventually split from the Vatican in 1870 after the unification of Germany, as the *Kulturkampf* began.

[65] Niebuhr, *Life and Letters,* p. 560.

soldiers and guards in garrison towns would go on parade and end by marching into the Protestant church before the service. These rituals, including patriotic songs and hurrahs for the monarch Friedrich Wilhelm III, would seem to be indicative of swelling national pride.[66] But soldiers' participation was enforced through ministerial ordinance, and many observers, including Bunsen, worried about the resentment of Catholic soldiers forced to participate in Protestant worship services. Bunsen, despite the warnings of the Crown Prince and other aides to the King, managed to personally convince the King to issue orders in 1837 to his army generals to drop the practice.[67] Bunsen's influence in ending this long-held practice is indicative of his persuasive power at court as well as the extent to which he hoped to reduce tensions between Catholics and Protestants in Prussia.[68] This, however, was neither the last nor the most contentious issue in which Bunsen found himself caught between the two powers.

Mixed marriages - What about the children?

The political affair which consumed the Prussian diplomatic mission in Rome, first by Niebuhr and then Bunsen most heavily during his last years in Rome had to do with the issue of confessionally mixed marriages in Prussia, that is, marriage between Catholics and

[66] More about these mandatory parades can be found in: Karen Hagemann, *Revisiting Prussia's Wars Against Napoleon: History, Culture and Memory* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015).

[67] Bunsen, *Memoir,* vol. 1, pp. 270-275.

[68] My assumption is that Bunsen was concerned about political blowback and social unrest in Prussia, the likes of which England was facing from their colonial practices in Ireland in the time period. Bunsen corresponded with many English politicians about the issue of Catholic Emancipation in the 1820s.

Protestants. On the one hand, Prussian Law after 1794 granted the father exclusive rights over the religious education of his children, except in the cases of mixed marriages, wherein the sons would be brought up in the religion of the father while daughters would be raised in the religion of the mother.[69] A modification was made in 1803, when the King passed a declaration that all children must henceforth be brought up in solely the faith of the father. Roman Catholic canon law, on the other hand, denied the possibility of a mixed marriage, but those restrictions could be suspended if the couple promised to raise *all* of their children (that is, both sons *and* daughters) in the Catholic church. This "sufferance" of mixed marriages on the part of the Roman church applied to any mixed couple, regardless of their distance from Rome. Still, the various dioceses in Germany adhered to canon law in differing ways. Most bishops in Prussian Diocese, even in heavily Catholic areas like Breslau and Ermland did not even demand the promise to raise the children in the Catholic faith. Sometimes, the Catholic clergy there would grant "passive assistance" to mixed couples, granting them validity. In these circumstances, the priest would be present at the ceremony to silently accept the union, without offering any benediction. In other cases, Catholic bishops would simply perform the full marriage services to mixed-faith couples, even in cases where they knew that the couple planned to raise their children in the Protestant faith, as was often the case in places like Württemberg.[70]

---

[69] See the *Allgemeine Landrecht für die Preußischen Staaten von 1794*, Part 2, Title 2, Section 2, §74-85 "Rights and Duties of the Parents regarding the upbringing and instruction of children."

[70] Tillmann Bendikowsi posits, however, that these instances may not have all been on account of enlightened attitudes of religious toleration on behalf of those bishops, but rather that some evidence shows that these German Catholic priests may not have even been aware of their own canon laws and regulations. See: Tillmann Bendikowski, "'Eine Fackel der Zwietracht': Katholisch-protestantische Mischehen im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert," in Olaf Blaschke, *Konfessionen im Konflikt: Deutschland zwischen 1800 und 1970: ein zweites konfessionelles Zeitalter* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002).

After 1815 however, in Prussia's newly annexed provinces of the Rhineland in the west, the Catholic clergy would not grant this passive assistance unless the groom secretly promised to break Prussian law by raising his children in the Catholic faith. This, of course, angered the Prussian state who saw this as an infraction of the secular law of the state, which specifically stipulated that no third party may coerce parents as to the religious upbringing of their children, so long as both parents were in agreement. Adding to this, an 1825 cabinet order extended the 1803 declaration into the western provinces, giving fathers the sole legal right to decide their children's religion. As increasing numbers of mobile (and Protestant) Prussian civil servants, bureaucrats, and soldiers from the Prussian military began flowing into the region and marrying local Catholic women, the Catholics in the Rhineland region saw this as a targeted attempt of the state to convert Catholic families to Protestantism.

Tensions flared further between 1825 and 1827, after an engaged couple sought to be married by a Catholic priest named Schütte, who refused to perform the service without the promise that their children would be raised Catholic. The couple promptly found a Lutheran pastor who obliged them. Schütte, however, did not let matters rest. He began to corner the young bride in town, threatening to exclude her from partaking in communion unless she relented. Schütte complained to his bishop in Münster about the case, while the husband also began lodging complaints with the Westphalian *Oberpräsident*, which quickly made their way to the King. The King stated that Schütte's attempt to extort a promise from the Catholic wife by threatening ex-communication was illegal and that such forms of religious pressure

(*Religionsdruck*) from a Catholic clergyman could not be tolerated by the Prussian State.[71] At this point, Bunsen was ordered to intervene diplomatically.

Bunsen, following his mentor and predecessor Niebuhr, believed that mixed marriages were vital to preserving the peace between the two confessions. Starting in 1828, Bunsen negotiated with Vatican officials to find a compromise for both sides of the marriage issue. The result of the negotiations was the papal breve of March 1830 by Pope Pius VIII, which despite granting passive assistance to mixed marriages, still resolved to subvert the Protestant church by coercing the bride to use "every means in her power" to raise her children in the Catholic faith.[72] Additionally, the Papal order still would not grant nuptial benediction to any marriage, without which some couples felt that the marriage was disreputable. While Bunsen had succeeded by some measures in negotiating this settlement, insofar as the compromise would at least allow mixed marriages to continue, the Prussian King and his ministers were still dissatisfied and hesitant to accept the conditions offered by Rome. To the royal court, this issue was about no less than the primacy of the Prussian state law, which they thought was being subverted and undermined by Catholic bishops whose loyalties were to Rome.

Further negotiations led to a secret meeting in Berlin in 1834, in which the Prussian government promised to abolish civil marriage in the annexed Western territories in return for the cooperation of the Catholic bishops there.[73] The deal brokered by Bunsen was made with

---

[71] Bendikowski, in Blaschke, *Konfessionen im Konflikt,* p. 226.

[72] A "breve" is a short papal order released as a public document, though is often simple in comparison with a papal bull.

[73] The 1830 Berlin convention sought to marginalize the Vatican's direct influence by reinterpreting the 1830 papal order by simply requiring bishops to make sure that the bride was of "sound mind" before performing the marriage. Negotiations were held between Westphalian bishops and Bunsen, excluding Roman officials. See: Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften, *Acta Borussica. Reihe 2: Preußen als Kulturstaat. Der preußische Kulturstaat in der politischen und sozialen Wirklichkeit, Von der*

the backing of moderate bishops friendly to the Prussian state, including the Archbishop of Köln, Ferdinand August von Spiegel.[74]

However, behind the scenes there were political forces agitating against this compromise as well. During the early 1830s, fears of revolution and the ascendancy of Prussian state power increasingly moved the political attitudes in Rome towards a more conservative, counter-revolutionary, and defensive posture. Pope Pius VIII, who had issued the original 1830 order of limited compromise with Prussia, died just eight months later. His successor, the traditionalist and anti-reformist Pope Gregory XVI, was only elected in 1831 after a fifty-day papal conclave and eighty-four ballots, and only after fears of revolts sprang up in the Northern Papal States.[75] Meanwhile, the moderate Archbishop Spiegel, who had pushed for compromise in the convention of 1834, died in 1835. The appointment in 1836 of a new Archbishop in Köln, Clemens August Droste zu Vischering, who was unfriendly to the Protestant cause, doomed the issue.[76] Vischering had been appointed to the Köln Bishopric in 1836 at the insistence of the Prussian Crown Prince (the future King Friedrich Wilhelm IV), in a miscalculated attempt to soothe tensions in that region, or perhaps to show Catholics

---

Kirchengesellschaft zur Kirche in der Gesellschaft, Katholische Frömmigkeit und Politisierung preußischer Katholiken (1815-1871) eds. Wolfgang Neugebauer, and Christina Rathgeber (Berlin: De Gruyter Akademie, 2015).

[74] Archbishop Spiegel had agitated at the Congress of Vienna for an independent German Catholic church, a movement which came to fruition in 1844. See: Friedrich Wilhelm Graf, *Die Politisierung Des Religiösen Bewusstseins: Die Bürgerlichen Religionsparteien Im Deutschen Vormärz, Das Beispiel Des Deutschkatholizismus*, Vol. 5 (Stuttgart: Frommann-Holzboog, 1978).

[75] See: Owen Chadwick, *"Gregory XVI", A History of the Popes, 1830-1914* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003) pp. 3-58.

[76] Bunsen wrote that his mentor and predecessor Niebuhr had already feared the collapse of the secret Prussian-Vatican deal on marriages that he had worked for in the 1820s, because of the death in 1829 of Pope Leo XII, who was “pious and peaceable,” and whose successors were less open to compromise with Prussia.

there that the Prussian state did not want to exert a heavy hand. Indeed, when Bunsen in Rome informed the Cardinal Secretary of State that Prussia intended to appoint Vischering, the Cardinal - who knew full well the extent of Vischering's temperament - replied to him "Is your government mad?!"[77]

The new Archbishop immediately began rooting out theological adversaries in his diocese in an effort to reorient Catholics towards Rome. One faultline opened up at the newly-opened *Rhein-Universität* in Bonn, which had been founded in 1818 by the Prussian monarchy, with both a Catholic and Protestant school of theology. Previously, Catholic professors at this university had been influenced by Georg Hermes, a theologian who sought to reform and rationalise Catholicism for the modern world.[78] Hermes died in 1831, but traditionalists in the Roman church had long opposed his doctrines leading to a Papal Bull forbidding the teaching of his doctrines in late 1835. After his appointment, Vischering forbade students from attending the lectures of Hermesian professors and withdrew his endorsement of their theological magazine. Vischering demanded that new priests in his diocese swear adherence to a set of doctrines that opposed the teachings of Hermes before taking office. Adding to this, Vischering defied the 1834 compromises on the marriage issue made between his predecessor Spiegel and Bunsen in Berlin, once again demanding that Catholic brides promise to raise their children in the Catholic faith. The Prussian monarch and his cabinet saw these as provocations and escalations by the Vatican, which intended to

[77] Bunsen, *Memoir,* vol. 1, p. 433.

[78] Hermesian professors were often more likely to support and align with the Prussian monarchy. See: Herman H. Schwedt, *Das Römische Urteil über Georg Hermes (1775-1831): Ein Beitrag Zur Geschichte Der Inquisition Im 19. Jahrhundert* (Freiburg: Herder, 1980).

remove control of the Bonn university from the King, to undermine Prussian control in the region, and to re-Catholicize the people living there.

After written negotiations between Prussian officials and the Archbishop broke down in 1837, Bunsen was dispatched to intervene. In their conference, Bunsen made reference to the 1834 agreement, noting that he did not want Vischering's conscience (*Gewissen*) to be injured, but that the Prussian state interests must also be observed - adding that the bishops in nearby Trier, Paderborn and Münster had all also signed the 1834 compromise. Vischering held firm, responding that he would follow the original Papal order of 1830, but that "no bishop may give an elucidation" of the original order, a direct rebuke to his moderate predecessor.[79] At any rate, the Prussian monarch and his advisers had long since decided that the original 1830 Papal order was not only inadequate, but subversive. Bunsen tried to explain to Vischering that the 1834 agreement was vital to the peace of the Kingdom, especially for areas where Catholics and Protestants lived amongst one another, but Vischering resisted, saying in October that this entire debate was simply an issue of his freedom of conscience (*Gewissensfreiheit*) as well as the free exercise of his clerical office. Defiant, Vischering proclaimed of mixed marriages: "The issue is purely clerical" ("*Die Sache ist rein kirchlich*.")[80]

When even these negotiations broke down, the King and his ministers made up their mind to remove Vischering, against the protestations of Bunsen, since he could not be made to come around to their point of view. Accusations were levied that Vischering had been

[79] "Kein Bischof dürfte eine Erklärung geben..." see: Christian Karl Josias von Bunsen, *Darlegung des Verfahrens der Preußischen Regierung gegen den Erzbischof von Köln vom 25. November 1837* (Berlin: Hayn Verlag, 1838), p. 32.

[80] Bunsen, *Darlegung,* p. 32.

consulting with ultramontane Belgian Catholics in instigating resentment among the Catholics in Prussia's western provinces, sealing his fate. On November 20th, 1837, Vischering was accused of violent opposition to the Prussian government, arrested and imprisoned at a fortress in Minden 230 kilometers away from Köln, and suspended from his ecclesiastical office.

The events came to be known as a the *Kölner Ereignis* (Cologne Incident), which is described in the literature as one of the more significant clashes between state and church power in pre-1848 Germany.[81] Noteworthy, though, is Bunsen's public and personal reactions to the event. Publicly, Bunsen wrote and printed a lengthy summary of the events leading up to the arrest of Vischering, in which he wrote that the Prussian government had treated the Catholic Church with patience and dignity and had tried to respect the religious convictions of all Prussians. Further, he wrote that the Prussian state showed goodwill to try to solve the differences of opinion and come to a peaceable solution to the mixed marriage issue. In these papers, Bunsen put the blame entirely on Archbishop Vischering, claiming also that the Catholic Church "through one-sided and false presentation of the issue, tried to awaken and motivate religious hatred of the Government."[82]

Privately, Bunsen lamented the events, writing to his wife that he had tried to preserve the Archbishop in his office, despite his errors:

> Not that I ever doubted of the final victory of truth and right, for that is wholly and entirely on our side; **but I dreaded that blood might flow, before it should be possible to bring the multitude out of their infatuation…** The King, having worn

[81] The most archivally rich and nuanced take on these events that I have found is that of Friedrich Keinemann. See: Friedrich Keinemann, *Das Kölner Ereignis Und Die Kölner Wirren* (Münster: Materialien Der Historischen Kommission Für Westfalen, 2015).

[82] Christian Karl Josias von Bunsen, *Darlegung des Verfahrens der Preußischen Regierung gegen den Erzbischof von Köln vom 25. November 1837* (Berlin: Hayn Verlag, 1838), p. 5.

> out every form of persuasion towards that fanatical, crafty pretender to sanctity, so that he well foresaw his lot, and had prepared himself for it. [Vischering's] plan was to escape into the Cathedral [before his arrest], to place himself before the altar, cause all the doors to be opened, and invite the violence he expected. The whole [population of Germany], as well as of the lower clergy, with few exceptions, are on the side of the Government. The greater part of Germany, from the Baltic to the Alps, is not against us, but with us and for us. That I, to the very last moment, strove to save the Archbishop, you will believe without my assurance. The Crown Prince is now, almost more than his father, irritated at the unworthy behavior of he man whom he recommended! He sees to what it tended.[83]

Bunsen, like his mentor Niebuhr, feared that government persecution of Catholics, or any action of the government which could be seen as despotic would threaten confessional peace and damage the prospect of unification of Germany.

Bunsen's claim to his wife, that "all of Germany" was on the side of the government, was not quite correct. Catholics observing this event in horror, in Köln, Rome and beyond, had a different view. To them, Bunsen was perceived as the *instigator* of the harsh government measures, or at least a vital instrument as the principal Prussian negotiator with both Spiegel and Vischering. Following the *Kölner Ereignis*, the Papal Court in Rome lost all remaining trust for Bunsen. Back in Germany, Bunsen was cast as a suspicious figure by factions within the Ministries of Culture who were impatient with and intolerant of the Catholic population, but who also were increasingly envious and distrustful of Bunsen's growing political stature and reputation with the royal family. On this issue, Bunsen's wife later remarked after his death: "At the time when his influence was great with Frederick William III, and with the Crown Prince, afterwards Frederick William IV, great was also the

[83] Bunsen to his wife, Nov. 28th, 1837 in: Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 447.

spite entertained against him in well-known circles: a consequence of which was his being accused of 'intrigue,' and of being more *sly* than any man in the Monarchy."[84]

During the negotiations in the 1830s with both Spiegel and Vischering, Bunsen had urged his government to show restraint, to prevent what he saw as despotism towards the Catholic population. Bunsen's opposition to governmental heavy-handedness lead some in the state bureaucracy and ministerial class to accuse Bunsen of being overly sympathetic to the Roman church, even to the point of "crypto-Catholicism."[85] Indeed, over the course of time, Bunsen's retrospective notes indicate that he suspected a plot: that he had been called to negotiate a compromise with Vischering, and Spiegel before him, even as factions within the Ministry of Culture wanted him to fail and suspected that he would.[86] In the event of his failure, not only would Bunsen's career be damaged, but the hardline, anti-Catholic elements within the Prussian government would then feel justified in asserting the supremacy of secular law, while also ensuring that the next generation of children born in the Rhineland area of Prussia would be more likely to be raised Protestant.

Following the events of 1836-7 in Köln, and the imprisonment of Archbishop Vischering, the Pope plainly refused to meet with Bunsen in Rome any further.[87] Bunsen's viability as a diplomatic agent of the Prussian state in Rome was shattered. After leaving the Easter service of his *Gemeinde* in Rome on April 16th, 1838, a courier from Berlin delivered

[84] Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 22.

[85] Bunsen, *Memoir,* vol. 1, pp. 402, 451.

[86] See Bunsen's notes in Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 403.

[87] Frank Foerster, *Christian Carl Josias Bunsen: Diplomat, Mäzen Und Vordenker in Wissenschaft, Kirche Und Politik* (Bad Arolsen: Waldeckischer Geschichtsverein, 2001), pp. 130-131.

a letter informing him that he was to leave his post in Rome and take a six-month leave of absence, during which he was permitted to collect a salary and visit England. That Bunsen was not discharged from state service outright, to the dismay of those factions who opposed him, can only be attributed to the last-minute intervention of his friend, the Crown Prince, who convinced his father that Bunsen's value to Prussia should not be squandered. When Bunsen and his family departed Rome a week later, a crowd of young men and women from the *Gemeinde*, artists, intellectuals, and students, followed alongside the Bunsen family's carriage, mourning the departure of the man who had been the intellectual, social, and spiritual center of their community for over two decades.[88] Bunsen could not have known then, that owing to the patronage and friendship of the future Prussian King, he would soon enjoy an even more powerful position and create a new community for himself in England.

In the aftermath of his departure from Rome, Bunsen wrote a sharp rebuke of his fellow Prussians, saying that he deeply regretted both the "malignant agitation and priestly pretentions" which threatened confessional peace in Prussia.[89] Niebuhr's stance reflected one of religious toleration which had greatly influenced Bunsen and many in his circles. On the issue of Prussian intervention with Catholic institutions, Bunsen continuously strived to avoid giving cause for further agitation. Bunsen wrote to his sister, five years after he had moved to Rome under Niebuhr:

> I come to the conclusion that interference [of Catholic affairs] from above, by State authority, even with the best intentions, is a very doubtful proceeding; and that a wise Government ought in fact to do nothing but acknowledge,

[88] Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, pp. 455-6.

[89] Niebuhr, *Life and Letters*, p. 562.

> encourage, and recommend to acceptance or imitation, what may independently form itself in the bosom of the Church.[90]

Bunsen, invoking his mentor, said that the confessional peace was the only guarantee for the potential unity of all Germans and that it was only through such a spirit of toleration and understanding that "universal peace" could be secured, "beneath whose fostering wings the life of European nations might attain its full development."[91]

As evidenced by his correspondence and the verve with which he strove for confessional peace between Catholics and Protestants in his negotiations, as well as his attitude towards his German Catholic friends living in Rome, Bunsen had a complex and evolving relationship with Catholicism. On the one hand, he and his allies firmly believed that an awakened and reformed version of Protestantism was the sole means to salvation of mankind. He worked tirelessly to encourage that confession in his Roman community, and in Germany. On the other hand, while he might have wanted Catholics in Germany and elsewhere to come around to what he saw as "true" religion, he spent significant political capital, and made many enemies in the process of attempting to protect Catholics from an increasingly powerful Prussian monarchy and bureaucracy which attempted to marginalize or assimilate them. Still, these actions and attitudes of Bunsen and his allies were not necessarily indicative of an egalitarian religious pluralism -- but rather came from two motivating impulses. First, they hoped that a stronger, purer, revived, and unified Church in Prussia would eventually present Catholics a spiritual option more attractive than what was offered by the Vatican. Secondly, and as we will see in the coming chapters, they were committed to the

---

[90] Bunsen to Christina, February 14th, 1823, in: Bunsen, *Memoir,* vol. 1, p. 205.

[91] Niebuhr, *Life and Letters*, p. 561.

idea of a German nation-state, which they thought was the best vehicle for peace and stability that would promote the spiritual and political flourishing of all Germans.

As the Protestant *Gemeinde* grew in Rome, fluctuating between 80 and 200 members over the first half of the nineteenth century, Bunsen and his embassy chaplains, enabled and allowed for public observances of awakened Protestantism. But as their community grew, particular energy was directed towards the protection of the Protestant beliefs of their members. What is particularly interesting about this episode of Prussian diplomatic history, is that Bunsen was able to create a specifically Protestant site of worship in Catholic Rome, bringing together Protestants from across the city, and visitors from across Europe. As Bunsen's state service continued in Rome for twenty-one years after his Reformation Anniversary Celebration in 1817, he leveraged his connections from other Protestant countries, especially England, to secure himself significant power in the Prussian court over the course of his career. Those chaplains that worked alongside Bunsen, preaching and working in Rome, would continue to work towards church reform and the renewal of Christian spirit in university professorships, newspaper and book publications, and social welfare missions in hospitals, schools and seminaries.

Bunsen began his career in Rome by appealing to the legacy and memory of the three-hundred year old Reformation to further his own ideals of a latitudinarian, broad-church Protestant Europe led by Prussia and England, while also signalling his desires for a revived and awakened Protestant spirit across Europe and, eventually, the entire world. These priorities would only continue to grow after his appointment to diplomatic office in England.

Chapter 2: Patronage and Piety, Anglo-Prussian Relations, 1835-1854

Following his resignation in 1838 from the Prussian Legation in Rome, Christian Bunsen was sent to England several months later for a six-month visit, paid for by the Prussian crown. The Crown Prince of Prussia, eager to install his Anglophile friend Bunsen into a diplomatic post in England, supported his travels there. However, it would not be until his father, the reigning King Friedrich Wilhelm III, died of a stroke in June 1840 that Bunsen's future career would be secured after the ascension of his friend and patron to the throne. After 1840, the new Prussian monarch sent Bunsen back to London.

During Friedrich Wilhelm IV's first visit to England in late January and early February 1842, Bunsen used the opportunity to present to the Prussian King several of his closest friends at a luncheon in his home at Carleton Terrace, near St. James Square. His closest English relations that he had met in Rome were in attendance: Dr. Thomas Arnold of the Rugby School and Julius Hare, the Archdeacon of Lewes. During the King's visit, Bunsen and his wife spent time dining and talking with London aristocrats, including Prime Minister Palmerston, the Duke of Sussex, and many others.

Bunsen seemed to have trouble adjusting to his new responsibilities as a man of state in England. He complained in 1842 that he did not have enough clerks and secretaries (only one of each) to assist him with his endless note-writing and visitation appointments. Still, he found time to do what he did well: entertain. Bunsen arranged to have choral performances of English and German holy songs performed in his home for an audience of notables. As far as getting on with those in the English court, Bunsen wrote to his friend in March 1842, "You will imagine that general relations to society are favourable, when one has started with one's

King!"[92] While Bunsen had spent the previous twenty-five years in the service of the Prussian crown, he had never before enjoyed such power, with the increased reputation and recognition as the Prussian King's right-hand agent in England. Bunsen had arrived in England, and he immediately began to influence the diplomatic course of relations between the two nations, while also acting to bolster the movements of Anglican church reform, religious toleration, and worldwide missionary activities.

This chapter explores the political and religious landscape of England in the 1830s and 1840s and highlight the ways that Bunsen and his allies contributed to a vision of a revived Christianity at individual, local, national and international levels. Additionally, it examines various patron-client relationships that emerged within and around this group. These relationships connected families, scholars, and politicians to institutions as far-flung as a Bishopric in Jerusalem to a hospital in London to colonies in Australia. At the center of each of these was a small group of pious individuals, determined to increase the breadth and scope of Christianity in Europe and well beyond. Their efforts emerged amidst historical and social changes in both England and Germany, the specifics of which are crucial to any attempt to investigate the consequences of their agenda.

In Prussia, a new liturgy for both the Lutheran and Calvinist churches was imposed by King Friedrich Wilhelm III in 1822 in order to pull together the different Protestant confessions.[93] From the monarch's point of view, liturgical unity among Prussian churches was central to the creation of a unified Protestant culture to harness the energies of

[92] Bunsen, *Memoir,* vol. 2, pp. 4-10.

[93] A good overview of the implementation of the King's agenda can be found in: Jürgen Kampmann, *Die Einführung der Berliner Agende in Westfalen. Die Neuordnung des evangelischen Gottesdienstes 1813–1835* (Bielefeld: Luther-Verlag, 1991).

nationalism. As patriotic fervor surged among student groups, in the press, and in the arts, the Prussian government became increasingly concerned with social unrest. State officials saw the church as a vehicle to inspire order and discipline, but also as a means to inspire loyalty and social cohesion. The stakes of liturgical reform were thus quite high. Officials were concerned with the stability of the Prussian state in terms of sectarian unity amongst Protestants, but also with the pernicious influence of Catholicism from within and beyond Prussia's borders. These officials feared that Protestants would be converted by Catholics, and suspected that Catholic subjects might harbor some loyalty to the Vatican. Furthermore, liturgical standardization had international implications in that it served as a potential basis for an alliance of Protestant superpowers. Prussia's domestic religious mobilization was also a reflection of its international and geopolitical ambitions. A standardized, centralized liturgy would reflect the strength and unity of a state whose subjects were both pious and loyal to the throne and altar.

In England, social and political debates about church reform were growing throughout the 1820s and 1830s around issues of their own church reform. At the heart of the projects of English and German church reform was a fear of the destruction of the church by both internal and external forces. Reformers in England saw the establishment church as inaccessible and out of touch with broad sections of English society.[94] In addition, they saw the church as corrupted by clerical privilege and unable to address worsening social problems. Faced with growing numbers of Christian Dissenters and separatists, such as Quakers, Unitarians, and Presbyterians, opposing viewpoints formed amongst church and political

[94] As seen in Chapter 1, Bunsen and his allies felt similarly about the Prussian church, as well. See also the Introduction in: Owen Chadwick, *The Spirit of the Oxford Movement: Tractarian Essays* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

leaders for how best to handle them. The High Church Oxford Movement sought to persecute dissenters politically, re-committing themselves to a more conservative version of Anglicanism, which emphasized its Roman Catholic origins. Opposed to them, Broad Church Reformers believed that there would always be religious dissent and thought that the best solution was to allow dissenters into the church community where they could be controlled.

This chapter focuses on several issues raised by these projects of church reform, revivalism, and political unity in Germany and England by assessing the activities of Bunsen and his closest allies in the two countries. Christian Bunsen did not become the Prussian ambassador to England until 1841, but he was already involved in and influenced by English politics in the 1820s and 1830s during his tenure as the Prussian ambassador to the Vatican in Rome. Bunsen's intimate friends, such as the schoolmaster Thomas Arnold, and Anglican Archdeacon Julius Hare, sought in different ways to protect their visions of an "awakened" Protestant Church as a force for social cohesion and moral edification, and they found each other during Bunsen's tenure at the Prussian Legation in Rome, between 1817 and 1838.

While Bunsen and his allies worked in public to shape the debate towards a more latitudinarian Church, they were also engaged privately in efforts to address what they saw as the greatest social evils of the era, especially poverty. The agenda pursued by this network in the nineteenth century can be seen in the broader tradition of the so-called "inner mission." The inner missions were pioneered by the Halle Pietists in the eighteenth century in Germany to attend to the social ills of society.[95] In the English context, these men founded and joined associations, and subscription-based relief funds, and organized fundraisers and events to

[95] See: Henning Wrogemann, *Missionstheologien der Gegenwart: globale Entwicklungen, kontextuelle Profile und ökumenische Herausforderungen* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2013).

advance their causes.[96] They worked tirelessly to secure both fiduciary and symbolic patronage from the richest and most powerful members of the British aristocracy in order to pursue various acts of charity. Collectively, Bunsen and those in his network solicited donations for the foundation of a German hospital in London, "reform" houses for "fallen" women, orphanages, schools associated with missionaries across the world, and financial relief for literary and intellectual figures, especially those who shared personal connections or who were seen to be contributing to their scholarly and spiritual agendas or both.[97]

Bunsen had a stimulating effect on the religious passions of the many allies, friends, and associates who came into his circle. I argue that what Bunsen had to offer his friends-cum-clients was not always material or financial although there was certainly a fair amount of that.[98] But rather, Bunsen offered political influence within the English and Prussian courts, as well as other forms of political support (loyalty, support, friendship) and pious understanding (validation of a shared ecclesiology). For instance, the English historian Connop Thirlwall (b. 1797-1875) visited Bunsen in Rome in 1818-19 and later claimed that it was his friendship with Bunsen that inspired him to become an ordained bishop in 1827.[99] As Bunsen extended his network through relationships he began to make in Rome, he was

---

[96] See chapter 1 in: Susan Thorne, *Congregational Missions and the Making of an Imperial Culture in Nineteenth-Century England* (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1999).

[97] The fundraising activities and foundation of missionary institutions can be seen as part of the larger program of the "Inner Mission," which in the German context typically meant reviving Christian sentiment and alleviating social ills within Germany. Although the German Hospital in London was outside of Germany, it still catered to the physical ailments and 'spiritual decay' of Germans living abroad. For a good overview of the emergence of the Inner Mission in Germany, see: Gerhard K. Schäfer & Volker Herrmann, "Geschichtliche Entwicklungen der Diakonie" in: Günter Ruddat & Gerhard K. Schäfer, *Diakonisches Kompendium* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2005).

[98] For instance, Bunsen was able to hire many secretaries for his own work in Italy and England, as well as full-time staff, chaplains for his Legation chapel, etc.

[99] Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, pp. 339-340.

especially keen on maintaining and nurturing ties with two overlapping types of groups. The first group included well-positioned people of elite status who Bunsen knew could be useful for his causes, and the second were individuals who shared his worldview for a latitudinarian Protestantism to unify Northern Europe, while strengthening the piety of the people and the role of the church in social life. The most coveted friendships for Bunsen, naturally, were individuals who occupied both groups, such as the English theologian Julius Hare and the English historian Thomas Arnold, both latitudinarian Anglican. The solidarity Bunsen exchanged with men like Arnold came in sentimental forms such as follows:

> So have I found, in the range of opinion which concerns the greatest political and religious problems of the day, precisely among those of your countrymen toward whom I feel myself the most drawn (the men who hold Old England high above all else), points on which I cannot easily either make my own reasoning intelligible to them, or comprehend and accept theirs. Therefore it was to me such a very great and unexpected joy, that in the intercourse of a few hours I found I could with you at once come to a common understanding, which so opened my heart towards you as to make it easy to express what the soul can only utter when conscious of communion with an allied spirit.[100]

Bunsen went on to express to Arnold his admiration for the Anglican church and expounded upon his liturgical project and aspirations. Over a decade later, when Bunsen was first sent as envoy to England in 1840, Arnold's friendship and connections would prove very useful for Bunsen as he began to integrate himself into English society. Through a shared sense of religious feeling and commitment to reviving and reshaping the Christian church, these men inspired one another to act in service, literarily, politically, and otherwise, to advancing the causes that were important to them.

[100] Bunsen to Arnold, April 26th, 1828. This letter was written by Bunsen in English. Bunsen commonly wrote to his English friends in their native language. See: Bunsen, *Memoir,* vol. 1, p. 316.

Patronage and Philanthropy: The Royal Literary Fund

As his influence and reputation grew in England, Bunsen increasingly became a patron to causes that he saw as important for spiritual revival or church reform in England and Germany, and he developed key relationships in order to exercise that patronage. At one level, he worked within extant institutional frameworks to provide material support for those whom he considered to be worthy or important recipients. An examination of his activities within one such institution can illustrate this patronage at work: the Royal Literary Fund (RLF), which provided monetary grants to authors who were "in distress" and whose works contributed in some way to the expansion of literary greatness.[101] Academics, poets, playwrights, and novelists enjoyed the patronage of the RLF, but Bunsen's attentions within the RLF shows his preference for a specific type of recipient.

Bunsen was probably introduced into the RLF organization by its secretary, Octavian Blewitt, who served between 1839 and 1864. Blewitt originally encountered Bunsen in Rome during the mid-1830s during his own extensive travels in Italy and the Middle East. As with so many other of the connections Bunsen made in Rome, Blewitt was so impressed by Bunsen's piety and expertise on Roman antiquity, that he cited Bunsen ten times within his own 700-page handbook for travelers to Central Italy.[102] A deeply pious Anglican, Blewitt also authored a 28-page pamphlet entitled *Treatise on the Happiness arising from the Exercise*

[101] The RLF bestowed many such grants beginning in 1790, and received a royal imprimatur in the early 1830s. For more on the Fund's history, see: Nigel Cross, *The Royal Literary Fund: 1790-1918: An Introduction to the Fund's History and Archives with an Index of Applicants* (London: World microfilms publications, 1984).

[102] Octavian Blewitt, *A Hand-Book for Travellers in Central Italy: Including the Papal States, Rome, and the Cities of Etruria* (London: J. Murray, 1850).

of the Christian Faith in 1832.[103] Under Blewitt's stewardship, the RLF dispensed hundreds of grants to authors whose work promoted biblical criticism or popular Christian morality.

One grant recipient was George Henry Christian Egestorff. Egestorff was a lecturer and teacher of the German language in England. His translation of the epic poem *Der Messias* by Klopstock brought his attention to Bunsen who supported Egerstorff's 1851 grant application, for which Egestorff received 15 pounds sterling. Across this and subsequent applications, he received a total of £70 between 1817 and 1858. Egestorff eventually became a Lecturer of English at the Johanneum Hamburg.

Another RLF grant was awarded to Aaron Pick, a professor of Hebrew, a biblical scholar and the author of *The Bible Students' Concordance* and several translations of the Bible. On Pick's application to the RLF in 1852, Bunsen was once again the first endorsing signatory, among others, appealing for "assistance in distress." All of the letters of recommendation spoke to Pick's great character and, most notably, of his importance for Christian work. Another of Pick's patrons was the English theologian Thomas Hartwell Horne, who was one of Bunsen's first connections in England. Likely, it was Horne who told Bunsen of Pick's substantial difficulties. The RLF must have held Pick's works to be particularly meritorious, as his total grants amounted to £215 throughout his life.[104]

---

[103] Indeed, such handbooks were an integral part of the agenda of Bunsen and his allies, in order to disseminate Christian morality to those who were less influenced by traditional church services. See: Octavian Blewitt, *A Treatise on the Happiness arising from the Exercise of the Christian Faith* (London: Simpkin & Marshall, 1832).

[104] £215 in 1852 would be worth about £21,000 in 2016 purchasing power. Source: MeasuringWorth, a project run by an international consortium of economists and economic historians headed by Samuel Williamson, Lawrence Officer, Joel Mokyr, Gregory Clark, and Richard Sylla, among many others. https://www.measuringworth.com/.

A third recipient was Rev. John Hobart Caunter. Caunter received a written endorsement from Julius Hare, who claimed him to be a man of pure and simple character, and "no foundation whatever for the rumours which charged him with moral guilt."[105] In this application, we once again find the written endorsement of Horne who vouches for Caunter:

> The Rev. Hobart Caunter's work on the poetry of the Pentateuch in 2 volumes is the result of much and attentive study of that portion of the Holy Scripture. All who take a deep interest in sacred literature, will read it with pleasure. But in these days of cheap literature, I fear it is too good a book ever to repay the author for the time and labor bestowed on the completion of it.[106]

Caunter received £50 in his first application to RLF in 1847, and after his death, even his widow was provided for, receiving another £50 between 1851-1852. Hare, Bunsen, and their allies published a pamphlet appealing to the benevolence of those in society who wanted to offer assistance for "a clergyman's widow and orphans totally unprovided for."[107] At the top of the list of subscribers, in bold face, was listed a £10 donation from the Bishop of London, a key endorsement.

The substantial degree to which Bunsen, Hare, Horne, and other like-minded colleagues solicited and allocated support for figures like Caunter, Pick, and Egestorff is evidence of patronage and charity towards a specific type of individual. Recipients of RLF grants endorsed by this network were not authors of general, secular literary value along the lines of Charles Dickens (who was also a RLF grant recipient), but rather fit a certain mold:

---

[105] Caunter had been charged by orthodox churchmen of subversion because of his sermons which had attacked those conservative churchmen for hypocrisy. See: "*Sermon VIII 'Religion Essentially Practical'*" in: John H. Caunter, *Sermons preached in St. Paul's chapel*, *Marylebone* (London: Edward Churton, 1842), pp. 131-148.

[106] Loan 96 RLF 1/1179, The British Library Western Manuscripts Collection.

[107] Loan 96 RLF 1/1179, The British Library Western Manuscripts Collection.

Protestant clergymen, biblical scholars, theologians, unemployed former professors, those who contributed towards an understanding of ancient and early Christianity, and those, like Egestorff, who followed transnational careers, connecting England with Germany. It is important to see how Bunsen and his allies worked within the existing framework of a royal financial patronage institution to direct funds to those who were sympathetic to their religious and political concerns.

Bunsen's connections and status within the RLF institutional framework was particularly crucial. Beyond his endorsements for individual applications, Bunsen acted as a conduit between the RLF and the Prussian monarch. Having met Bunsen in Rome, the RLF general secretary Octavian Blewitt called on Bunsen to secure Prussian royal patronage, by asking Bunsen to forward a report to Berlin.[108] Blewitt's report indicated the specifics of the Fund's activities and how influential and helpful it had been towards writers from Prussia. Appealing to Friedrich Wilhelm's sense of Prussian ascendence within central Europe, Blewitt crossed out "Prussian" and replaced it with "German" when describing how the RLF had assisted "many German writers" in his draft letter. Within just two months, Bunsen returned with a contribution from the Prussian King of One-hundred pounds sterling.[109] The RLF sent a letter to the King thanking him for his support:

> We regard this instance of your Majesty's patronage as a gratifying testimony to the value of an Institution which has afforded assistance to the distressed Authors of

[108] Loan 96 RLF 5/9/12, Western Manuscripts Collection, British Library, p. 3. On January 24th, 1842, Blewitt sent a letter to Bunsen which began: "Your kindness at Rome, and subsequently in your joining the Literary Fund at my request, induces me to take the liberty of asking you, if an opportunity should occur, to lay before His Majesty the King of Prussia, the accompanying Reports of the Fund."

[109] Not to be outdone, the Tsar Nicolas I of Russia donated 155£ during the same year. The French King, Louis-Philippe declined to donate anything to the Fund, to the consternation of the Fund officials.

> genius and learning, Foreign as well as British, for upward of half a century, and whose substantial aid has been experienced in every nation of Europe.[110]

In subsequent years, Bunsen became more involved with and celebrated by the Literary Fund. In 1846, Bunsen was asked to act as the presiding chair for the annual dinner reception for the RLF. In attendance was The Bishop of Lincoln, John Kaye, who praised Bunsen as "one of the ablest divines of the day."[111] Such praise should be seen as remarkable for a man who never held an academic or ecclesiastical position, underscoring his influence as a layman within the religious sphere. This was a notable instance of public support for Bunsen in a time when he had been accused of heresy within the pages of publications sympathetic to the Tractarian movement such as The English Review and *The Christian Remembrancer*. In this way, it can be seen that the Broad Church movement enjoyed the symbolic solidarity and support of the RLF, but also that the reformers had a substantial amount of control and influence within the RLF institutional leadership.

A contemporary attendee of the dinner observed: "It is unusual for a foreigner to have been invited to preside" but surmised that Bunsen "would have felt bound to decline the distinction, if he had not regarded it as a compliment to his King and country."[112] This observation was likely correct, as Bunsen labored continuously to boost the reputation of Prussia within English circles. One can hardly doubt that he felt gratified for the public show

---

[110] Loan 96 RLF 5/9/12, Western Manuscripts Collection, British Library, p. 4.

[111] It is worth pointing out the reputation of Bunsen as a "Divine," usually reserved for academic theologians or clergymen, speaks to his stature within those communities. See: Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 2, p. 118.

[112] Bunsen, *Memoir,* vol. 2, p. 118.

of support with regard to his position on church politics, especially from the seat of an institution that carried a royal charter.

Missionaries & Evangelism

> Being desirous to cultivate brotherly relations with true believers throughout the whole of Christendom, and thus to be helpers of each other's faith and charity, we avail ourselves of this opportunity to express our hearty sympathy with those brethren on the Continent, who are labouring for the defence of the Protestant faith, and the wider spread of the Gospel.[113]

Since its foundation in 1846, Bunsen was heavily involved with the Evangelical Alliance (EA) which is currently the oldest evangelical organization in the UK.[114] Originally, Bunsen was connected to this association by August Tholuck during his time as chaplain in Rome in 1827-8, and years later, during his tenure in England, Bunsen worked to strengthen ties between the Alliance and Prussian corollaries. Bunsen's influence within the Alliance, as a financially and politically powerful patron, steered the Alliance's agenda. Bunsen once wrote to the Alliance's "Correspondence Committee" that their mission ought to be to reach pan-Protestant harmony and to "strengthen the cause of Protestantism and to render the ranks of Protestantism more impregnable to the assaults of Popery."[115]

---

[113] Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 2, pp. 426-428. This was a Latitudinarian statement of faith and solidarity from British & Irish Anglicans and Dissenters to the Prussian Evangelical Church in 1857.

[114] The term "evangelical" as used here, is defined as those Protestant Christians whose faith rests on the centrality of the "born-again" or "awakened" conversion experience popular amongst British Methodists, German Pietists and Moravians, Low-church Anglicans and Baptists.

[115] GStA PK, VI. HA FA Bunsen, A.21 no. 79.

In a 1846 letter to Karl Sieveking, the powerful Syndik of Hamburg, Bunsen wrote that "nothing interests me so nearly as the Evangelical Alliance," equating it with the General Synod of the Prussian Evangelical Church.[116] Both the General Synod in Prussia and the EA in England acted as plenary conferences which would bring together church officials, theologians, jurists, government ministers and laymen to decide upon issues relating to church reform, governance, and missionary work. Despite some bitter debates in both cases, Bunsen and his allies saw these meetings as instances to strengthen the awareness of Protestants as belonging to a broader community, as well as a chance to celebrate their living faith. He boasted to Sieveking that 200 Anglican clergy had attended the meeting, including the brother of Prime Minister John Russell, Lord Wriothesley Russell, one of the four canons who presided over St. George's chapel at Windsor Castle, along with nearly as many dissenting ministers.[117]

At the London meeting, Bunsen publicly advocated for the formation of a missionary arm of the Alliance to evangelize abroad. The primary aim of this group within the EA would be to raise funds for missionaries traveling within British colonies, and to translate, publish, and reprint copies of popular German tracts and pamphlets into English for dissemination in the colonies.[118]

---

[116] Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 2, p. 112.

[117] Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 2, p. 114.

[118] Nicholas Railton, *No North Sea: The Anglo-German Evangelical Network in the Middle of the Nineteenth Century* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), pp. 250-1.

The Baroness Burdett-Coutts

Beyond the institutional level, Bunsen formed relationships with individual wealthy and powerful benefactors in the English gentry and nobility. One such example was his strong friendship with the philanthropist noblewoman Angela Burdett-Coutts, one of the wealthiest women in England. He sent the Baroness a letter on the eve of the abdication of the French King Louis-Phillippe in 1848, indicating that he was troubled by the events, but that he had faith in the potential Regency of Prince Phillippe, writing "God will protect Her who confided in Him & is pure of all guilt which may attach itself to her family."[119]

The use of such idioms and sentiments of royalism and Christian piety ran through the correspondence between Bunsen and the Baroness. In 1846, he presented her with a personal gift of his recently published *Collection of German Hymns and Prayers* which he wrote was a "sort of German Book of Common Prayer," for the composition of which "the materials are in part taken from the English; the greatest portion contains the standard productions of Germany during the last 300 years, besides many gems of Christian antiquity."[120]

Bunsen depended on the wealthy heiress for patronage and donations to various causes he had championed. In one letter, Bunsen asked for financial assistance on behalf of the Polish poet Zygmunt Krasinski, a nationalist whose novels and poems were thought to evoke Christian feelings of love and charity and whose ill-health brought him to England where he caught Bunsen's attention with his poetry. In the same letter, he brought a subscription book asking for 40£ on behalf of a Moravian church mission to the "West India Negroes" of the

[119] It is to be assumed that "Her" is the Baroness herself, who Bunsen is assuring of divine protection. Burdett-Coutts Manuscript, Add MS 85282, British Library, Western Manuscripts Collection. pp. 1-3.

[120] Burdett-Coutts Manuscript, Add MS 85282, British Library, Western Manuscripts Collection. p. 8

Danish Antilles and another request asking for funds to build a Moravian school in the same colony. Of the project to build a school, Bunsen wrote:

> The [subscription] book is headed by an autograph inscription of no less personage than the King of Prussia, and contains the subscription of the Queen of Prussia, Queen Victoria & many distinguished and pious men in Germany. The permission of the Danish Govt [sic] for building the school has been obtained. Having laid these papers before you, I must leave the rest to your own kind consideration: what you feel yourself moved to do will, I am sure, be well employed.[121]

Bunsen also sent a copy of his treatise "The Constitution of the Church of The Future" to Burdett-Coutts, highlighting passages in his book's appendices about the Institutions of Protestant Deaconesses in Paris and Kaiserswerth, and "similar institutions for suffering humanity."[122] In so doing, Bunsen directed the Countess' attention to reports of the Moravian reverend Theodor Fliedner, who opened the famous Deaconess training center in Düsseldorf in 1836, as well as to the reports of the "*Rauhes Haus*" in Hamburg opened by Bunsen's close associate, the theologian Johann Wichern. The *Rauhes Haus* was an institution for poor or abandoned boys from Hamburg's slums. These institutions were all key institutions of the Inner Mission's activities in Germany.

Bunsen's endorsements of these institutions, which promoted Christian charity and the moral rehabilitation of "fallen women" and delinquent, or destitute youth, was a segue to his asking for the Baroness' patronage for a similar project of his own - the German Hospital in Dalston, London:

> Now I conclude with a begging. I never beg for my friends, and scarcely ever for my Countrymen. But here is a public institution, a free hospital, destined to relieve, as far as its means go, the English hospitals of London, of the German poor residing in this

[121] Burdett-Coutts Manuscript, Add MS 85282, British Library, Western Manuscripts Collection. p. 10.

[122] Burdett-Coutts Manuscript, Add MS 85252, British Library, Western Manuscripts Collection. p. 18.

> metropolis. (We have 40 beds, always full); and besides give relief to the English poor of the Parish of Dalston (whose clergyman is a member of the Committee) as Out-patients, to the amount of £1000 a year.[123]

The heiress gave generously to all of Bunsen's requests, for which he offered her a ticket to the Bazaar (described on the broadsheet as a "Fancy Fair") to be held as a fundraiser for the German hospital on June 1st, 1848. Bunsen, the Steward of the Dalston Hospital, offered to escort the Baroness personally throughout the fair, boasting to her that "[the fair] contains all what the industry of our Queens and Princesses, and the patriotism of our German towns has accumulated for that purpose, amongst others, beautiful embroideries of the Queen of Prussia and Wurttemberg, the portrait of the Prince of Prussia presented by his princess and vice-versa."[124]

Bunsen lavished praise and gratitude on Baroness Burdett-Coutts for her many gifts. Often writing "I bless God for having so great means to so noble and wide a heart!" and "You are THE eminent Patroness of all what is intended for the relief of suffering humanity"[125] One of Bunsen's gifts was the ability to draw in those who could assist in his patronage projects, either through friendship, flattery, or a shared sense of piety. Bunsen utilized his charisma and connections to create his own "Inner Mission" style project for Germans living in London, as he had once done in Rome before his resignation in 1838.

[123] Burdett-Coutts Manuscript, Add MS 85252, British Library, Western Manuscripts Collection, p. 18.

[124] Add MS 85252, British Library, Western Manuscripts Collection, p. 20.

[125] Add MS 85252, British Library, Western Manuscripts Collection, p. 33, 19.

The Dalston Hospital

The German Hospital at Dalston, of which Bunsen was the Steward and vice-president, was an institution linked in spirit and function to other similar institutions that sprang up to attend to the spiritual and material care of those affected by increasing poverty during the industrial era. Inspired by his friends Fliedner and Wichern, and responding to a clear and present need amongst the German-speaking immigrants in London in the 1840s, Bunsen set out to construct a hospital in the image of those institutions.

By some estimates, between 30,000-40,000 Germans were living in London in the early 1840s, most of whom did not speak English, and about 20,000 of whom were Protestant. In 1848, Bunsen organized an appeal to be signed by the most prominent ministers of the German churches of London. Dr. Wilhelm Kuper, chaplain of the Royal German chapel in London, Rev. Steinkopff, Minister at of the Lutheran Church at Savoy, Rev. Johann Tiarks, Minister at the German Reformed Church at Hooper Square, Adolph Walbaum, Chaplain to the Prussian Embassy and to Dalston Hospital, Rev. Louis Cappell, Minister to the Lutheran Church at Whitechapel, all signed this letter. Each one of these signatories, in addition to their ministerial duties at the various German churches in London, were members of the Committee of the Dalston hospital.[126] The ministers were deeply troubled by the impoverishment of Germans in London, which was relatively well-known at the time. But in addition to the material suffering of these Germans, the ministers were most especially concerned at their spiritual apathy: “It is lesser known, that an even larger number [of the

[126] (Dalston), German Hospital, *German Hospital, Dalston, Supported by Voluntary Contributions, (in Connexion with Which Is a Sanatorium) ; Opened 15th October, 1845. For the Reception of Natives of Germany, Others Speaking the German Language, and English in Cases of Accidents*. (London: Wertheimer, 1846).

Germans living in London] find themselves in the deepest spiritual hardship and impoverishment," they attested.[127] The appeal asked Bunsen for 100-120£ to hire and fill a new missionary position to minister to the spiritual needs of these Germans who were straying from the church. The ministers speculated that they had perhaps stopped attending church services in London out of shame for their tattered clothing.

Bunsen had solicited the donations of the wealthy Baroness Burdett-Coutts, but also received substantial patronage for this project from his friend, the monarch Friedrich Wilhelm IV. Over the course of time, a vast fundraising operation was mobilized to support the institution, and many of the German merchants living in Berlin donated generously, as did some English businessmen who employed German workers. Over time, Queen Victoria and Prince Albert also donated to the hospital, impressed by Bunsen's commitment and grateful to the hospital for serving the surrounding Dalston community as well. Indeed, Bunsen took pride in the services which the hospital rendered for free to the poor. In 1844, Bunsen visited Kaiserswerth and impressed Fliedner so much that Fliedner offered to send four or five of his own Deaconesses to Dalston to serve in Bunsen's Mission.

Much of the work that Bunsen did within the circles of English society was done with a view towards the prevailing evangelical interests of the period: moral improvement, especially for young people and women, missionary work abroad, and reviving a spirit of Christian feelings within society, and in this way the Dalston Hospital can be seen as a node connected to other *Innere Mission* institutions in Germany like the *Rauhe Haus* run by Johann Wichern near Hamburg, the *Diakonie* in Kaiserswerth, and other *Stiftungen* run by Moravians

[127] GStA-PK, VI, HA FA Bunsen, B1a no. 43, pp. 101-104. "Es ist weniger bekannt, dass einen noch größere Anzahl von ihnen in der tiefsten geistige Noth und Armuth sich befindet."

and Pietists in Germany and beyond. Bunsen rallied the financial and political support of wealthy patrons, both English and German, in London in order to support such efforts.

A distinct confessional character was programmed into these institutions. As we saw in 1819 with Bunsen's Protestant Hospital in Rome, a primary motivation for its creation was to tend to the medical needs of Protestants while preserving their confessional purity and access to spiritual care without fear of conversion at the hands of Catholic nuns. Unlike the situation in Rome, the patients who entered the German hospital at Dalston did not need to fear bedside proselytizing at the hands of Roman Catholics. Nevertheless, Bunsen made sure that the hospital chapel and grounds utilized his own liturgy for their daily prayers and worship services, imprinting the Dalston campus with a confessional tone that he hoped would bring his patients and staff closer to Christ.

The Dalston hospital, then, can be seen as a kind of headquarters for the operations of German missionary networks in England in the 1840s. The Dalston Hospital operators and fundraisers themselves were also involved with the Missions in Hamburg and Kaiserswerth. Indeed, the German ministers Steinkopff and Kuper mentioned above raised funds two decades prior during Theodor Fliedner's 1824 tour through England to relieve the poverty which had struck Kaiserswerth south of Düsseldorf, twelve years before Fliedner's Kaiserswerth Mission officially opened.[128]

Missionary impulses are the common thread which connects these ventures. The men and women who contributed to this project were drawn together through a shared interest in the relief of suffering and to address the social questions of the period, but it is important to

[128] The missionary impulses connecting these institutions ran deep, as Fliedner, Bunsen, and other institutions sought to tend to social ills in their locales. See: Jürgen Püschel, *Die Geschichte des German Hospital in London, 1845 bis 1948* (Münster: Verl. Murken-Altrogge, 1980), pp. 17-40.

also emphasize the eschatological and revivalist flavor which characterized the motivations of Bunsen and his circle. In 1840, Bunsen wrote to his wife:

> I desired particularly to mark the blessing which had attended the Missionary work in rousing religious feeling among German Protestants, commenting upon the sad condition of whole districts and provinces from which the spirit of life had fled; and showing that only the conception of one universal Church could offer a prospect satisfactory to Christian contemplation. As a secondary result, I noted the gain in knowledge of humanity in general from the spread of Missions, and **in particular as to establishing the fact of the unity of the human race.** . . . **what has been accomplished as yet must be looked upon as proof of the power existing for the renewal of humanity by means of Christianity**; and that we are now called upon to found Christian Communities not to aim merely at single conversions by means of single efforts. [emphasis Bunsen's][129]

The communal efforts of these Christian institutions such as the Dalston Hospital, the various *Diakonie* establishments at Kaiserswerth, Hamburg and Halle, would accomplish much more in the eyes of Bunsen and his allies than could be done simply through the distribution of Bibles or even the reformation of any liturgy. But all of these efforts were in service of a grander future, one in which the Kingdom of God could unfold on Earth under Christian auspices. Even (or especially) through the turbulent times of the 1848-49 Revolutions, those in this network used the idioms of a pre-millenarian eschatological future to comfort one another:[130] Hare wrote to Bunsen on October 30th, 1849: "When we cannot work for the present, we may at least work for the future: and in spite of Austria & Russia; of

[129] Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 577.

[130] Common amongst Bunsen and those in his circle was a utopian hope for a future era of peace and prosperity. See: Keith A. Mathison, *An Eschatology of Hope* (Phillipsburg: P&R Publishing, 1999).

Socialists & Red Republicans, of the hangman & the Devil, a glorious future is coming & shall come. God shall reign & Christ shall be glorified. Amen."[131]

There was a significant amount of crossover among missionary organizations such as the Evangelical Alliance, the British Foreign Bible Society, and the London Society for Promoting Christianity Among the Jews. It is useful to consider Bunsen as a central figure working within and across these organizations. Bunsen mustered financial and political support for these institutions, but also worked to exercise influence when it seemed prudent and possible. One such organization was The London Society for Promoting Christianity Among the Jews (LSPCJ), an association which was among the first missionary networks of the Anglican church to have a global reach. In an 1845 letter to Arthur Hamilton-Gordon, then the sixteen-year-old son of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Lord Aberdeen, Bunsen cleverly attempted to influence the outcome of a consular appointment in Jerusalem. Bunsen's candidate was a pious man named James Finn, himself a philanthropist and writer, who was also a member of the LSPCJ.

In this instance, as in others, those within this network were keen to present the goals of evangelical mission work as *separate* from the more official duties of the British Government, so as to avoid giving any impression of bias.[132] Regarding Finn's appointment, Bunsen wrote to the Foreign Minister's son: "but of course, [Finn] would have to consider

[131] GStA-PK, VI, HA Bunsen, B1a, no. 43, pp. 318-320.

[132] The question of whether it was geo-political or religious impulses that led the British to open a Consulate in Jerusalem is a matter of scholarly debate. See p. 166 in: P. E. Caquet, *The Orient, the Liberal Movement, and the Eastern Crisis of 1839-41* (New York: Springer, 2016). The competing assumptions are that the British were keen to open the consulate to protect pilgrims and travelers to the region, or that the consulate was the result of significant lobbying on behalf of the LSPCJ and other missionary groups.

himself, if placed in such a situation, as a faithful organ and agent of government and not allow his connection with the Society to interfere with his duties, or to bias his judgment." and "I do not think he would allow his private ears and his connection with the Society to interfere with his duties or obscure conscious judgment"[133] Bunsen was clear in his correspondence with Gordon that he had also recommended the Prussian consular official, Ernst Gustav Schulz, as well, who could assist the incoming British officials because of his expertise with Hebrew and Arabic. Finn eventually did win the appointment, and while the degree of Bunsen's influence is not clear, it is suggestive of a trend in which the bestowal of influential diplomatic and ministerial offices were mediated at the time through public acts of piety, such as membership in the LSPCJ.

University Politics

A major frontline for the struggle between orthodox Anglican conservatives and the Broad Church Reformers, Dissenters and Unitarians was within the various universities and colleges in England. Throughout most of the nineteenth century, formal education in England was under the purview of the Anglican Church, which was keen to enforce Anglican orthodoxy. The University College of London (UCL) opened in 1826 as a secular institution, allowing the matriculation of dissenters and built without a chapel for compulsory services - a radical move for the era. The conservative response to this "godless institution in Gower Street" was to open a rival institution. Tories and orthodox Anglicans raised the financial and

[133] Add MS 49233, The Stanmore Papers. Correspondence and papers of Arthur Hamilton-Gordon, 1st Baron Stanmore (1829-1912), colonial governor; 1841-1912, with Supplementary Aberdeen Papers; 1803-1861. The British Library, Western Manuscripts Collection, p. 13.

political capital to build King's College of London (KCL), which despite also permitting dissenters, mandated chapel service attendance. Indeed, the Bishop of London, Charles Blomfield, wanted to ensure that religious thought was intertwined with intellectual production in universities. Blomfield had preached that wisdom was only attainable when "the light of divine truth and energy of heavenly motives" were also present.[134] As universities became sites of competing political and religious ideologies, professors who violated or transgressed political and religious norms of the church increasingly found themselves facing disciplinary panels, sometimes leading to termination.

In one such case, a theology professor at KCL named Frederick Maurice (1805-1872) was fired after publishing a series of essays which cast doubts on the theological foundations of eternal damnation for the wicked.[135] At a special hearing, Blomfield said Maurice's book was "of a dangerous tendency and calculated to unsettle the minds of the theological students at King's College" and recommended severing Maurice's relationship with the university.[136] Bunsen and his friends had been keeping close watch over this and similar events. Furious about Maurice's ouster, Archdeacon Hare wrote to Bunsen :

> The blind bigots know not what evil they have been doing to the College, and to our whole Church, strengthening Unitarianism in all its forms, repelling all who cannot believe that the greatest proof of God's glory is the everlasting damnation of ninety-nine hundredths of the human race. No heathen could have believed this; & this is the Gospel we are bid to back & preach! I hope you are going on prosperously in

---

[134] Malcolm Johnson, *Bustling Intermeddler?: The Life and Work of Charles James Blomfield* (Leominster: Gracewing Publishing, 2001), p. 34.

[135] The issue of damnation was contentious, because many lay Christians felt that it ran counter to the beliefs in the unity of all things in the divine love and the Kingdom of God, while fundamentalist groups and establishment churchmen felt that it was necessary to compel obedience. Of note here is to understand that Maurice's opponents took issue with his using moral criteria to evaluate theological doctrines. See: Alan Richardson, *The Westminster Dictionary of Christian Theology* (Westminster: John Knox Press, 1983), pp. 143-144.

[136] An account of Maurice's termination can be found in: Johnson, *Bustling Intermeddler?*, pp. 35-36.

> body and mind. But I cannot write about anything else. The best and wisest man in our Church [Maurice] is condemned for one of the grandest, most heroic books ever written, because he dares to say that the fires of hell are not the foundation of God's truth & love.[137]

Hare's letter, dripping with outrage and sarcasm, illustrates the fractures in the Anglican landscape. On one side were the Tories and High Church Anglicans, who believed that dogmatic orthodoxy was necessary to keep the church pure and effective in society, and on the other were dissenters, liberals, reformists and their sympathizers, who believed that rigid dogmatism only repelled people from the church.

> What will be done in the University question? My opinion has been for a long while to let all the Colleges continue to exist as particular institutions of the National Church, but to raise the University to a general establishment, on the system of a Scottish or German University, only Divinity might be taught exclusively by, although not exclusively for, members of the Episcopal Church, which, in most of the lectures, would not exclude any rational dissenter. - Bunsen to Arnold Jan. 13th, 1835[138]

Religious toleration and religious liberty were deeply held convictions on the part of Bunsen, Hare, Arnold, and their allies, for in their view, persecution would drive dissenters further away and ultimately damage the state of Christendom. The concept of religious liberty in the university is a thread which connects many of the issues of the 1830s and 1840s which preoccupied the efforts and energies of Bunsen and his allies. The issue of allowing dissenters into the oldest universities in England was enormously controversial, leading to protests and arrests. In 1834, a Bill was rejected by the House of Lords which would have permitted entrance into these universities based on a simple statement of Christian faith, rather than the

[137] Hare to Bunsen, Nov. 1st, 1853, GStA-PK VI, HA Bunsen. B2, no. 80, pp. 17-18.

[138] In the English case, all university instruction had been under the purview of the Anglican Church. Bunsen thought the tensions of allowing dissenters could be soothed by allowing the Universities to secularize (aside from their Theological Faculties), along the lines of the German University System. See: Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, pp. 410-411.

more conservative pledging of allegiance to the 39 Articles of the Anglican Church. Professors, theologians, clergymen, and politicians began to publicly take sides on this debate through publishing and activism. Among them was the Oxford Professor Renn Hampden, who taught at Oxford between 1829-1846. In 1832, Hampden gave a series of lectures which his opponents had deemed heretical in his rejection of the Holy Trinity. After his publication of a book defending religious dissenters in 1834 and his nomination to become the Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford in 1836, Hampden was viciously opposed by conservatives and High Churchmen who considered him to be a dangerous teacher for future generations of clergymen at Oxford.[139]

These accusations of heresy and other forms of religiously motivated condemnation by the most powerful members of England's elite institutions show both the stakes and magnitude of social and political issues at the time. The issue of admission of non-Anglican Christians to Oxford and Cambridge and the dogged ways in which individuals entrenched themselves on one side of this debate or the other show us that the English educational system became strained when elites and conservatives felt that the piety and purity of their highest educational institutions would be tarnished by those who did not believe or worship in the correct way. This was especially true with regard to the issue of religious education, about which Whigs and liberal politicians and leaders tended to promote a more latitudinarian attitude towards dissenters and other minority religious groups, while their Tory and

[139] Vivian Hubert Howard Green, *Religion at Oxford and Cambridge* (London: SCM Publishing, 1964), p.268. Incidentally, V. H. H. Green (1915-2005) was the former teacher of acclaimed spy novelist David John Moore Cornwell, better known by his pen-name: John le Carré, who said that V. H. H. Green was the inspiration for the character George Smiley, the intelligence officer and central character of most of le Carré's novels.

Tractarian counterparts preferred a more orthodox approach to doctrinal issues and a more hostile attitude towards dissenters.[140]

Privately amongst themselves, Bunsen and friends deeply resented what they saw as the persecution of Nonconformists like Hampden and Maurice. Rather than simply being an observer of these events, however, Bunsen found himself at the center of the controversy. A Tractarian clergymen observed in 1847: "You know whom we have to thank for Dr. Hampden's appointment? *It is all Bunsen's doing*, he prevailed upon the Queen to lay her commands [to appoint Hampden] upon Lord John [Russell, the Prime Minister]."[141] The fears that the conservative clergy had of the influence of a German diplomat over their Queen, if nothing else, shows their respect for his stature within English political life. Although Bunsen had not known Dr. Hampden prior to the controversy around his appointment and had even cautioned his friend Thomas Arnold against his vigorous defense of Hampden in 1838, Bunsen did play a supporting role in Hampden's career after being sacked from Oxford. In truth, the decision to elect Hampden as the Bishop of Hereford in 1847 was heavily influenced by then-Prime Minister John Russell. Bunsen had become close with Russell, who had Bunsen over to his home on the evening of Hampden's election. Bunsen, Russell, and the rest saw this event as a success. Bunsen wrote privately that Lord Russell was "radiant with satisfaction" while Bunsen toasted to Hampden's new office and parishioners, adding "and he who has managed them," while gesturing toward Lord Russell.[142]

---

[140] The political and theological debates over who should have access to university education created high tensions in England in this period. See: Mike Higton, *A Theology of Higher Education* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012) pp. 79-106.

[141] Bunsen, *Memoir,* vol. 2, p. 152.

[142] Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 2, p. 155.

Perhaps the Tractarian opponents of the dissenters feared that Bunsen represented an element they could not control: Deeply pious and enamored of Anglicanism yet not Anglican himself, who sought to bridge the gaps between confessions via his liturgical works, and altogether too close to the English monarchy for comfort. As a layman and a German, Bunsen was able to wield influence in the British religious landscape through his social relationships, acting outside of the bounds of formal parliamentary or ecclesiastical hierarchy. To the extent that it was possible, Bunsen weighed in and attempted to influence university appointments on behalf of reform-minded theologians, so that England's educational system could also act within his broader mission: to achieve Pan-Protestant harmony by resisting orthodoxy and raising dissenters into the political and social mainstream.

Liturgy, Union, Renewal:

In 1834, Bunsen carefully and meticulously introduced his liturgical project in a letter written from Rome in reply to Richard Whately, the Anglican Archbishop of Dublin. Whately was a leading member of the Broad Church movement within the Anglican church, and represented a valuable and high-ranking contact for Bunsen to connect with within those circles. This private letter, sent by a mutual friend rather than via the less secure official post, offers a view of Bunsen's intimate thoughts and emotions around this issue, shared with someone who he considered symbolically powerful enough to extend the hand of friendship and alliance, though they had never met in person. Bunsen wrote to Whately that "we . . . entertain the same view as to the maintenance and strengthening of our Protestant churches by an Evangelical argument of their basis," referring to a set of shared beliefs: the centrality of

the conversion experience, a commitment to missionary efforts, the need for Christian charitable associations, and an emphasis on the spiritualization and moral conduct of daily life.[143] Furthermore, Bunsen was flattered to receive an inquiry about his liturgy from someone "placed so high in the literary world and occupying so elevated a station in the Church of the greatest Protestant Nation."[144]

It is worth exploring at length some passages that Bunsen wrote privately to Whately, for they illuminate several important pillars of Bunsen's theological and political foundation. First, as to why he began the liturgical projects in the first place:

> It was in the year 1817 that being in Rome I began to make researches into the origin and history of the Liturgy of the ancient and modern churches under the conviction that the time was near when liturgical arrangements would generally be found the only means of reviving our church establishments and of becoming a bond between different confessions.[145]

Such language of renewal and revival permeates much of Bunsen's private correspondence. But the revival he sought was not the only aim, for he also sought to use the liturgy as a vehicle for the union of the Lutheran and Reformed churches across Germany, long sought by the Hohenzollern family. Bunsen continues:

> My attention was in that respect particularly directed to the Liturgy of the Church of England which I considered as the most perfect, admirable result of the religious convictions and researches of the 16th and 17th centuries as in general I hold that

[143] MS 2164, Whately Papers, Lambeth Palace, p. 10; Bunsen here is referring to the forms of sermons and church authority promulgated under the *Erweckungsbewegung*, in which pastors and church leaders would reorient their message to emphasize the spiritualization of everyday life, as opposed to a rationalist theological approach.

[144] MS 2164, Whately Papers, Lambeth Palace, p. 10.

[145] MS 2164, Whately Papers, Lambeth Palace, pp. 10-11. As mentioned in Chapter 1, Bunsen employed the services of each of his successive chaplains to research and rework the liturgy for the German church.

> church to be the Pride and Glory of Reformed and Evangelical Christianity in a great Empire.[146]

Bunsen's Anglophilia notwithstanding, what is most striking about these lines is that he believed that the Anglican church model, properly infused with the essence of legitimacy and authenticity provided by ancient Christianity, would represent the best chance to both unify and revitalize the spiritual lives of German Protestants.

> [Your letter to me] made me recollect the not less glorious time of the Reformation when the Christians of our two Nations held a close communion with each other conversing or corresponding on the points of which the history of the world, the state of the greatest kingdoms and Empires, and ... the salvation of millions of souls from the combined assault of external religion (which is superstition) and of barren atheism and unbelief was to depend for centuries to come.[147]

Bunsen saw both England and Germany as the heirs of the Reformation, and therefore uniquely able to save the souls of their countrymen from the antagonistic forces of atheism and "external religion." As sympathizers of the Broad Church movement, both men were wary of the Catholic Church. Throughout his lifetime, Bunsen wrote a number of different liturgical works. The first was a supplementary introduction attached to the official *Kirchenagende* of King Friedrich Wilhelm III. Bunsen's *Gesang und Gebetbuch* was, according to his Memoir, only ever officially introduced for use at the Protestant Gemeinde in Rome, the Bishopric at Jerusalem, a congregation in Liverpool, the German Hospital in London, and several colonies in Australia. Bunsen had a hand in each of these locations, though it is worth noting that his liturgy never saw official adoption within German borders. Nevertheless, he was afforded the continued patronage of the Prussian King who donated

[146] MS 2164, Whately Papers, Lambeth Palace, p. 12.

[147] MS 2164, Whately Papers, Lambeth Palace, p. 13.

1,500 Thalers towards the printing of his *Gebetbuch.*

Bunsen earned the attention of Archbishop Whately via the recommendation of their mutual friend Thomas Arnold. In a letter dated October 21, 1833, Arnold wrote to Bunsen that he had shown the Archbishop a copy of Bunsen's ideas with regard to liturgical reform, with the express intent of winning favor with someone whose connections and influence might be able to realize the outcome that they desired. Arnold wrote:

> I thought that I was not doing what you would disapprove in showing [your letter] to my very old and intimate friend the Archbishop of Dublin. This his influence with the Government there was some chance of your notions producing some fruit. And when Church Reform was likely to come before Parliament, I thought it most desirable that notions so beautifully pure and yet so impressive should be made known to those who might carry them into effect.[148]

The relationship between Arnold and Bunsen grew strong over the course from their first meeting in Rome in 1827 until Arnold's death in 1842. As with other members of Bunsen's inner circle, Arnold was a liberal historian who also admired Bunsen's mentor, Niebuhr. Their relationship was mediated by shared political opinions and ecclesiastical sympathies. It would be a fair characterization to say that these men were conservative liberals, skeptical of republicanism but sympathetic to reform in the political and spiritual spheres of society, such as the German ambition towards the creation of a constitutional monarchy, major reforms in education, social welfare programs for labor and women. They were especially keen to reform the spiritual lives of people both in terms of liturgical practice inside the church as well as the moral reform of the everyday lives of citizens.

A close reading of the correspondence between these men allows a deeper look at the ideas, notions and sympathies which bound them together. On a personal level, these men

[148] GStA-PK, VI, HA Bunsen, B.63, vol. 1, p. 11.

were intimate friends. The two men became so close that, six years after they met, Arnold honored Bunsen by naming his daughter after Bunsen's wife Frances, with "Bunsen" as the girl's middle name (Frances Bunsen Arnold). In his second letter to Bunsen, dated October 15th 1827, Arnold wrote:

> You would not think this extravagant & mere compliment, if you knew how deep a Pleasure it affords me to meet with a Man with whom I can thoroughly sympathize, **whose Principles & highest Hopes I know to be the same as my own**, while his opinions are in the true sense of the word free & Liberal. In England I am afraid this Union is not very common, with many of the Friends whom I most respect and love I cannot converse freely on all points without shocking some of those prejudices which as you well know beset in an unreasonable manner some of the most valuable of my Countrymen.[149] [emphasis added]

The constant affirmation their shared principles and hopes for the future runs through most of the correspondence. This passage is helpful in situating these men on the political spectrum as liberals who were nevertheless dedicated to a form of Christian idealism and spiritual revivalism which characterized the more zealous faction of the liberal, *Vermittlung* theological system. Favored by many academic theologians, this brand of theology distanced itself somewhat from the Pietist emphasis on feelings and inner devotion in favor of a version which would manifest the Kingdom of God as moral, ethical, and civilizational progress in the world. Yet, importantly, it must be reiterated that they were skeptical of "too much" liberty in the civil space, as such might threaten to destabilize the fabric of society. This school of thought posited history as a dialectical process unfolding on Earth between the spirit of man and the spirit of God. Conceptualized by Schleiermacher, this merger of culture and Protestantism sought to unify intellectual life, philosophy, history, literature, and theology.[150]

---

[149] GStA-PK, FA Bunsen, B.63, vol. 1, p. 3.

[150] Christian Albrecht. 2001. *Vermittlungstheologie als Christentumstheorie* (Hannover: Lutherisches Verlagshaus, 2001), pp. 9-17.

In this liberal version, a desire to incorporate modern thinking and the sciences was prevalent. Bunsen believed that liberal values ought to be tempered by gradual reforms combined with an moral foundation of hard work and self-sacrifice. It is no wonder, then, that Bunsen's liturgical revisions place the issue of self-sacrifice in the most prominent place at the end of the worship service. Upon receiving a copy of Bunsen's liturgy and hymnbook, Arnold wrote: "the Views of Christianity manifested throughout the whole work are completely in unison with my own, and while I was pleased to see how much you esteemed our Prayer Book, I regretted that we did not adopt some of those improvements which you had introduced."[151]

Bunsen's liturgy focused more on the role of the congregation through collective prayer and singing, rather than passively listening to a sermon. He believed that a more active participation would allow the worshipper to understand themselves as an essential part of the service. In other words, by giving their contribution to a worship service, the individual would have more investment in the collective spirit of the congregation and would feel that they had more emotional attachment to the faith.

Bunsen and his allies were always nervous about the potential effects of revolution, especially as it pertained to the church and state. Arnold wrote to Bunsen in March 1831, in the aftermath of the July Revolution in France, that he had been with Niebuhr when news arrived that Louis Phillippe had been installed as the head of France's constitutional monarchy. Arnold wrote, "I was struck with the enthusiastic joy which [Niebuhr] displayed on hearing it." Arnold, Niebuhr, and Bunsen represent a class of liberals who were

[151] Arnold to Bunsen, July 15th, 1828 in: GStA-PK, FA Bunsen, B.63 vol. 1, p. 3. Bunsen's liturgy was first printed in 1833 in Hamburg, but Arnold had an advanced, handwritten copy from Bunsen. See: Christian Bunsen, *Allgemeinen evangelischen Gesang- und Gebetbuchs zum Kirchen- und Hausgebrauche* (Hamburg: Friedrich Perthes, 1833), and chapter 4 of this dissertation.

nevertheless fond of some semblance of aristocratic order in society. In the same letter, Arnold wrote to Bunsen that he feared the "Democratical spirit" would gain power in the near future, and that "Reform would now … prevent destruction, but every year of delayed reform strengthens those who wish not to amend but to destroy."[152] Church reform was a tense issue, deeply necessary on the one hand to strengthen a weakening church, but fraught with risks as well. Arnold continued: "But I fear that our Reforms, instead of labouring to unite dissenters with the Church will confirm their separate Existence by relieving them from all which they now complain of as a Burden. And continuing distinct from the Church, will they not labour to effect its overthrow, til they bring us quite to the American Platform?"[153]

Arnold and Bunsen both shared concerns about bringing Dissenters back into the folds of the Church of England. Throughout the 1830s, Arnold published pamphlets, which he shared with Bunsen and others, which had a view to form a broader established Church of England. Arnold's reformed church would open-up the church to non-Anglican Dissenters within English Christendom, as well as giving more power to the laity and diminishing the clerical privileges of the Anglican clergy. The conservative Oxford Movement naturally resisted the reform-minded impulses of Arnold, both in public, in print and wherever else they had influence. Arnold wrote of the movement to Bunsen:

> I detest as cordially as you can do the Party of the "Movement," both in France and England. I detest Jacobinism in its Root and in its Branches, with all that godless Utilitarianism which is its favourite Aspect at this moment in England. Nothing within my knowledge is more utterly wicked than the Westminster Review, the Party of the Benthams, and Mills, and Austins, and Grotes, and Roebucks. Men too easily, and literally, as I fear, **blaspheme not the Son of Man but the Spirit of God. They hate**

[152] GStA-PK, FA Bunsen, B.63 vol. 1, p. 8.

[153] Arnold to Bunsen, May 6th, 1833, in: GStA-PK, FA Bunsen, B.63 vol. 1, p. 9. Arnold refers here to the status of religious denominations in the United States under the Establishment Clause, which gave special status to no American churches as far as the state was concerned.

Christ, because he is of Heaven & they are of Evil.[154] [emphasis added]

The zeal of Arnold's words is striking, and suffice to place Arnold to the right of the radicals on the religio-political spectrum, although it could be that Arnold found all secular, political parties to be ill-suited to the moral care and spiritual guidance of humanity. He confides in Bunsen here that not only are Jacobins to be detested, but also the Radical philosophers of Liberalism, all of whom were insufficiently pious in Arnold's view. Yet Arnold was also skeptical of the Tories, whose High Church tendencies too closely and too often aligned them with the Oxford Movement. Arnold, whose sole remaining possible political home was with the Whigs, nevertheless supported them, sometimes only tepidly. Still, through Arnold's influence, by the 1840s, Bunsen began to gradually shift away from the Tory mindset favored by Niebuhr and towards a more moderate Whiggish position.[155]

The Oxford Movement:

> Truth and falsehood, reality and sham, must soon separate, as fire from water. Whoever was not before convinced of the eternal truth of Gospel faith and the doctrine of justification by that living faith in the Saviour, would now become so here on beholding the deathlike superstition of the Puseyites.[156]

It is difficult to conceive of Bunsen and those in his closest network, including Julius Hare, Thomas Arnold, and Thomas Carlyle without also talking about the significance of the Anglo-Catholic Oxford Movement which emerged in 1833. The conservative, High Church

[154] Arnold to Bunsen, May 6th, 1833, in: GStA-PK, FA Bunsen, B.63 vol. 1, p. 9-11.

[155] Recall that during his time in Rome, Bunsen had been more in line with Niebuhr's political orientation towards the Tory party, while his experiences confronting and dealing with poverty in England, combined with the constitutional questions arising in the early 1840s in Germany, led Bunsen to adopt a more Whiggish position over time.

[156] Bunsen to Julius Schnorr von Carolsfeld, August 3rd, 1843, in: Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 2, p. 43.

position held by the “Tractarians” - so named for the 90 Tracts published by the group between 1833 and 1839 - was to bring the Church of England into closer communion with the Roman Church. Tractarian leaders such as John Henry Newman, Edward Bouverie Pusey, and James Anthony Froude caused turbulence within British religious circles with their writings suggesting that Anglicanism was one of three branches of the Catholic Church, alongside the Roman and Eastern churches.

The public debates between the adherents of the Oxford Movement and Broad Church evangelicals were wide-ranging, but was born out of a fear on behalf of conservatives that the spiritual lives of those in the church were weakening. While Bunsen and his group shared those fears, the two sides fundamentally disagreed on how best to revive feelings of piety in the Church. This group appears throughout the dissertation at various intervals, and often served as a foil to Bunsen and his allies.

Hare and Macmillan

Daniel Macmillan, the Scottish founder of the publishing corporation of the same name, contacted Julius Hare unsolicitedly by mail in September 1840, exclaiming that “I cannot help breaking through the usages of Society” to express the gratitude he felt for the tone of Hare’s collections of sermons. The relationship formed between Macmillian and Hare is fascinating, because it was originally formed around and mediated by their shared moral and religious interests. Macmillan, then just beginning his publishing business, had a view to boost Hare’s theological views in order to aid in the moral and religious instruction of English young men. Macmillan wrote:

> But there are still large classes who have no better foundation for their morality. In this London . . . I know a good deal of one class . . . who very much stand in need of guidebooks to aid them in the formation of opinions on moral and religion issues. Namely, young men occupied in the different departments of commercial life. Hundreds of them are continually coming here, fresh from the Country, with warm, pure, genial hearts, which soon become (one can scarcely say what) for no expression can be too strong to indicate which a few years produces.[157]

Macmillan lamented what he saw as the corruption and religious apathy of those in London's growing commercial class. Most importantly Macmillan expressed frustration with the ability of the established church to connect with these young men. He saw the Oxford Tractarians as deeply injurious to the cause of bringing young men into the church:

> The distrust which they have of those who ought to be their spiritual guides in still more hurtful. And this distrust is greatly increased by the perpetual squabbles which we have about Oxford Tract Doctrines" "Evils of Dissent" and the like. They hear the noise: ask those who stand next to them what it means: get for an answer "Humbug" "Priestcraft" and walk away quite satisfied. [158]

In particular, Macmillan believed that even the more spiritually curious men would be confused and put off by the complexities of formal Christian works, such as those advanced by High Churchman William Sewell.[159] Macmillan wrote of their confusion: "Having read this far, they cast the book aside, muttering 'deliver us from priestcraft' and so infidelity and much else of a kind and nature increase in the Land."[160] In order to remedy these issues, Macmillan had a lofty goal by contacting Julius Hare:

---

[157] Add MS 55109, MacMillan Archive, vol. 314, Western Manuscripts Collection, British Library, pp. 2-3.

[158] Add MS 55109, MacMillan Archive, vol. 314, Western Manuscripts Collection, British Library. pp. 3-4.

[159] Sewell was an early member of the Oxford Movement, alongside Newman and Pusey, who had published several books of sermons for young men. See Sermon 2 in: William Sewell, *A Year's Sermons to Boys, Preached in the Chapel of St Peter's College, Radley,* vol. 1 (London: James Parker & Co., 1853), pp. 171-173.

[160] Add MS 55109, MacMillan Archive, vol. 314, Western Manuscripts Collection, British Library, p. 4.

> My motive for writing this is to induce you to write such a book as would be useful to such persons. They won't read sermons: the very name of "Sermons" alarms them. But such a book as Coleridge's "Aids to Reflection" written for the use of a more commercial man who have a taste for reading without any thing like extensive culture would be sure to sell well if it were well advertised.[161]

Macmillan, Hare, and Bunsen were interested in the publication of such Christian manuals, books, pamphlets and articles designed to revive spiritual feeling. Indeed, Macmillan's solicitation of Hare to write such a handbook can be thought of as an example of the ways in which those who participated in the Inner Mission also formed patronage relationships connecting disparate institutions and settings. For instance, over the course of several years, Hare offered Macmillan a £500 loan for the opening of his first bookstore at Oxford. Macmillan turned to Hare for friendship, advice, and the sharing of pious sympathies and sentiments. Hare, for his part, saw in Macmillan a friendly and pious young man whose business might prove useful to their platform of increasing Christian sympathies in London along latitudinarian lines. These allies shared a desire to revive and make Christianity more accessible and more universal than it had been. Throughout their initial correspondence, Macmillan made many references to the reformer Frederick Maurice, the broad churchman who had been fired from King's College, indicating to Hare that Macmillian shared their worldview, and opposed the "Tractarians" Oxford Movement.

It would be appropriate to describe Bunsen and his closest friends as deeply pious, anti-rationalist Christian critics and reformers who were committed to the Reformation and opposed to Catholicism. Like other awakened neo-Pietists, they propagated and valued an internal and personal feeling of Christianity, complete with individual or family study of the

[161] Add MS 55109, MacMillan Archive, vol. 314, Western Manuscripts Collection, British Library, p. 6.

scriptures, but yet rejected the "separatism" of the Pietists. They were nevertheless keen to have a vibrant, living Protestant church without skewing too deeply towards the Roman Catholic church, as they feared the conservative Oxford Movement would have preferred.

After reading a book of the Oxford Movement's Henry Newman, in a letter to his friend Arnold, Bunsen wrote:

> Newman, I always thought, had a dreadful hankering after papism, but I hoped his inward Christianity and the air of England would set him right … but his setting up of rules of faith is beyond all belief. It is the downright opposite of, and blind reaction against, that spirit of lawlessness and individualism of separatists, who think a Church ought to have no test whatever to control the opinions of her teachers.[162]

In Bunsen's analysis, Newman represented an ultramontane, conservative reaction against any changes to the university system or church liturgy, while on the hand Bunsen also opposed the radical dissenters who wished to remove all influence of Anglican leadership. In this way, Bunsen and his allies, reformer-minded as they were, still favored a moderate approach to change. Nevertheless, it was suspicion and contempt for the Catholic church on the part of Bunsen and his close associates that constituted at least part of their opposition to the Tractarian movement. But as seen in his letter to Arnold, Bunsen believed the High Church Oxford Movement's conservative reaction to religious dissenters and separatism was a swing too far. He continued to Arnold:

> You are right to call the false Conservatives essential destructives; but I am equally right in calling the Radicals the greatest enemies to liberty. 'Men' (as Niebuhr says) 'can only bear a certain quantity of liberty,' and I should add, in Niebuhr's sense, this quantity is proportioned to their private and political virtue, to their power of self-sacrifice- which is almost saying that it is in an inverse ratio to 'the progress of civilization' - which is the art of shrouding selfishness and vice in certain regular and conventional forms, the efficient varnish of the animal instincts … I consider our

[162] Bunsen to Arnold, July 14th, 1835, in: Bunsen, *Memoir,* vol. 1, p. 414.

> Protestant countries to be precisely in this respect distinguished from the Catholic, that we can advance by reform, and they only try to begin to advance by revolution.[163]

Bunsen and his allies preferred a moderate approach to the problems facing both ecclesiastical and practical political problems in England and Germany. Conservative when it came to his skepticism and fear of revolution, Bunsen nevertheless was more moderately liberal when compared to High Church Englishmen. His comment to Arnold about "advance by reform" and "progress of civilization" nevertheless indicates a liberal, even progressive ideological streak. This was particularly true when it came to church issues. Bunsen's projects of re-writing the liturgy and composing volumes of biblical critical scholarship all rested on a foundation towards reviving and renewing Christianity in the Protestant world. Despite the affinity shared by Bunsen and his friends for antiquity and ancient Christianity, changes to the official liturgy would by necessity consist of a kind of reform or revision of it. It is precisely here where he might have encountered friction with the Oxford Movement. *The Tracts for the Times*, a series of ninety theological texts from which the Tractarians earned their moniker, were published between September 1833 and January 1841. The third such Tract, written by Henry Newman in the early years of the movement, specifically criticized any attempts to alter the liturgy. The originalist, conservative rigidity with which Newman advised other Anglican bishops to resist reform was quite clear:

> Though most of you would wish some immaterial points altered, yet not many of you agree in those points, and not many of you agree what is and what is not immaterial. If all your respective emendations are taken, the alterations in the Services will be extensive; and though each will gain something he wishes, he will lose more from those alterations which he did not wish. Tell me, are the present imperfections (as they seem to each) of such a nature, and so many, that their removal will compensate for

[163] Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 415.

> the recasting of much which each thinks to be no imperfection, or rather an excellence?[164]

Newman went on to indicate that such changes to the liturgy would lead the minds of parishioners to become unsettled, or worse: "Now I think this unsettling of the mind a frightful thing; both to ourselves, and more so to our flocks. They have long regarded the Prayer Book with reverence as the say of their faith and devotion. The weaker sort it will make sceptical; the better [sort] it will offend and pain."[165]

Newman and the rest of the Tractarians believed that any changes to the Anglican liturgy would weaken it, thereby repelling those worshippers who saw the church as a pillar of tradition and stability, and incensing those who resisted change. But a more complete understanding of the attitude of Bunsen and his allies towards the Oxford Movement requires a look at their view towards Catholicism: Bunsen wrote to Niebuhr: **"**The thought which for many years I cannot dismiss, that our children will witness wars of religion, came so strongly before my soul, that the accompanying visuals disturbed my nightly sleep. You know my opinion as to the final result of such a struggle, but I shudder at the amount of misery that must attend it."[166]

As was seen in chapter 1, Bunsen hoped to support Prussian (and Protestant) interests by reducing Catholic resentment, which could push Catholics further under Rome's political influence. Bunsen was concerned at a pragmatic level about the treatment of Catholic subjects

---

[164] See Tract 3 "Thoughts Respectfully Addressed to the Clergy on Alterations in the Liturgy" in: John Henry Newman, John Keble, William Palmer, Richard Hurrell Froude, Edward Bouverie Pusey, and Isaac Williams, *Tracts for the Times* (London: J. G. & F. Rivington, 1834), pp. 9-13.

[165] Newman, et al., *Tracts*, pp. 9-13.

[166] Bunsen to Niebuhr, June 12th, 1824, in: Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 243.

living in Protestant countries. He was deeply interested in the issue of Catholic Emancipation in England in the late 1820s and often corresponded with influential politicians like the conservative Home Secretary Sir Robert Peel, who initially supported the legal discrimination against British Catholics but eventually supported emancipation. Bunsen ultimately argued against political discrimination of Catholics because he wanted to remove potential causes for further Catholic antipathy against Protestant governance.[167] At the same time, he and his allies were convinced that the Oxford Movement's inclinations towards Catholicism were also dangerous for the spiritual well-being of the Anglican church, for English Protestantism more generally, and therefore also to the ecumenical alliance between both England and Prussia.

* * *

Bunsen and his allies participated on many fronts regarding the formation of "correct" religious faith, in terms of university appointments, the publication of Christian handbooks, and the foundation of missionary institutions like the Dalston Hospital and the Bishopric in Jerusalem.[168] They did so by carefully cultivating relationships with wealthy patrons in English society, but also by connecting English religious interests with analogues in Germany. They sought to protect a more tolerant form of Protestantism in England which would give more rights to dissenters, and also to give Catholics in England and Ireland more equal treatment in order to prevent them from falling further under Vatican influence.

At the same time, this network was concerned about the spiritual engagement of Englishmen, but also the tens of thousands of other Germans who lived in England, and even

[167] In the early nineteenth century, politicized Catholicism was beginning to take shape. Influential Catholic newspapers such as *Die Rheinischer Merkur*, wrote disdainfully of Prussian leadership and suggested that Germany be united under the imperial leadership of a Catholic Austrian prince.

[168] The Bishopric project will be explored more fully in Chapter 5.

the “souls” of Jews and other non-Christians in British colonial territories. As a result, Bunsen and those in his network continued to promulgate new ways either to convert nonbelievers or to revive and revitalize Christianity on domestic and global levels, through the publishing of new handbooks for popular consumption, and by the appointments of reform-minded university theologians. In the eyes of Bunsen and his allies, the creation of a new form of liturgy was essential for all of these projects, as it would give a model for worship that would be more pure and more engaging for its participants. The fourth chapter will look at the creation of that liturgy, in finer detail. But now that I have examined the broader strokes of both phases of Bunsen’s career in Rome and London, I will turn to an examination of the creation of Bunsen’s powerful network itself.

Chapter 3: Sociability and Correspondence: The Construction of Bunsen's Political and Ecclesiastical Network

The first, second, fourth, and fifth chapters of this dissertation each focus on a series of actions undertaken by Christian Carl Josias von Bunsen and his network of allies. As a young diplomat at the Prussian embassy in Rome, Bunsen began constructing a political network of like-minded individuals. Bunsen's network defies easy definition, as it was comprised of artists, churchmen, university professors, diplomats, politicians, writers, philanthropists, and missionaries from Germany, England, Italy, France, Switzerland, Scotland, and the United States. In general, though, Bunsen was most drawn to people who shared his personal ideological positions for ecclesiastical and political affairs. This included those who were interested in biblical criticism, and especially those who were committed anti-rationalists. In Germany, Bunsen connected most intensely with Protestant theologians who belonged to the *Erweckungsbewegung*, a group which emphasized personal conversion experiences and which advocated for not only the revival of church life, but also the spiritualization of everyday life. In England, Bunsen most sympathized with members of the so-called "Broad Church" movement, a latitudinarian group, which turned away from strict, dogmatic adherence to theology, favoring instead a liberal, broad tolerance of religious dissenters, so long as they were Protestant.

This chapter primarily focuses on the construction of Bunsen's network, its nature and maintenance. Some discussion of formal network analysis will be brought to bear on Bunsen's network in order to determine its efficacy and his own place in it. Through the

practice (and performance) of written correspondence and face-to-face visitation, Bunsen created a peculiar atmosphere of sociability that was at times striking in its disciplined piety and at other times festive, even raucous. What made Bunsen so gifted at this sort of work? This chapter argues that Bunsen's gregariousness, social versatility, and his ability to form robust relationships with people of varied and different backgrounds, were crucial to his success as a networker, bridge-builder, broker, patron, and friend to and between some of the most influential individuals of his time.

This chapter is not the first scholarship to take note of Bunsen's social world. Several historians over the years have recognized the significance of Bunsen's ability to bring people together. The architectural historian Kathleen Curren, in describing Bunsen's social environment, cited his close English friend Julius Hare:[169]

> [Bunsen's] house [in London] became what the home on the Capitoline [Hill, in Rome] had been, an intellectual centre of the most interesting kind -- first to foreigners, gradually to Englishmen. All who were connected with what was best in theology, history, philosophy, in poetry, music, or painting, seemed naturally to gravitate towards it, and its cosmopolitan gatherings.[170]

Bunsen's network was indeed cosmopolitan, as Hare noted. Nicholas Railton wrote that the Bunsens had "gathered around themselves a wide circle of writers, painters, and theologians from many countries," and noted that the Roman Legation had become "a social and intellectual center much frequented by English visitors, particularly the

---

[169] Julius Hare (1795-1855), the eventual Deacon of Lewes (now known as the archdiocese of Hastings) is referred to extensively in chapter 2, and was one of Bunsen's closest allies in England.

[170] Augustus Hare, writing about Bunsen's Home in London, quoted in: Kathleen Curran, *The Romanesque Revival : Religion, Politics, and Transnational Exchange* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2003), p. 179. Professor Curran's monograph is an excellent examination of the German *Rundbogenstil* architectural style and its manifestations in the nineteenth-century in Germany, England, and America, of which Bunsen and Friedrich Wilhelm IV were most influential when it came to church design.

Germano-Coleridgeians."[171] Railton pointed out the tradition of "wonderful hospitality," which only increased upon Bunsen's 1841 move from the Continent to London, where his luncheons and tea-times "turned into evangelical reunions," with meals that included "on average twenty to twenty-five people."[172]

A history dissertation from almost a century ago by Ralph Owen was titled *Bunsen and his English and American Friends*. He wrote of Bunsen's connections to Anglo-American liberal theologians, although his brief dissertation mostly focused on the shared theology of a group of four of five nodes from Bunsen's English network.[173] The intention of this chapter will be to examine the construction of Bunsen's political and ecclesiastical network itself, rather than only using Bunsen's relationships to examine the various projects with which they were involved. Nevertheless, some granular texture is unavoidable and will serve to show the practices, ideologies, beliefs, and interests which bound Bunsen to his associates. Additionally, a case study examining one of Bunsen's political opponents will be drawn in some detail to show how his network operated in the larger political sphere concerning contentious issues of religious toleration and inclusion in 1850s Prussia.

[171] Nicholas Railton, *No North Sea,* p. 159. The term "Germano-Coleridgeians" will be explored a bit later in the chapter.

[172] Nicholas Railton, *No North Sea*, pp. 159-160.

[173] Owen's 84-page dissertation from the University of Wisconsin was filed in 1922 and later published in 1924 under a new name. See: Ralph Albert Dornfeld Owen, *Christian Bunsen and Liberal English Theology* (Montpelier: Capital City Press, 1924). I am thinking of the members of Bunsen's network as "nodes," which are, according to social network theory, individuals, actors, people, or things within the network.

The Opportunities and Limitations of Correspondence and Diaries

The majority of the sources used in this dissertation have come from letters and diaries, both published and unpublished, of Bunsen and those in his networks. The voluminous archive of their correspondence affords historians significant opportunities to glimpse the inner lives of Bunsen and his associates, but my methodological approach is tempered with a measure of caution. It must be disclaimed that many (though not all) of the letters that are cited in this dissertation were eventually published, which in some cases may mean that they have been translated, curated, and selected for particular purposes.[174]

The main concern is whether or not we are able to truly penetrate the "inner lives" of the historical figures we seek to understand via an examination of their letters. A succinct discussion of this debate can be found in the introduction to Christopher H. Johnson's monograph *Becoming Bourgeois: Love, Kinship, and Power in Provincial France, 1670-1880.*[175] Johnson identified a group of French historians who argued that using correspondence to derive a clear picture of the emotions of authors is impossible and is, at best, only able to establish a *pacte épistolaire* (epistolary pact), which acts as a bonding agent between author and recipient.[176] This group contends that the contents of written letters "are symbolic of a ritual system and cannot be trusted to represent 'real' feelings" and that

[174] This is especially the case with the main two-volume, 1200+ page collection of Bunsen's Memoir and correspondence which was arranged and editorialized by his widow, Frances Waddington Bunsen. In some cases, I have also seen the original letters at Bunsen's archive at the Geheimes Staatsarchiv Preußischer Kulturbesitz in Dahlem, Berlin, Germany.

[175] Christopher H. Johnson, *Becoming Bourgeois: Love, Kinship, and Power in Provincial France, 1670-1880* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2015), pp. 3-5.

[176] See: Cécile Dauphin, Pierrette Lebrun-Pézerat, and Danièle Poublan in *Ces bonnes lettres: Une correspondance familiale au XIXe siècle* (Paris, 1995).

"private letters do not constitute true documents of private life."[177] Johnson rejects these warnings, contending instead that one can indeed draw generalizations from these sorts of archives regarding the emotions and intentions of the author, even if doing so only provides limited access.[178] Johnson shared a personal letter from the historian Joan Wallach Scott which said, "letters are not usually or always transparent statements of feeling. People represent themselves to the other as they wish to be seen, as they want to be recognized. Letters construct a persona as much as they express one."[179] I agree with both Johnson and Scott, and I hope (and believe) that the selected quotes from letters and Memoir used in this dissertation might give an accurate picture of the motivations and beliefs of Bunsen and his allies.

In analyzing the content of these letters, I am turning to a research methodology developed by Michael Kannenberg, based in part on theoretical ideas from the German sociologist Niklas Luhmann. Borrowing from Luhmann the conception of a social system as a closed network of communication in which writers and recipients derive and define meaning, Kannenberg parses the letters of millenarian Germans in his 2007 book *Verschleierte Uhrtafeln: Endzeiterwartungen im Wurttembergischen Pietismus Zwischen 1818 und 1848.* Kannenberg sought out specific phrases, idioms, or words which would indicate apocalyptic leanings in the letters of his subjects. For example, he points to expressions written by Pietists in Württemberg which indicated fears of persecution or idiomatic biblical references from the

[177] See Johnson, *Becoming Bourgeois*, p. 3, and Michelle Perrot, *Histoire de la vie privée,* ed. Philippe Ariès and Georges Duby, vol. 4 (Paris, 1987), 11; in English, *History of Private Life*, trans. Arthur Goldhammer, vol. 4 (Cambridge, MA, 1990), 3-4.

[178] Johnson, *Becoming Bourgeois*, p. 4.

[179] Johnson, *Becoming Bourgeois,* p. 5.

Book of Revelations to posit an apocalyptic or millenarian current shared by radical Pietists. Kannenberg suggests that these communications create a "space" that is given shape by its social forms, such as amongst the members of a conventicle or workers in a factory break room. Kannenberg goes on to suggest that it is within these communicative spaces that specific styles of thought are forged and maintained.[180]

Letters and diaries can often be the location of the working out of life's problems and help to legitimize the position of the author to his or her environment. German historian Ulrike Gleixner suggests that historians should think of writing and correspondence as a cultural technology which enables individuals to define themselves (as pious, for instance), while also offering those in their networks the opportunity to project that image of piety (or patriotism, etc.) as they sent and received each others letters.[181] My suspicion is that this kind of mutual understanding created a practice of piety through correspondence that could be just as developed, frequent, and demarcated as the physical conventicles of the eighteenth century. Wherever possible, I attempted to interpret the words left behind by Bunsen and his allies to indicate the sentiments behind them and to speculate as to the larger purpose behind them. In this chapter, selections will be cited which indicate emotions of warmth, friendship, respect, and piety in order to indicate the aforementioned *pacte épistolaire* and, following the various methodologies mentioned above, to show how Bunsen was able to forge ties between himself and his interlocutors to create his network.

---

[180] Michael Kannenberg, *Verschleierte Uhrtafeln: Endzeiterwartungen Im Württembergischen Pietismus Zwischen 1818 und 1848* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007), pp. 35-39.

[181] An overview of these mechanisms can be found in: Ulrike Gleixner, *Pietismus und Bürgertum: eine historische Anthropologie der Frömmigkeit, Württemberg 17.-19. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2005), p. 394

Bunsen built his network using a combination of strategies, including an assiduous practice of letter-writing. Bunsen claimed that he was at his writing desk from 5:30am until 2pm each day.[182] The published Memoir and letters alone comprise two volumes of approximately 600 pages each in the English edition, and three volumes in the German editions. Bunsen's feverish commitment allowed him to carry out an immense volume of correspondence, allowing him to stay in contact with his associates in Germany or England while in Rome. Of course, his desk-time was also demanded by the affairs of his public diplomatic office and his copious liturgical and religious writings, which makes the amount of his correspondence altogether more impressive.

With his letters, Bunsen used several strategies depending on who his recipient was. For those in his most intimate acquaintance, such as his wife, sister, children, and his closest associates (Niebuhr, Thomas Arnold and Julius Hare in England, even Friedrich Wilhelm IV), Bunsen deployed rhetoric steeped in a specifically Christian (and frequently millenarian) valence: For instance, Bunsen wrote to his sister, with whom he was always the most forward about his religious inclinations:

> The only germ of life, which one can oppose to the evil spirits of destruction and death, lies in Christianity and in Christian associations; the Christian spirit must pervade, reanimate, and guide the general relations of life, as in marriage and in the education of children. If there be any hope of saving the aged States of declining Europe, it can only proceed from this cause, and may the All-Merciful grant it! But if He has determined … that they are to perish, might such Christian relations and associations remain upright amid the ruins of our political systems.[183]

The direct way by which Bunsen suggested an impending sense of decline in Europe, as well as the primary importance he ascribed to the survival and preservation of Christian

[182] Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 295.

[183] Bunsen to his sister Christiana, September 27th, 1820, in: Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 179.

institutions even above governments, were sentiments Bunsen might not have written to state officials at higher levels. Yet, Bunsen would share similar thoughts with other theologians who he considered sympathetic to these ideas. Bunsen wrote to the theologian Wilhelm Hey (1789-1854), one of Bunsen's earliest and closest friends from the University of Göttingen, who would go on to become a court preacher in Gotha:

> There is something of a consciousness remaining from better times gone by, and perhaps of a better future in store; not only, in general, for the union of the German people into one nation, but, in particular, for their becoming Christians, and being combined into a Christian organization. As the other nations of Europe have no conception of the power of inner life in the individual, which exists in Germany; so do we not possess the consciousness of collective life and force.[184]

Suggestions of living in turbulent or difficult times appear in his letters again and again, with explicit emphasis placed on the desperate need for Christian intensification and unity. These words to Wilhelm Hey also signify a proto-nationalist sentiment for German unification. Indeed, Bunsen regularly forged and maintained relationships with other Germans on the basis of a shared patriotism, and often alluded to the unique power of Christianity in enabling national unification.[185]

Christian references were commonly expressed alongside political allusions by Bunsen to his friends and were often mixed with political opinions, such as in this letter to Thomas Arnold:

> [You are] the triumph of Christian and Teutonic liberty, and [You are] the antagonist of that dissolving atheism, political and religious, of 1789. I read your letters with rapture, whether you astonished your hearers by praise of the blessings of the

[184] Bunsen to Hey, July 11th, 1818, in: Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 147.

[185] Bunsen's letter was written in 1818 in the aftermath of Napoleon's defeat and the subsequent ascendance of Prussia. Bunsen's Romantic sentiments track with other early German nationalists Johann Fichte, Ernst Moritz Arndt (with whom Bunsen had a friendship), and *Turnvater* (Friedrich) Jahn.

> aristocracy and Church, or whether you pointed out, unsparingly but without exaggeration, **the rooted evils of the present state of things**.[186] [emphasis added]

Bunsen confides in Arnold a fear of Jacobinism, atheism, and once again alludes to forces of evil at work in the present. The deployment of these sorts of shared idioms and references to forces of good and evil was restricted largely to those in Bunsen's closest confidence, with whom Bunsen knew he shared a troubled, even eschatological, outlook on political and spiritual affairs.

In addition to religious idioms, Bunsen consistently used other writing strategies such as metaphor, flourish, and innuendo in his letters to describe situations and relate to his friends. For example, in describing the political situation in 1838 England to a German friend he had known in Rome, Bunsen wrote: "Here in this country, in spite of apparent movement, all is in secure repose; the wind may disturb the sails, but the vessel is moored in the depths by invisible anchors."[187] The recipient of this letter was Ernst Zacharias Platner, a German painter who later became the Saxon diplomat to Rome at Bunsen's urging in 1828. By "invisible anchors," Bunsen was referring to the strong national character of England, to which he attributed its resilience to the revolutionary waves (the "disturbing winds") sweeping Europe in the 1820s and 1830s. Platner, an early friend from Bunsen's earliest days in Rome, had been appointed to a diplomatic post at the Saxon legation in 1823 and given a raise in 1828 in large part due to Bunsen's patronage.[188] Bunsen's network, if it may be

---

[186] Bunsen to Arnold, March 15th, 1833, in: Bunsen, *Memoir,* vol. 1, p. 390. Ever the clever classicist, Bunsen dated this letter "Idibus Martiis," Latin for "The Ides of March."

[187] Bunsen to Ernst Zacharias Platner (1773-1855), December 30th, 1838, in: Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, pp. 495-496.

[188] See Bunsen's letter to his wife, March 18th, 1828, "That same day I received the answer to the application made at my entreaty for a pension and rank as Saxon Chargé d'Affaires for Platner…" in: Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 315.

permitted to characterize them as a group, were staunch anti-revolutionaries who sought at all times to support monarchical nationalism, and these sentiments can be seen in the above exchanges with Platner, Arnold, and even with Hey.

***Geselligkeit*, Parties, and Visiting: The Role of Sociability in Bunsen's Network**

The role of correspondence was especially crucial for the *maintenance* of Bunsen's vast network of allies across Europe. As a Prussian diplomat based in Rome, Bern, and London, Bunsen required epistolary communication to share thoughts, feelings, and plans with his various faraway interlocutors. While those written exchanges served a vital function for the network, we must examine another mode of networking that took place inside Bunsen's house. The social practices of face-to-face visiting during parties, meals, Bible-reading groups, drinking, merriment, and late-night conversations arguably played the most important role in the *creation* of Bunsen's network.

From a young age, Bunsen became aware of his own charismatic personality on those around him. While he wanted to devote his time and energy primarily to his liturgical research, Bunsen realized his time would have to also be spent frequenting society, especially as a Prussian diplomat. In 1817, the first year of his employment in Rome, Bunsen described his approach to social life:

> I know I have it in my power to go every evening into company, pay attention to *grandees* [notable men] and to ladies, and talk away time to the insignificant; and I have done it. I quitted University employment in 1813 on purpose to see and know the world. I have seen and known the most distinguished men in my own country, and wherever I was, I frequented the circles of ambassadors, princes, and ministers: I was reckoned *amiable* by some of their ladies, clever by the learned, and *bon enfant* [easy-going] by the men. This cost me some time, but has been a great lesson for me. **Almost always in these societies I was liked and valued for that which I ridiculed**

> **in myself**… There are … sometimes useful facts to be picked up in this way, sometimes even persons found that may be good acquaintances beyond the moment.[189] [emphasis added]

This excerpt from Bunsen's letter to his mother-in-law may have been designed, in part, to reassure his wife's parents that their daughter would belong to a properly sociable house. Still, it is apparent that Bunsen was becoming increasingly attuned to the importance of forging friendships with others and of his own special ability to do so. In particular, his explicit awareness of the self-deprecating style of humor and humility he practiced in groups seems to have earned him much admiration from others, particularly those of a higher social station. Humble or not, when one looks at Bunsen's social strategies as his reputation increases, it becomes clear that he was an aggressively social and charismatic social climber, one who did not shy away from any opportunity to make friends in the highest of places.

In Bunsen's House

The Bunsens lived in the *Palazzo Caffarelli*, a spacious apartment building a few hundred meters away from the Tiber river, built along the slope of the Tarpeian Rock, a cliff on the summit of the Capitoline Hill in Rome, and overlooking the Forum to the east. The upper level of the residence was originally inhabited by Bunsen's friends and students, the painters of the Nazarene Movement like Julius Schnorr von Carolsfeld, Phillip Veit, Johann Overbeck, and Peter von Cornelius.[190] In England, the Bunsens resided in Carlton House Terrace, a townhouse on Carlton Street along the northeastern edge of St. James Park, only

[189] Bunsen to his mother-in-law, Mrs. Waddington, December 6th, 1817, in: Bunsen, *Memoir,* vol. 1, pp. 132-134.

[190] The Nazarene painters and their role in the Protestant *Gemeinde* around the Prussian embassy is covered in Chapter 1.

meters from St. James Square, Trafalgar Square, and Downing Street. The Prussian (and later, German) Embassy was located here, in the nerve center of British political life.[191]

Bunsen's homes can be easily compared to the salons of the eighteenth-century Enlightenment, with both Bunsen and his wife Frances acting as *salonnières*. Frances Bunsen, in her editorializing narrative prose, indicated her awareness of the social power at work in her home:

> It has been justly said that "a common interest in the great objects among which you are living and their stirring and expanding influence on the mind render the interchange and community of thought in Rome more easy than anywhere else" and **this was in a high degree experienced in the delightful intercourse which in the case of Bunsen formed the foundation of invaluable friendships for the beginning of which no other place would have afforded such favourable opportunities.** This is particularly the case with Englishmen of high station who in their own country are absorbed by the manifold duties of their calling and position, but in Rome become more accessible and a few words must be allowed to mark the pleasure of those breakfast parties.[192] [emphasis added]

Mrs. Bunsen correctly identifies precisely the aspect which enabled Bunsen's early network construction at the Roman embassy: the peculiar dynamic of the location. In Rome, away from the normal trappings of class, rank, station, or duty, the home of the Bunsens and the Prussian Protestant *Gemeinde* offered an atmosphere for intellectual exchange, Bible study, and affable sociability with food and drink. It is doubtless that Bunsen's wife, from a well-to-do English family, was able to replicate the bourgeois experience typical of the English house: offering tea-times, sending invitations to guests, and so on. She describes the experience of inviting their friends over for breakfast:

> To the social cheerfulness of the breakfast hour, Bunsen was as sensible as if he had always been used to it, although the custom of assembling one's family and friends at breakfast scarcely exists in Germany; and even in the latter years of declining health it

[191] The German embassy would remain in Carlton Terrace until the Second World War.

[192] Frances Waddington in: Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 264.

> will ever be a precious remembrance to his sons and daughters how bright and full of power and of cheerfulness was his appearance at breakfast how he would talk over public events if he had a newspaper and how he would pass from one subject to another taking special delight in the free exercise of intellect in the freshest hour of the day, like a courser unbound, rejoicing in his strength. [193]

The atmosphere of conviviality contributed to a feeling of social atypicality which might be compared to masonic lodges, Pietist conventicles, or salons, in that these settings allowed individuals from different social stations to mix together in a setting removed from their normal social contexts. There are many such examples of individuals lowering their guard in Bunsen's social world. Consider the case of Joseph von Radowitz (1797-1853), a Prussian general who befriended Bunsen in 1824:

> Radowitz [had] in a manner domesticated himself in the home circle of Bunsen at Rome. It was to this that he fled for refuge from the societies of higher pretension frequented by the Prince [Augustus][194] whom he accompanied only on occasions of state, after which he was accustomed to give vent to an accumulated mass of irritation, produced by uncongeniality, in brilliant sallies of description or animadversion, to the ceaseless entertainment of his audience to whom he would complain of the "hardship of tempting a man desirous of not forgetting his Christian duty, to hate rather than love his neighbour when tied down at a dinner party, lasting for hours, between two persons, strangers to eyes and mind alike."[195]

One can easily imagine the scene described by Mrs. Bunsen, when General Radowitz would feel free and comfortable to complain about staid, formal dinner parties with the prince. Amusing though Radowitz's "animadversion"[196] must have been to Bunsen and his friends, this atmosphere of familiarity and casual sociability enabled a friendship between the two

---

[193] Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 264.

[194] Prince Friedrich Wilhelm Heinrich August of Prussia (1779-1843) was the youngest nephew of Friedrich II (Frederick the Great), and a Prussian general. Gen. Radowitz came to Rome as one of August's attendants.

[195] Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 233.

[196] Animadversion connoting negative criticism in this context.

men that lasted for nearly three decades until Radowitz's death. Like Bunsen, Radowitz had been a close adviser to the Crown Prince Friedrich Wilhelm IV before he became King. In 1824, Radowitz confided in Bunsen his fears that their shared favor with the future King would not last, "The Crown Prince is now free to divert himself with his chosen associates and favourite speculations; but when he becomes King all that will be changed, and he will fall into royal routine, and you and I must be prepared to be cast off, like Falstaff and the rest by Henry V."[197]

Radowitz's tongue-in-cheek Shakespearean allusion aside, it is clear that he considered Bunsen to be his equal in the eyes of the Prussian prince. This anecdote shows not only Bunsen's quick rise in status due to his diplomatic appointment and favor from the prince, but also the quickly-earned trust of Radowitz, an aristocratic, Catholic military general, who, despite his differences with Bunsen, was quickly drawn into Bunsen's network. Radowitz's fears never came to pass: both he and Bunsen remained close advisors of Friedrich Wilhelm IV. This episode shows that Bunsen's home was a place where he and the other figures of his network, like Radowitz, would come to understand their positions of power via their proximity and status in relation to the Prussian crown, and to each other.

Bunsen put substantial time and energy into either hosting or attending social gatherings, even during periods of intense intellectual production or diplomatic business. Bunsen noted during his first trip to England in 1838, "the parties, wanderings, dinners,

[197] Radowitz to Bunsen while in Rome, 1824, in: Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 234. Radowitz is referencing the fictional character Sir John Falstaff from part 1 and 2 of Shakespeare's play, "Henry IV." Falstaff, the jovial and portly friend, is both a corrupting influence on the Prince of Wales (the future King Henry V), but is also a charismatic *bon vivant.*

journeys of the last few days left me scarcely any minutes…"[198] Bunsen entertained guests with food, drink, and music. During a long residence in Rome in 1830, the young Felix Mendelssohn played music at Bunsen's house as he was drawn into Bunsen's network. Felix wrote: "Bunsen, who often warns me against playing if I find it prejudicial, gave a large party yesterday, where nevertheless I was obliged to play; but it was a pleasure to me, for I had the opportunity of making so many agreeable acquaintances."[199] We will examine how Bunsen met the Mendelssohns later in the chapter, but the key here is to understand that Bunsen understood the benefit to his own reputation and that of his social world when he could offer an intimate musical experience at home performed by one of the preeminent superstars of that era.

Bunsen's parties required substantial financial investment and logistical planning. Bunsen once wrote that his new salary in England was "as much as three and a half Ministers of State in Prussia, seemingly enormous, and yet inadequate."[200] Bunsen soon used his increased wealth to hire clerks and secretaries and to furnish his home at Carlton Terrace for frequent parties and gatherings. The British Foreign Office archives have a Treasury Order "required by his Excellency Chevalier Bunsen for the undermentioned wines to be supplied to him" including: One quarter-cask (28 gallons) of Port wine, 27 gallons of Sherry, one hogshead (a large cask of 63-64 gallons) of Claret, 64 gallons of Claret, 12 gallons of

---

[198] Bunsen's journal entry, November 25th, 1838, in: Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 482.

[199] Felix to his father, December 10th, 1830, in: Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, *Letters of Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy from Italy and Switzerland* (Boston: Oliver Ditson & Co, 1861), pp. 76-77.

[200] Bunsen to August Kesnter (1777-1853) on March 13th, 1842, in: Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 2, p. 14. August Kestner, incidentally, was the son of Johann Kestner and Charlotte Buff. Buff had rebuffed and rejected the unrequited love of a young Johann Wolfgang von Goethe. Therefore, Bunsen's friend's mother was the inspiration for the character "Lotte" in Goethe's *Die Leiden des jungen Werthers,* published in 1774.

champagne, and 12 gallons of Brandy, mostly all delivered in the year 1841 when Bunsen first took up permanent residence in London.[201] These hundreds of gallons of wine and spirits were sent to Bunsen's residence at Carleton Terrace in London where he entertained his English friends and visitors, and it is easy to imagine the merrymaking and discussions amidst those libations.

Bunsen's time spent socializing sometimes took a toll on him, not least because it distracted him from his scholarly pursuits. Still, Bunsen came to understand that his role in certain contexts, especially while visiting with the Prussian King in Berlin, was to act as a conversationalist and entertaining member of the court, rather than to work on his ecclesiastical projects: "I do not *work* much now; I merely *think* which costs me no trouble; I eat and drink, which gives me none either; and I sleep, which does me much good. Besides, I lounge about, doing nothing, and enjoy the society, first of the King, then of friends, from five to eleven every day."[202] The six hours of daily socializing might have distracted Bunsen from his work as he conceived of it, yet this too was a kind of "labor," ensuring that he remained well-positioned in the King's own network of trusted advisors.

Bible-Studies

A primary means of social bonding in Bunsen's network was communal worship, both within and outside the context of a formal worship service. This normally took the form of reading and discussing the Bible together, a practice which was consistently undertaken by Bunsen in his home, as well as in the homes of others. It is important to reiterate that shared

[201] The National Archives of the UK: Foreign Office (FO) 64/235, p. 2. The fact that the British paid for Bunsen's alcohol is in itself quite interesting.

[202] Bunsen to his wife, June 13th, 1844, in: Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 2, p. 66.

Christian piety was one, if not the single most powerful, thread which bound Bunsen to those in his network. The reading of the Bible together, or the singing of church music, was the primary means by which Bunsen related to his wife, children, and closest friends. Bunsen describes the evenings of a typical week in Rome:

> The evenings from seven o'clock are thus engaged: Sunday and Tuesday we read the Bible with [Legation Chaplain Heinrich] Schmieder, and he expounds to us and a small number of friends: we have already read through "Genesis." Every Thursday we are at Niebuhr's who receives the Germans on that evening. Monday we remain at home receiving any friends that wish to visit us, or to meet for the singing of ancient church music.[203]

This practice was also carried along with Bunsen when he went on the road during his diplomatic assignments or to visit with other associates in his network. Bunsen described a visit with another member of his network, Joseph John Gurney (1788-1847), an influential Quaker from Norwich, England: "The simple Bible reading with which the day begins in Mr. [Joseph John] Gurney's house, short and earnest, accompanied by deeply thought comments, will, I trust, not easily be forgotten."[204]

Joseph was the brother of prominent social reformer Elizabeth Fry (1780-1845) (née Gurney), who was likely the connective node between Bunsen and Joseph. Like Bunsen, Fry and Gurney were committed to prison reform and prison philanthropy. Like so many of Bunsen's associates mentioned in Chapters 2 and 4, Fry had opened a Christian social institution, in her case, a training school for nurses akin to Theodor Fliedner's Kaiserswerth

[203] Bunsen to his sister Christiana, November 27th, 1819, in: Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 170.

[204] Bunsen to a son, November 14th, 1845, in: Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 2, p. 98. Gurney had feared that the Society of Friends had wandered too far from the original Scriptures, and was therefore a more evangelical branch of Quakerism.

Deaconess house.[205]

It was through the study of the Bible that Bunsen was able to expand his network, creating connections through other acquaintances via their shared experience in reading it together. This was a practice that also characterized Bunsen's home life, with friends and family: "The order for daily devotion [Bunsen's first published Liturgy] we have in regular use in our house every Sunday, with our nearest friends and the chaplain; reading together the Gospels in parallel passages."[206] The fact that Bunsen wanted to read the Bible aloud *together* is a crucial point, one which mirrors two of his central theological attitudes. First, Christian worship was something that ought to be communal by design. Secondly, the Christian's entire life ought to be sacralized, so that one did not only consider their relationship to Christ on Sundays, but by the day, hour, minute.[207] These activities were integral to the performance and practice of Bunsen's theological worldview, and was shared by the many friends and visitors who spent time in Bunsen's social orbit.

Even when he was unable to read the Bible in person with those in his house, he wrote letters longingly referencing the activity with his faraway friends, like in this instance to Friedrich Lücke: "My most earnest longing is towards the study of the Bible. Could I but read the Bible with you! God will doubtless help. Were there but a *spirit of power*, making itself

[205] Theodor Fliedner (1800-1864) was an associate of Bunsen's who in 1836 opened a Christian hospital and training center for nurses in Kaiserswerth, near Düsseldorf. Fliedner's institution was also a direct inspiration for Bunsen's hospital in London.

[206] Bunsen to Christiana, March 30th, 1922, in Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 194.

[207] These themes are mirrored by his liturgical productions for worship, both formally and informally. See Chapter 4.

felt among Protestants!"[208] The centrality of Bible reading in Bunsen's home, and even in his correspondence, shows that a reverence for a personal relationship and familiarity with the Bible, characteristic of the *Erweckungsbewegung*, was a major mediative force used by Bunsen to bond with others, especially over their shared desire for spiritual revival in German Protestantism.

The Structure and Efficacy of Bunsen's Network, and his place within it

Through the practices of letter-writing, sociability, and face-to-face visits, Bunsen was able to create a durable network, the collective aims of which were responsible for a diverse and substantial series of actions and events, some of which we have seen in the chapters of this dissertation. Nevertheless, one must be cautious not to exaggerate the historical impact of Bunsen, or even of his network. In general, one must differentiate between *influence* on one hand and *power*, on the other. In other words, an individual might be well-connected and will-liked within his social circle, but he may not necessarily have the power to change his fate or the fates of those around him, let alone to marshal the political and economic resources necessary to establish an overseas Protestant Bishopric, for example. Still, it should not be said that influence is completely differentiated from power, either. Power, in Bunsen's case, may best be illustrated by his central role within the network as a broker, patron, and bridge between other powerful people.

Bunsen's network was created through multiple means with different groups, each of whom were connected to Bunsen by differing, sometimes overlapping "ties." Throughout this dissertation, we have seen that Christian sentiments were often exchanged between Bunsen

[208] Bunsen to Gottfried Christian Friedrich Lücke (1791-1855) on February 12th, 1817, in: Bunsen: *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 109.

and his closest allies and family members. However, reputational and financial patronage was also a central filament which bound Bunsen to the other nodes of his network. We have seen numerous examples of this patronage at work over Bunsen's career. Financial support from the Prussian treasury and fundraising enabled Bunsen to build up the Protestant Gemeinde and its ancillary institutions in Rome. Earning Bunsen's favor led to significant career advancement for the embassy chaplains who he selected in Rome and London. A recommendation letter from Bunsen affected the academic careers of scholars at universities in Berlin and London. Evangelical Protestant missionaries looked to Bunsen for political and material support for their various projects. At the same time, Bunsen was himself the recipient of patronage from the Prussian monarchs Friedrich Wilhelm III and IV, Barthold Georg Niebuhr, and ultimately Queen Victoria. Their favor elevated Bunsen at various points across his career, yet through him they were each able to obtain something for themselves. Niebuhr, for instance, had been relatively anti-social compared to Bunsen, so the Protestant *Gemeinde* in Rome gravitated instead to Bunsen's home. At the level of state, it suited the Prussian monarchs to have their agent in Rome acting to prevent the conversion of German Protestants living in Rome, or to later build German-speaking hospitals for Germans living in London, or to advance a Prussian ecclesiastical and missionary presence in the Middle East for the first time.

Bunsen's place within his network changed over the course of his career as his reputation grew. Several milestones can be identified along Bunsen's professional trajectory, each one leading to a substantial increase in his reputation and power. When Bunsen first arrived in Italy in 1816, he was only a minor figure within the social and diplomatic circle of

Barthold Georg Niebuhr, the Prussian ambassador.[209] The first such milestone was Bunsen's appointment as Niebuhr's secretary in September, 1818 - Bunsen's first position as an official of the Prussian government. In 1823, he succeeded Niebuhr as the ambassador, a position he went on to hold for fifteen years, until April, 1838. A prolonged visit to England, followed by a one-year tenure as the Prussian ambassador to Switzerland enabled the missionary connections which were examined in Chapter 4. Finally, his appointment in 1841 as the Prussian ambassador in England saw Bunsen at his most powerful as an elder statesman and powerful figure in London's ecclesiastical, academic, and political landscape. His career trajectory must be understood in the context of his proximity to powerful figures whose patronage elevated him at crucial junctures. By impressing Niebuhr as a young student, he was able to work his way into Niebuhr's diplomatic office in 1816, which in turn enabled his being able to win the friendship of the Prussian Crown Prince in 1822, who later sent Bunsen to England in 1841. Each of these milestones enabled Bunsen to have increased repute and clout within the Prussian court, and then by extension in London political society as well.

Bunsen's network was not a pyramidal hierarchy like an absolutist monarch or a business executive, but rather it was actually made up of a number of disparate, smaller networks, which will be described below. It was Bunsen's position as a node uniquely capable of connecting many varied networks which made him so powerful. The extent to which any particular node is connected to others is formally referred to as "degree centrality," or the number of total linkages of any node within a network. Specifically, Bunsen possessed very high "betweenness centrality," because he acted as a node through which many other, less

[209] In those early days, Bunsen did not even have any official appointment within the Prussian embassy, but was hanging around because Niebuhr had taken a liking to him, so Bunsen was hoping to continue studying with him.

well-connected nodes were connected.[210] We have already seen several examples of Bunsen's ability to act as a bridge between interests. Consider the group of revivalist missionaries from the 1840 meeting in Basel, which are examined in Chapter 5, in order to illustrate the point. Bunsen's close relationship with Friedrich Wilhilm IV afforded him the opportunity to secure Prussian patronage for the Jerusalem Bishopric, but Bunsen's real *power* was located at his unique position as a bridge *between* the relevant groups most responsible for the Bishopric: in England (Lord Ashley, William Gladstone), Switzerland (Spittler, Gobat, Zeller), and Prussia (Friedrich Wilhelm IV, Friedrich Eichhorn). Although Bunsen cultivated relationships with countless individuals and groups, the most important of these will be highlighted below.

Bunsen and the Prussian State

It makes sense to begin the examination of Bunsen's network structure through his connections to the most powerful members of the Prussian state. Bunsen first became known to the Prussian royal house in 1822, when King Friedrich Wilhelm III and his entourage (including his son, the future Friedrich Wilhem IV) came to visit Rome. Niebuhr had, in his reports to Berlin, spoken highly of Bunsen as a learned and capable member of the Prussian mission to Rome, so the King had already heard of Bunsen. During a dinner party with the King, Niebuhr, Bunsen, and the other visitors, there was a discussion about a concert of sacred music by the 16th-century composer Giovanni Palestrina, which was to be performed

[210] "Betweenness" is one measure of degree centrality posited by the sociologist Linton Freeman, and is to be differentiated somewhat from "Eigenvector" centrality, which instead measures the influence of a particular node. See: Linton C. Freeman, "A Set of Measures of Centrality Based on Betweenness," *Sociometry*, (1977): 35–41. If Bunsen is connected to figures in the Prussian court, theologians in Germany and England, academics, artists, students, diplomats, then he has a higher betweenness centrality than perhaps a parish pastor in a rural village, for instance, but certainly less than the Prussian King, who as a matter of statecraft must encounter and be connected to many more people.

by members of the Sistine Chapel choir for the King. The King asked "Who was this Palestrina? What is this music?," to which nobody had a quick answer. Embarrassed that he might have seemed ignorant, the King turned towards Bunsen and said, "Habe wohl etwas dummes gefragt!" ("I probably asked a stupid question!").[211] Bunsen seized the opportunity to educate the King on one of his favorite topics, quickly establishing himself as not only knowledgeable with matters of culture and history, but also, more importantly, as someone who would not judge the King for his deficits. This shrewd move endeared Bunsen to the monarch, and the dividends of his congenial relationship would pay off as Bunsen's reputation grew.

A particularly important moment of ascendancy for Bunsen was his six-month trip to Berlin between September 1827 and March 1828, his first visit to the Prussian capital since becoming its ambassador to Rome. The purported reason for his trip was to deliver a painting by Raphael alongside other works of art for the Prussian Museum, although the true reason was to advise state officials about the inner workings of the Papal government.[212] Yet, even these two ostensible reasons for the trip obscure the fact that Bunsen himself had been angling for a further audience with the King to lobby for increased royal patronage for the Protestant *Gemeinde* chapel, and to present his thoughts and feelings regarding the Protestant liturgy for the newly unified Prussian Church discussed in chapter 4.[213] Bunsen's sudden

[211] See Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 326.

[212] The trip began on September 24th, 1827 and lasted through March, 1828. The painting was Raphael's "Madonna della famigilia di Lante," and was accompanied by several other works of art. It took over 2 weeks for Bunsen to reach Berlin. Bunsen's wife claims that he had truly been sent to provide advisement regarding the Prussian political relationship with the Vatican. Remember also, that Bunsen had established himself as a cultured man to the King in 1822, as someone knowledgeable in the arts and music.

[213] See: Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 325.

appearance in Berlin and acceptance into the most powerful circle of the Prussian state caused some astonishment, alarm, and jealousy. Frances Bunsen wrote: "Two gentlemen were speaking of the marvellous reception given to Bunsen by the King 'All royal favours are showered upon him in an unexampled manner,' said one of the interlocutors to the other; 'nothing remains for His Majesty to do for him.' 'Nothing,' replied the other, 'unless the King means to *adopt* Bunsen.'"[214]

The favor shown to Bunsen by the royal family was remarkable, even according to contemporaneous accounts. Lea Mendelssohn Bartholdy (née Salomon) (1777-1842), the mother of musical virtuoso Felix Mendelssohn (1809-1847), wrote of Bunsen after meeting him in Berlin:

> We have made an agreeable and attractive acquaintance in M. Bunsen, Minister Resident at Rome. It is without example, I believe, that a man not belonging to the nobility should have enjoyed such favour from the highest personages as he has done; he is daily with the King and the Princes, and has been commanded repeatedly to lengthen his sojourn here.[215]

These observations of Bunsen's quick acceptance into the intimacy of the Prussian royal court during his visit to Berlin is helpful to illustrate how other luminaries and socially notable figures in Prussia reacted to his political ascendance with shock and surprise, most especially because he was not a member of the aristocracy. The royal family's demands that Bunsen extend his stay in Berlin was a good sign for the strengthening of his ties with the monarch and his sons. Mendelssohn-Bartholdy's letter continues, illustrating which of Bunsen's personal qualities enabled these developments:

This unusual favour is the more remarkable and honourable to [Bunsen] as he does not

[214] Frances Bunsen recorded this anecdote amidst other letters and Memoir from Bunsen's visit to Berlin in the winter of 1827. See: Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 301.

[215] Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 300.

> purchase it by flattery, but on the contrary, maintains his opinion with the utmost frankness against one and all of the acknowledged authorities at Court and in society. He has a powerful decisiveness of judgement and even sharp persistency in opinion, yet such a gift of intelligence to soften the edge of this otherwise repelling peculiarity, that his superiority is not oppressive, but is accepted as naturally resulting from the very charm of the abundance of his knowledge and animation of intellect.[216]

Bunsen's ability to speak authoritatively and knowledgeably about various subjects was tempered by his perceived modesty and affability, which won him many admirers in Berlin society that winter. Similar accounts appear throughout Bunsen's long archive, of those who were impressed by his intelligence and charm. As for the Mendelssohn-Bartholdy connection, Bunsen was delighted two years later when Felix came to Rome to perform on tour, remaining almost a year between November 1830 and October 1831. Felix spent time with Bunsen almost daily in Rome, where they spoke of music and Bunsen's liturgical work:

> I am often with Bunsen, and as he likes to turn the conversation on the subject of his Liturgy and its musical portions, which I consider very deficient, I am perfectly plain-spoken, and give him a straight-forward opinion; and I believe this is the only way to establish a mutual understanding. We have had several long, serious discussions, and I hope we shall eventually know each other better. Yesterday Palestrina's music was performed at Bunsen's house (as on every Monday).[217]

Bunsen brought Felix into his inner world by sharing with the young pianist, then only twenty-one years old, his designs for the Prussian liturgy. This relationship was representative of many of Bunsen's social connections, in that he brought people into his confidence through serious intellectual discussion of religious themes.

Although Bunsen's professional and personal rise approached its zenith *after* the ascension of Friedrich Wilhilm IV in 1840, and although the favor of the Crown Prince after

---

[216] Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, pp. 300-301.

[217] Felix to his siblings, November 23rd, 1830, Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, *Letters of Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy from Italy and Switzerland* (Boston: Oliver Ditson & Co, 1861), pp. 67-68.

their fast friendship in 1822 certainly had a part to play in Bunsen's increased favor, Bunsen also had an important relationship with King Friedrich Wilhelm III, whose own patronage in the 1820s and 1830s led to a significant number of Bunsen's goals being realized: the construction of the first Protestant hospital in Rome, the hiring of more staff (chaplains and a secretary) at the Prussian embassy to assist with his liturgical research, the printing and publishing of his Capitoline liturgy at royal expense. Bunsen's network of contacts and friends grew substantially after his 1827 visit to Berlin, and so too did his power as he grew closer to the monarch's inner circle.

In Berlin that year, Bunsen also established connections which would enable further progress towards his goals. He met Georg Heinrich Ludwig Nicolovius (1767-1839), the powerful leader of Prussia's *Ministerium der Geistlichen, Unterrichts und Medizinal-Angelegenheiten* and vice-president of the Prussian Bible Society (*Preußischen Hauptbibelgesellschaft*).[218] Nicolovius in turn introduced Bunsen to the literary scholar and book collector Karl Hartwig Gregor von Meusebach (1781-1847), whose conversation with Bunsen, and collection of 350 hymn books acted as the impetus for Bunsen's hymnological work.[219] Nicolovius also introduced Bunsen to August Neander (1789-1850), Bunsen described the event: "I was introduced to Neander by Nicolovius and had a conversation of almost two hours with him. He is admirable both as a Christian and a scholar I mean to go to

[218] The *Ministerium*, after 1817, separated the educational component but remained under Nicolovius' control. Nicolovious had also been an ally of the Prussian Union of Churches, and likely appreciated Bunsen's support of that cause.

[219] See Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, pp. 293-294. Meusebach gave Bunsen many volumes to bring home to Italy for his research.

him every day I can."[220]

In Neander, Bunsen found an influential interlocutor of the *Erweckungsbewegung*. Neander, like Bunsen, opposed the rationalism advocated by David Strauss and focused his scholarship on the piety of the heart. Through Neander, Bunsen was introduced to August Tholuck, who went on to preach as the chapel preacher in Rome later in 1828. Bunsen was impressed by Neander's speaking of the need for a theology that spoke to the heart as a way to circumvent what he and others in his network saw as the staid and lifeless theology of mainstream Lutheranism.[221] Neander, Nicolovius, and Meusebach were eager to assist Bunsen's agenda. Bunsen wrote to his wife after these meetings:

> I shall bring or send 100 New Testaments which we want much for the German congregation at Rome: and hope to obtain a good collection of Greek and Latin Fathers of the Church for the library of the chaplain… In aid of the progress of my liturgical studies, I shall bring with me much living experience and observation, and a large collection of books of Hymns, Chorales, and Forms of Worship.[222]

From these new connections, Bunsen was able to increase his own repute in Berlin academic and courtly circles, to win increased attention for his Protestant *Gemeinde* in Rome, and to secure research materials for his liturgical and hymnological scholarship projects.

In Berlin, Bunsen also attended lectures by Alexander von Humboldt on geography, sermons by Schleiermacher, and numerous gatherings in Sans Souci in Potsdam. There, he became friendly with Moritz Haubold von Schönberg (1770-1860), who at the time was the Prussian Undersecretary of State for Foreign Affairs. Of his conversation, Bunsen wrote:

---

[220] Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 294.

[221] This theology was known as *Pectoraltheologie*, from the Latin "Pectus est quod facit theologum" or "The heart makes the theologian."

[222] Bunsen, *Memoir* vol. 1, p. 295.

> With Schönberg, I became thoroughly acquainted by means of a long conversation I had last week, in which he in the kindest manner possible gave me information as to the relations of parties and persons here, and confirmed me in the high esteem in which I have from the first held him, and in which the far greater part of Berlin sympathises.[223]

Bunsen, in befriending the key figures of the Prussian ministerial apparatus, showed that he was a quick study of Berlin's political landscape. The foreign minister Friedrich Eichhorn (1779-1856) also became an early ally of Bunsen, who wrote of the two ministers, "the acquaintance and friendship of Eichhorn, and that of Schönberg, are valued acquisitions in the world of public business" and "I have friends for life in Schönberg, Eichhorn, and Nicolovius, and I believe I might reckon others in that number."[224] These same allies warned Bunsen in 1845 after he became a member of Friedrich Wilhelm IV's *Wirklicher Geheimer Rath* (Privy Council), that other ministers and courtiers were jealous of Bunsen's influence with the new king.

These powerful friends in the Prussian state apparatus were welcome members to Bunsen's network, and he related to them through frequent religious references and a shared commitment to Christianity. This trip was important in particular for the degree to which it increased the already-strong patriotism that Bunsen felt for both Prussia and "Germany." Those sentiments towards Germany had long been present, especially during the years during and immediately following the Napoleonic occupation, which Bunsen described to a friend in 1815 as "the sacred enthusiasm for the common cause of the country."[225] This convergence of romantic patriotism and religious enthusiasm within Bunsen's associates was a mediating

[223] Bunsen, *Memoir,* vol. 1, p. 296.

[224] Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, pp. 291, 295.

[225] Bunsen to Lücke, June 16th, 1815 in: Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 78.

ideology, which both brought them together and inspired their projects over the decades.

German Theologians, Intellectuals, and Churchmen

The German and English members of Bunsen's network were partly comprised of university figures, most of whom were theologians. Although Bunsen never held a formal academic position, he was well respected by many that did. Theologians in university faculties had been somewhat weakened in the early post-Napoleonic era, but during the Restoration, universities transformed and adapted by adopting a scholarly/modern/research ethos defined by scholarship and "modern" research methods.[226] University theology faculties played a key role in promoting Christianity, by maintaining good relationships with other academic disciplines. Academic professors were appointed by the state, and therefore served both ecclesiastical and state interests in training the next generation of ministers, theologians, and church leaders. One such smaller network was of students that Bunsen had met while in university in Göttingen during the years 1814-1815. Gottfried Christian Friedrich Lücke (1791-1855), Wilhelm Hey (1789-1854), Johann Friedrich Agricola (1790-1862), Christian August Brandis (1790-1867), Ernst Schulze (1789-1817), and Karl Reck (b. 1790) all constituted Bunsen's inner circle during his university years, and each went on to have a lifelong correspondence with Bunsen. Brandis once wrote of their group, that Bunsen acted as the peacemaker after spirited debates:

> Occasions of disunion failed not to occur among the friends, especially when the two extreme points came into harsh contact, when the rough jokes and uncongenial questions of Reck wounded the susceptible and refined nature of [Ernst] Schulze; then could Bunsen alone find out the means of restoring harmony, and with humorous

[226] Thomas Albert Howard, *Protestant Theology and the Making of the Modern German University* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), p. 6.

cordiality to overrule both.[227]

Practicing diplomacy even as a student amongst friends, Bunsen drew these men together through late night discussions, readings of poetry, hikes in the forests, and especially a shared interest in theology. Particularly important was an edition of the *Theologica Germanica*, a mystical Christian text dated to the fifteen century which Bunsen and his friends spent significant time with.[228] Bunsen's friend recalled the book's importance: "A small volume entitled *Theologia Germanica* made at this time a profound impression upon us, and among Bunsen's papers a set of sheets inscribed "Building Stones" may yet perhaps be found in which he wrote down notes on the subjects that occupied his thoughts and were continually discussed between us."[229]

The *Theologica Germanica* had gained wide traction during the Reformation, and again through the influence and endorsements of leading Pietists Johann Arndt and Philipp Jakob Spener. The text argued that God and mankind are able to be unified by living a life of perfection along the lines of Christ through the renunciation of sin and selfishness. In Luther's preface to his 1518 edition, he argued that the text was proof that divine theological truths are capable of being expressed in German (instead of only Hebrew, Greek, and Latin):

> Let as many as will, read this little book, and then say whether Theology is a new or an old thing among us; for this book is not new. But if they say as before, that we are but German theologians, we will not deny it. I thank God, that I have heard and found my God in the German tongue, as neither I nor they have yet found Him in the Latin, Greek, or Hebrew tongue. God grant that this book may be spread abroad, then we

[227] Brandis' recollections in: Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 55.

[228] The *Theologica Germanica* was actually a fourteenth century text which was later found, reworked, and republished by Martin Luther in 1516 and 1518.

[229] Brandis' recollections in: Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 60.

shall find that the German theologians are without doubt the best theologians.[230] These sentiments, rediscovered by Bunsen and his friends three centuries after they were written, seemed to influence much of what motivated their primary motivations in life: That German theology was uniquely important to Protestant Christianity, and that self-sacrifice and the renunciation of selfishness could lead to man's unity with God.[231] Indeed, Bunsen's friend Brandis wrote of Bunsen's work after his death, that "In [Bunsen's] latest works I discern traces of those early-formed germs" from the *Theologica Germanica*.[232] The book's importance to Bunsen never faltered as he caused it to be translated into English and published forty years after he first read it by another node in his network, the translator Susanna Winkworth.[233]

The influence of even this small network of students was significant to his career later in life. The publisher Friedrich Christoph Perthes (1772-1843) opened one of the first major modern publishing houses in Germany in the nineteenth century, *Friedrich Andreas Perthes* (named after himself and his brother Andreas) in Gotha in 1822. Friedrich Perthes had become involved with the *Erweckungsbewegung* and was a leader of the *Hamburgisch-Altonaischen Bibelgesellschaft*, and directed his business to publish many texts by anti-rationalists. Bunsen's schoolmate Agricola had married Perthes' daughter, and the son-in-law quickly arranged a correspondence between his father-in-law and Bunsen, the former of whom would go on to publish many of Bunsen's works in German.

---

[230] "Preface" in: Martin Luther, *Theologica Germanica*, (Wittenberg: 1518).

[231] See Chapter 3 for Bunsen's feelings regarding self-sacrifice in the Liturgy.

[232] Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 60.

[233] Susanna Winkworth, *Theologica Germanica* (Andover: W. F. Draper, 1857).

The other German theologians who were in Bunsen's network were the embassy chaplains in Rome, discussed at length in Chapter 1. These men, Schmieder, Rothe, Tholuck, and Tippleskirch, all went on to advanced careers in German churches, and all carried on correspondence with Bunsen in the years after leaving Rome. The thread that tied these men together was their ceaseless commitment to church reform via the spiritual renewal of the congregation along the lines of the *Erweckungsbewegung.*

English theologians and Churchmen

The English theologians who had visited Bunsen at Rome made up an integral component of Bunsen's wider network, and it was this group that contributed to his popularity in London even before his appointment as the Prussian ambassador there in 1841. Previous chapters have focused on several of the major motivations of this group of mostly latitudinarian Anglican churchmen: expanding religious toleration for dissenters, combating rationalism on the one hand and High Church orthodoxy (or worse, crypto-Catholicism) on the other, and bringing Germanic ideas into the English mainstream. The most significant members of this network were Thomas Arnold, Julius Hare, Frederick Maurice, Arthur Stanley, and Philip Pusey, all of whom had met Bunsen in Rome and played significant roles in English religious discourse.[234]

The men in the English Protestant network were unified by two main ideas. First, they believed that Christian faith was necessary because it fulfilled an intrinsic human need while

[234] Philip Pusey (1799-1855) must be differentiated from his younger brother, Edward Bouverie Pusey (1800-1882). Philip did not share the crypto-Catholic attitudes of his brother Edward.

also being "reasonable."[235] Secondly, they believed that the nature of spiritual revelation was not exclusively limited to the Bible, but that it could also be found in the texts of classical antiquity, Judaism, and other world religions as well. Still, they all believed that divine revelation found its perfect expression in Christianity, which had been diluted and corrupted in most instances by doctrinal orthodoxy and ecclesiastical hierarchy. Hence, the network was bound together by biblical criticism and a special reverence for the classical world. As such, Rome provided the perfect background for the formation of relationships which would last for decades on the basis of their shared beliefs about the nature of Christianity, revelation, and the pressing need for the revitalization of the church in society.

Earlier in the chapter, it was noted that Nicholas Railton had referred to this group as the "Germano-Coleridgeans." This was a term coined by John Stuart Mill to refer to a school of thought in England which was attracted to German biblical criticism and philology, whose main proponent in England was Samuel Taylor Coleridge. The key issue for the Germano-Coleridgeans was the power of language, wherein words themselves contained power which demanded careful examination. Bunsen himself had begun a philological society while a student in Göttingen in 1814, at the age of 23. Christian August Brandis (1790-1867), Bunsen's close friend and predecessor as secretary to Barthold Niebuhr, recalled the activities of this young society: "Its object was to propose subjects of historical and philological research for short essays and treatises to be communicated and critically commented upon and discussed," and recalled that, "Bunsen's room, as the largest, was the accustomed place of

[235] Schleiermacher's *Vermittlungstheologie,* examined in Chapters 1 and 4, was the genesis of Bunsen and his allies' attempt to combine reason and faith.

meeting for the rest."[236]

The study of words and language was a form of mediation that bound together nodes within Bunsen's network over the course of his entire career. In 1854, for example, he held a philological "Alphabetical Conference" in his London residence, attended by the renowned German orientalist and philologist, Max Müller (1823-1900).[237] Indeed, Müller was an early benefactor of Bunsen's patronage when Müller was appointed to Oxford in 1850, and Bunsen was able to assist Müller in publishing many articles and books in England, often with Bunsen as a co-author. Frederick Denison Maurice (1805-1872), who studied with Coleridge and Bunsen, also made the study of words a central part of religious life. Indeed, Maurice wrote that the language of devotion signified "the entrance into a mystery, into the presence of that Absolute and Eternal Truth, which words may speak of but cannot embody."[238] Bunsen, Hare, and Maurice also briefly published a magazine called the "Philological Museum" in 1831, dedicated to philological essays.

Bunsen's English associates: Arnold, Hare, Thirlwall, Maurice, and Stanley, had all taken trips to Rome and met him in the 1820s and 1830s. There, he astounded them with his knowledge and enthusiasm of England and Anglicanism, his mastery of classical history and philology, and his vigorous Christianity. After meeting Bunsen, Hare and Thirlwall worked together on translating Niebuhr's History of Rome (published in 1828), to Bunsen's great

---

[236] From the 1861 "Recollections of Bunsen in the years 1814 and 1815" by his friend, Christian August Brandis, who became a professor of philology at the University of Bonn. See: Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, pp. 55-56.

[237] Max Müller, *Proposals for a Missionary Alphabet, Submitted to the Alphabetical Conferences Held at the Residence of Chevalier Bunsen in January 1854* (London: Spottiswoode, 1854).

[238] Frederick Denison Maurice, *Thoughts on the Rule of Conscientious Subscription* (Oxford: 1845), pp. 12-13, cited in: Jeremy Morris, "The Text as Sacrament: Victorian Broad Church Philology," *Studies in Church History* 38 (2002): 365–74.

delight. These men were all bound together by Bunsen through their shared commitment to the Broad Church, and thereby also a shared animosity towards the Oxford Movement led by Edward Pusey. Connop Thirlwall, writing to Arthur P. Stanley, wrote:

> Our [ideal] Church has the advantage -such I deem it- of more than one type of orthodoxy: that of the High Church, grounded in one aspect of its formularies, that of the Low Church grounded on another aspect; that of the Broad Church striving to take in both in its own way. Each has a right to a standing-place; none to the exclusive possession of the field.[239]

Thirlwall's description accurately describes the ideal that bound them together: a Broad church which would allow Christians of both "High" and "Low" proclivities to belong under an encompassing Protestant umbrella. In the view of those in Bunsen's network, by including all Protestants with diverging views in one church, it would hopefully cause them to face one another and therefore lead them to moderate their feelings of animosity towards one another. All of these men at various times acknowledged their indebtedness to Bunsen in the realm of religious scholarship.[240]

Thomas Arnold (1795-1842), the headmaster of the Rugby School from 1828-1841, was one of Bunsen's most intimate friends. Although we examined some of Arnold's career in chapter 2, it is especially worth showing how Bunsen was able to cultivate this relationship with quite intimate prose and sentiments of friendship. Arnold first visited Bunsen in Rome in the spring of 1827, and Bunsen acted as a tour guide to the various monuments and hallmarks of the Roman cityscape. Note the language of Bunsen's first letter to Arnold:

> The voice of esteem and hearty affection, from the lips of one whom one truly esteems and loves, is a precious boon to the heart, when granted as the result of long

[239] Connop Thirlwall, Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, *Letters to a Friend* (Boston: Roberts Brothers. 1883), pp. 57-58. This was a published series of letters between Thirlwall and Stanley.

[240] Owen, *Bunsen and his Friends,* pp. 82-83.

> acquaintance; and only those who have thus experienced it can duly estimate its cheering sound from afar off, as the faithful echo of merely short hours of friendly intercourse. Every degree of mutual inclination and affection is a free gift from man but also a gift of the Lord in whom only the fullness of friendship can be met and in a peculiar sense felt to be such.[241]

Expressions of friendship ebullient as these are representative of other letters from Bunsen's archive, although they are not always as poetic and glowing as those between Bunsen and Arnold. Bunsen was determined to show in this first instance of correspondence that he had been quite taken with Arnold, that their friendship could be understood as a divine gift, and furthermore, that they shared mutual interests in the countries from which the other came: "As you have been attracted by much in the German character and life, essentially allied to, and yet differing from, the national character of your people and their method of mental cultivation, so is it with me in regard to yours, in which I have found so much, not only to respect, but to love."[242] This letter shows that Bunsen was as keen to display his Anglophilia to Arnold as he was to act as the purveyor of German "character." Bunsen drew Arnold to himself through their shared interest in one another's countries and in church reform.

It was not just their shared ideals that kept the network together. These particular connections of Bunsen's network were especially intimate. When Thomas Arnold died in 1842, Bunsen wrote a letter to their mutual friend, Julius Hare, lamenting his loss for their mission against the Oxford Movement:

> I write to *you*, now *only* to you all I think. All the errors and blunders, which make the Puseyites a stumbling block to so many- the rock on which they split, is no other than what Rome split upon- self righteousness, out of want of understanding justification by faith … With the Puseyites, as with the Romanists, these ideas [of church reform] are cut off at the roots. Oh, when will the Word of God be brought up against them?

[241] Bunsen to Thomas Arnold, April 6th, 1828 in: Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 316.

[242] Bunsen to Thomas Arnold, April 6th, 1828 in: Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 316.

> What a state this country is in! The land of liberty rushing into the worst slavery, the truest thraldom![243]

Bunsen's alarm about the effects of the Oxford Movement on the English is clear. In the 1840s, the cultural war between the Broad Church reformers and the Oxford Movement was at a fever pitch, resulting in the firings of university professors and the barring of dissenting students from attending certain universities. To Bunsen and those around him, the loss of Arnold made those issues seem more dire.

Bunsen was not just a social climber in the forging of these ties, but there was genuine affection established among them. Bunsen was bound in trust and confidence to Hare, with whom he could be honest about his fears of "Puseyism." The intimacy of this group was bound up in notions of religious battle, as evidenced by two stanzas from the poem that accompanied Bunsen's letter mourning Arnold's death, sent to Hare:

Du hast mit uns gekämpfet [sic] des Glaubens heil'gen Kampf,
Für alle tief empfunden der bittren Leiden Krampf:
Du sagst der Menschheit nahen Gericht und blut'gen Streit,
Klar stand vor deinem Auge der Jammer dieser Zeit.

Wir aber wollen kämpfen, wie du es vorgethan,
In Hoffnung und in Liebe, mit Glauben angethan,
Die Ewigkeit vor Augen, Wahrhaftigkeit im Sinn,
Und geben für die Wahrheit das Leben willig hin![244]

The poem was translated into English in 1852 by Anna Gurney, although the translation seems to lose most of the substance of the original German. A more literal translation would get at several of the core beliefs that animated these men in Bunsen's network:

You have fought alongside us with the Faith of holy war,
For everyone who perceived the bitter pain of life's drudgery:
You said humanity drew near to Judgement and bloody conflict,

[243] Bunsen to Thomas Arnold, June 19th, 1842, in: Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 2, p. 18.

[244] Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 593.

Clearly before your eyes stood the sorrow of our times.

But we wanted to fight, as you once did,
In Hope and Love, pleased with Faith,
Eternity before your eyes, Truthfulness in your mind,
And giving your life willingly for the truth!

These rapturous sentiments expressed by Bunsen over Arnold's character show that these men believed that they were involved in matters most important. Bunsen's allusions to the impending nature of judgment and bloody conflict once again illustrate the eschatological flavor that often characterized the intimate correspondence of Bunsen's network. Whether or not these men were anticipating the imminent, actual, and cataclysmic end of the world is not entirely clear, but the important point is that they conceived of themselves and their work as taking place within a divine struggle.

Thomas Arnold was so close to Bunsen that he named one of his daughters after him. In a letter to a friend, Arnold wrote she was:

> … a little girl to whom we mean to give the unreasonable number of names- 'Frances Bunsen Trevenen Whateley Arnold,' the second after my valued friend Bunsen, the Prussian Minister at Rome, of whom, as I know not whether I shall see him again, I wished to have a daily present recollection in the person of one of my children… I am sure that you would love and admire with me the extraordinary combination of piety and wisdom and profound knowledge and large experience [of Bunsen].[245]

The impression made by Bunsen on the lives of these theologians and scholars in English society, schoolmasters like Arnold, bishops like Hare, and literary figures like the Winkworth Sisters, Catherine and Susanna, was accomplished through verbal and written expressions of sincere admiration and piety. The network was animated by the shared belief that they were involved in a struggle whose consequences might, in their perception, lead to the destruction

[245] Thomas Arnold to J.T. Coleridge, October, 1833 in: Thomas Arnold, *Life and Letters of Thomas Arnold* (London: John Murray, 1877), p. 463.

or salvation of the church, and the societies built up around them.

Counter-network: The Neo-Lutheran Threat to *Gewissensfreiheit*

The other chapters of this dissertation focus on the activities and motivations of Bunsen and those in his network. We have occasionally examined the resistance to Bunsen by the conservative, High Church Oxford Movement in England, but what of the rivalry to Bunsen in Prussia? The most high-profile opponents to Bunsen emerged in the years after the 1848 Revolutions, as a reactionary element within the Prussian church hierarchy: The Neo-Lutherans. The movement had formed within the milieu of the *Erweckungsbewegung* but placed a heavy emphasis on the "church visible" or the institutional hierarchical body which administered sacraments and dictated spiritual life for worshippers. The movement can be seen as a Prussian corollary to the Oxford Movement in England. Indeed, the Tractarian leader John Henry Newman, one of Bunsen's opponents during the establishment of the Jerusalem Bishopric, was read widely by German-speaking Neo-Lutherans who also sought to re-establish the "Catholicity" of the Prussian Church.

From friend to opponent: The case of Stahl and "Freedom of conscience"

Bunsen's most consequential public rival was the jurist Friedrich Julius Stahl (1802-1861). Stahl was born in Würzburg to Jewish parents but converted to Christianity at the age of seventeen. After studying law in Erlangen, Würzburg, Heidelberg, and Munich, Stahl became an adjunct professor (*Privatdozent*) in Munich in 1827, lecturing on the philosophy of law. Bunsen met Stahl in the summer 1840 while serving as the Prussian

ambassador to Switzerland. Friedrich Wilhelm IV, having just ascended the throne in June, had asked Bunsen to help him vet potential candidates for academic promotion to the University of Berlin. Over the course of a two or three day visit, Bunsen had formed a good impression of the younger scholar and informed the King of his recommendation.[246]

Bunsen may have been impressed by Stahl's counterrevolutionary leanings. During Stahl's university years (1820-1824), he had joined the nationalist student fraternities (*Burschenschaften*) at each institution, in which he was elected to leadership positions.[247] Yet, Stahl worked from within the fraternities to suggest that the fraternities should avoid political agitation, and should focus instead on their studies.[248] Like Bunsen, and so many other of Bunsen's closest peers, Stahl had experienced a spiritual awakening in 1822 while at the University of Erlangen as a student of the theologian Johann Christian Gottlob Ludwig Krafft (1784-1845). Krafft was a founding figure in the *Erweckungsbewegung* in Erlangen, having had his own adult "awakening" experience in 1821 (at the age of 37), after which he influenced a host of younger theologians who came to form the *Erlanger Schule* of *Erweckungstheologie*.[249] When Krafft died in 1845, Stahl eulogized him by comparing him to Phillipp Jakob Spener, the founder of German Pietism. Stahl claimed that Krafft was the

[246] A short narrative account of this meeting was written editorially by Frances Bunsen, who claims that no extant letters exist in Bunsen's archives of the event. See: Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, pp. 570-571.

[247] The student *Burschenschaften* had been an early form of political agitation for German nationalists, and were criminalized by Count Metternich's Carlsbad Decrees in 1819 following the assassination of conservative dramatist August von Kotzebue by a student member of the *Burschenschat*, Karl Ludwig Sand. Still, the Carlsbad Decrees were not as strictly enforced in Bavaria, where Stahl attended university, as in other provinces of the German Confederation.

[248] Helge Dvorak and Klaus Oldenhage, *Biographisches Lexikon der Deutschen Burschenschaft* (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2014), p. 477.

[249] The *Erlanger* school of theology was a conservative form of the *Erweckungsbewegung*, which came to be associated with Neo-Lutheranism, and advocated for a more assertive, chauvinistic Lutheran confessional church in society.

"man who has rebuilt the church in my Bavarian Fatherland … who has caused throughout the whole land a springtime to bloom, the fruits of which are sure to ripen in eternity."[250] As we have seen throughout this dissertation, Bunsen formed fast friendships with those with an affinity toward the *Erweckungsbewegung*, so it can rightly be argued that Stahl was a member of Bunsen's network who benefitted from his patronage.

Shortly after Bunsen's recommendation to King Friedrich Wilhelm IV in 1840, Stahl was brought to the University of Berlin to teach the philosophy of law, state law, and ecclesiastical law, and began to curry increased favor in the Prussian court. Indeed, he had been recruited by Bunsen and the king specifically to counter the rationalist Hegelian element in the university, a fact which Stahl unabashedly announced during his introductory lecture, causing a minor scandal and Hegelian student protests.[251] Stahl became increasingly conservative and reactionary after his move to Berlin. During the 1848/49 Revolutions, Stahl opposed recognizing the legitimacy of the Frankfurt Parliament.[252] During the nascent era of party politics after the failed revolutions, Stahl gathered conservative students around himself and began formally organizing a conservative party.

At first glance, one might assume that Stahl's theological anti-rationalism and reactionary, counterrevolutionary political stance might have endeared him further to Bunsen

---

[250] Karl Goebel, "Johann Christian Krafft," *Realenzyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, eds. Johann Herzog and Gustav Plitt (1881), 8: 247-249, quoted and cited amongst a good summary of the relationship between Stahl and Krafft in: Andrew Kloes, *The German Awakening : Protestant renewal after the Enlightenment, 1815-1848* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2019), pp. 108-109.

[251] Christian Wiegand, *Über Friedrich Julius Stahl (1801-1862): Recht, Staat, Kirche* (Paderborn: F. Schöningh, 1981), p. 22. The German historian Heinrich von Treitschke called Stahl "loutish" (*pöbelhaft*).

[252] Wilhelm Füssl, *Professor in der Politik, Friedrich Julius Stahl (1802-1861): das monarchische Prinzip und seine Umsetzung in die parlamentarische Praxis* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988), p. 118.

and his allies, who were themselves also deeply worried about revolutionary energies and the secularizing effects of rationalism in universities and churches. Indeed, Frances Bunsen wrote of Bunsen's initial reaction to Stahl in 1840: "The opinion formed by Bunsen of the capabilities of Stahl as a writer to carry on active opposition to the current of infidel writings and lectures at that time exercising such general and perceptible influence must have been a considerable one."[253]

However, to Bunsen's dismay, Stahl's conservatism in church matters eventually led him to argue for the reestablishment and supremacy of the Lutheran confession. Stahl turned his attention to the unified church of Prussia pursued, codified, and implemented by Friedrich Wilhelm III between 1817 and 1821, which Stahl considered to be a grave mistake which diminished the centrality of Lutheranism in Prussian churches and weakened the legitimacy of the church hierarchy. Having worked his way into the good graces of Friedrich Wilhelm IV, Stahl was appointed to the Supreme Church Council (*Evangelischer Oberkirchenrat*), the chief executive body governing church affairs in Prussia, while also being appointed as president of the German Protestant Church Diet (*Deutscher Evangelischer Kirchentag*).[254] In 1850, Stahl gave a speech on "Christian Toleration," in which he denounced religious dissenters like Baptists. In Stahl's view, a strong Christian state ought to have a strong national church, administered hierarchically by the *Kirchentag* and the *Oberkirchenrat*.

[253] Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 570.

[254] Founded in 1848, the *Kirchentag* was established in order to show unity among the different Protestant denominations in Germany and Austria: Lutheran, Reformed, United, and Moravian churches, to stand against so-called "non-evangelical" denominations (i.e. Baptists, Quakers, *Lichtfreunde*). The *Kirchentag* also debated questions of church and state relations and the logistics of the "Inner Mission" projects of Christian missionary work and philanthropy. See: Werner Kreft, *Die Kirchentage von 1848-1872* (Frankfurt am Main: P. Lang, 1994).

Bunsen and his latitudinarian network had long promoted broad religious tolerance and freedom of conscience (*Gewissensfreiheit*) for the numerous Christian denominations in Prussia to worship however they saw fit.[255] Bunsen rebuked Stahl's 1850 speech (and its subsequent written publication) on the subject: "[Stahl] so openly preached intolerance and persecution, that it seems to me impossible to a Protestant who possesses voice and pen to keep silent."[256] As he was writing a series of responses to Stahl's speech, Bunsen wrote that he "had much to read on the subject… to be armed against the hail of attacks that will be made upon me by Jesuits and Protestant zealots."[257] Bunsen and Stahl thus became opposing figureheads on either side of a cultural and religious rift in the 1850s which pitted two networks against one another. The reverberations of this conflict took place in print, in public, and at the highest levels of church and state governance. Partisan articles even appeared in the press and periodicals abroad, in England, France, and the United States.

Stahl's essay *Über christliche Toleranz: ein Vortrag*, published in 1855, argued that the Prussian state was justified in persecuting and prohibiting religious dissenters from worshiping in the state churches, out of fear that their beliefs would spread in the general public.[258] Stahl's position was typical of the reactionary impulses which shook conservatives in the aftermath of the failed revolutions in 1848-9 in Germany, as they feared revolutionary impulses might foment within the smaller, nonconformist denominations. To that end, Stahl's

[255] These included the so-called *Freikirchen* (Free Churches), Baptists, Quakers, Methodists, and Independent regional churches which were all, nevertheless, nominally Christian in so far as they accepted Christ.

[256] Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 2, p. 379.

[257] Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 2, p. 379.

[258] Friedrich Julius Stahl, *Über christliche Toleranz: ein Vortrag* (Berlin: Wilhelm Schultze, 1855).

book attacked the ecumenical Evangelical Alliance as a dangerous crowd of sects which would undermine the strength of a newly forceful Prussian national church.

Even more alarming to Bunsen and his network, Stahl argued that Christian "tolerance" ought only to be extended from the Protestants of Germany to the Roman Catholic Church in Germany, and vice versa:

> German Protestantism must keep its historical position in God's Kingdom; and by this position it is united, as with a link, to the Roman Catholic Church of the middle ages, and therefore also to that of the present day. At [German Protestantism's] rise, it did not aim to overthrow the Church of Rome, in order to establish a new one by the Word of God, nor can we unite now in brotherly concord with those who aim to destroy it.[259]

In response to his embrace of Catholicism, the English newspaper *Evangelical Christendom* attacked Stahl as "an adversary to the evangelical faith" and "an historical pervert," because of Stahl's position. The magazine argued further that: "Does it not appear as if [Stahl] purposely went back to the beginning of the Reformation in order to ingratiate himself with the Roman Catholics? … The Pope continues, year by year, to anathematise Protestants as heretics, Dr. Stahl not excepted; but he is so fond of Popery that he smiles even under its blows."[260]

The positions held by Stahl and his supporters to persecute religious dissenters while embracing a friendlier attitude towards Roman Catholicism were considered nothing less than tyrannical by Bunsen and his allies. The network quickly countered Stahl by publishing a two-volume series of Bunsen's letters with Ernst Moritz Arndt (1769-1860), the German

[259] Stahl, *Christliche Toleranz*, p. 26.

[260] Anonymous, "Professor Stahl's Discourse on Christian Toleration," *Evangelical Christendom: Its State and Prospects* vol. 9 (1855): 180.

nationalist poet, as the apocalyptically-titled book, *Die Zeichen der Zeit* (Signs of the Times) in 1855.[261] Bunsen slammed Stahl, suggesting that "religious liberty has never led to political revolution, but its suppression often has" and that the church hierarchy "desires freedom of conscience only for itself, and instinctively combats it in others."[262] A more overtly powerful (and intolerant) church hierarchy, thought Bunsen, was tantamount to "papism" and was a dangerous "sign" of the times, which would lead to the downfall of the church and the legacy of the Reformation. Echoing his earlier liturgical work, Bunsen's polemic suggested "He who wants a church, must build a congregation."[263] In Bunsen's view, shared by his English allies in the Evangelical Alliance and moderates in the Prussian church, freedom of conscience as it pertained to religious worship was at the root of Christianity, and that only the state could guarantee that tolerance, even for unconventional Christians. Bunsen claimed that Christian *Gemeinden* could not live "without being able to breath the holy air of *Gewissensfreiheit.*"[264]

Stahl responded to Bunsen's attack with the unsubtly-titled book, *Wider Bunsen* ("Against Bunsen") in 1856. In contrast to Bunsen, Stahl argued that *Gewissensfreiheit* would unquestionably lead to doubt in the established church, which should be protected against the organized propaganda of "sects."[265] Stahl cautioned that *Gewissensfreiheit* would ultimately lead to more terrifying consequences, saying that Bunsen's position would lead to revolution:

---

[261] Arndt was eighty-six years old at the time of the publication of his correspondence with Bunsen.

[262] Bunsen's book was also translated by Susanna Winkworth (one of Bunsen's most important English allies) and published as: *Signs of the Times: Letters to Ernst Moritz Arndt, on the Dangers to Religious Liberty in the Present State of the World.* trans. Susanna Winkworth, (London, 1856).

[263] "Wer eine Kirche haben will, muß eine Gemeinde bauen," in: Bunsen, *Zeichen der Zeit*, vol. 2, p. 39.

[264] Bunsen, *Zeichen der Zeit*, vol. 2, p. 34.

[265] Friedrich Julius Stahl, *Wider Bunsen* (Berlin: W. Hertz, 1856), p. 72.

"It is not freedom of conscience, but rather the unlimited foundation of [new] churches, it is not freedom of religion, but rather equality of religion. It is *Liberté* and *Égalité* at the ecclesiastical level. That is the state of our fight."[266] For Stahl, nothing could have been more threatening to German Protestantism than the equality of all denominations. By invoking the tropes of the *Liberté* and *Égalité*, only a few years after Germany's own failed revolutions, Stahl was rhetorically linking Bunsen and his latitudinarian fellows to the unholy, anti-Christian specter of the French Revolution.

Bunsen's ally, the Reformed pastor Friedrich Wilhelm Krummacher (1796-1868) attempted to mediate between the two sides with his own 1868 essay, *Bunsen und Stahl.* Like Bunsen, Krummacher was a dedicated theologian of the *Erweckungsbewegung* who had been trained in Halle and who frequently denounced rationalist theology. Krummacher was a friend of Bunsen's, having even visited and dined with Bunsen and his family in London in 1851 alongside other evangelical friends of Bunsen like Daniel LeGrand and Johann Wichern.[267] On the debate between Bunsen and Stahl, though, Krummacher ultimately sided with Stahl. However, Krummacher came to Bunsen's defense, suggesting that Stahl's insinuations of Bunsen's anti-Christian motives were unjust and that Bunsen was indeed a thoughtful and pious Christian who had simply gotten "deeply lost" (*tief verirrt*) along the wrong track in his thinking about tolerating dissenters in Prussian churches.[268]

---

[266] "Es ist nicht Gewissensfreiheit, sondern unbegränzte Kirchenstiftung, ist nicht Religions*freiheit*, sondern Religions*gleichheit*. Es ist die *liberté* und *égalité* auf dem kirchlichen Gebiete … Das ist der Stand des Streites." [emphasis Stahl's] in: Stahl, *Wider Bunsen*, p. 76.

[267] See Bunsen's letter to his daughter on August 25th, 1851, in Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 2, pp. 269-271.

[268] Friedrich Krummacher, *Bunsen und Stahl : zur Verständigung über den neuesten Kirchenstreit : drei Vorträge gehalten vor der Versammlung des Evangelischen Vereins in Potsdam* (Berlin: Wiegandt und Grieben, 1856), pp. 1-3.

The consequences of this debate led to Bunsen's self-estrangement from the *Kirchentag*, and ultimately distanced him from Friedrich Wilhelm IV, as well.[269] Although the King had long advocated for religious tolerance along the lines of the Prussian Union implemented by his father, Stahl and other conservatives had increasing influence over Friedrich Wilhelm IV until his stroke in 1857.[270] It can be said that although Bunsen's network enjoyed spectacular literary success in the late 1850s, they had less influence over church politics than he may have enjoyed in the 1830s and 1840s.

In this time of publicly-aired turmoil, Bunsen turned to those in his network for emotional and political support. To his trusted friend of 40 years, Friedrich Lücke, Bunsen wrote about the issue:

> The woes and wrongdoings of my beloved fatherland in general, and the condition of the Church and of religious instruction in particular, weigh more heavily upon my heart than I could … have believed possible … **I shall keep away from the *Kirchentag* at least until the men who design to make it an instrument of their separatist will shall have been excluded from the committee**. The first object ought to be to support the Union against their [Stahl et. al] system of violence and persecution. The feeble basis of confederacy is not even accepted by them in sincerity. But what should be expected from those who propose *as law* the Lutheran Liturgy for infant baptism, with Exorcism and Regeneration? **I shall not go to that meeting, but other levers will not be wanting to drive out the evil spirit, not by Beelzebub, but by the Word of the Lord; to which work I feel, as you do, a fresh spring of youthful courage.**[271] [emphasis added]

These dramatic lines sent to Lücke show that Bunsen and his allies were deeply troubled about the highest Prussian ecclesiastical authorities, along with the state, mandating a

---

[269] The Prussian monarch's decision for Prussian neutrality during the Crimean War (1853-1856) had already led to Bunsen's resignation from his diplomatic service in 1854.

[270] Friedrich Wilhelm IV suffered a massive stroke in 1857 which left him mentally incapacitated. The rule of Prussia fell to his younger brother William who acted as Regent for three years until Friedrich Wilhelm's death in 1861, after which William I became King (and then Emperor, in 1871).

[271] Bunsen to Lücke, August 24th, 1854, in Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 2, p. 357.

specifically Lutheran liturgy for baptism (thus discriminating against the Baptists). In Lücke, Bunsen knew he had a friend who would sympathize with his view that the *Kirchentag* had become tyrannical. The fact that he alluded to "evil spirits" (via Stahl) had corrupted the Kirchentag, which could be fought by "the Word of the Lord" showcases, once again, the fact that Bunsen and his allies consistently saw their political debates in the context of a divine, even Manichean struggle between good and evil. Bunsen described his discontent in a letter to one of his sons:

> And the poor German people must pay for all this, and endure it! The time of vengeance will indeed come, but long after we are gone. As regards the Church in Germany, nothing will be done at present. It is only the spirit in the congregation which can overcome the spirit of Popery (i.e. priestly power); but the Governments, blind or ill-intentioned, are afraid of the former. The Lutherans are becoming Puseyites -- the Jesuits laugh in their sleeve. In Prussia, the Church of the country is ruled by means of an Ecclesiastical Council which is anti-Unionist! Nicholas and *Pio Nono*![272]

Bunsen's sentiments, shared with his son, show just how much he lamented the conservative grip over the *Kirchentag* held by Stahl and his allies, as he thought the ultra-conservative position would weaken the church to the delight of the Catholic Church. Indeed, his reference to "*Pio Nono*" is a play on words for Pope Pius the IX (1792-1878), with "*Pio Nove*" meaning Pius the Ninth, and "*Nono*" meaning "Grandpa." This commonly-used derogatory nickname for the Pope shows that Bunsen and his network saw even their intra-Protestant debates as part of a larger struggle between Catholicism and Protestantism.

An analysis of Bunsen's network would not be complete without another discussion of the looming specter of Roman Catholicism and its influence. The historian Michael Gross

[272] Bunsen to his son, December 31st, 1854, in: Bunsen, *Memoir,* vol. 2, p. 368.

argued that Bunsen's anti-Stahl polemic *Die Zeichen der Zeit* used anti-Catholic tropes.[273] When Bunsen asked in the introduction of his book, "Which will triumph, church or state? Clergy or nation? *Pfaffentum* (popery) or *Volksthum* (national traditions)?" in his book, Bunsen was setting up a dichotomy between an organic movement of Germanness and an external, malignant force.[274] Gross argues that Bunsen saw Jesuitism as a form of enslavement, from which the Catholics themselves must be rescued.[275] Gross sees Bunsen as belonging to an anti-Catholic milieu of ascendant Protestant Liberals in mid-century Germany. It must be conceded that one of the forces that animated Bunsen was his deep suspicion of the "popery" and "Jesuitism" of the Roman Catholic Church, as seen even in the quotes from his correspondence excerpted above. However, Bunsen's animosity towards Stahl and the Neo-Lutherans was not simply anti-Catholic in nature. Rather, it should be seen as motivated primarily by a fear that persecuting or discriminating against dissenters would only weaken the church and lead to the spiritual and political ruin of Prussian society.

As the latest chapter of the ongoing cosmic struggle, Bunsen suggested that Stahl's Neo-Lutheran chauvinism was creating an analogous ideological strain to the Oxford Movement, the network which had opposed Bunsen's work of church reform in England in the 1840s. These movements: Tractarian "Puseyism" in England, and Neo-Lutheranism in

---

[273] Michael B. Gross, *The war against Catholicism: Liberalism and the anti-Catholic imagination in nineteenth-century Germany* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2004), p. 100.

[274] Bunsen, *Zeichen der Zeit*, vol. 1, p. 3. The use of "*Volksthum*" in Bunsen's book in 1855 must be contextualized. In earlier Enlightenment usage, the word usually signified the cultural achievements of the German *Volk*, which in the Romantic period and beyond (under Ernst Moritz Arndt and Johann Fichte) took on a more anti-clerical, anti-dynastic meaning. Of course, this term also eventually took on an anti-Semitic meaning as well. See: Wolfgang Emmerich. *Zur Kritik der Volkstumsideologie* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1971), p. 30.

[275] Gross' compelling section on Bunsen's anti-Catholicism can be found in: Gross, *The War Against Catholicism*, pp. 100-101, 109-110.

Prussia, were both considered highly dangerous by Bunsen and those in his network of reform-minded latitudinarians. The Prussian *Kirchentag* and *Oberkirchenrat*, in the wake of the 1848-9 Revolutions, had become significantly more reactionary. While Bunsen and his allies had long-been monarchist and conservative in their fears of atheism, rationalism, and Jacobinism, they felt that the High Church movements had become far too conservative. In this regard, Bunsen and his allies (like Hare, Lücke, etc.), may have found that their position had become relatively "moderate" or even "liberal" over the passage of time.

* * *

Christian Bunsen was a gregarious intellectual. He moved within and between networks, charismatically using a keen sense of sociability, friendship, and shared religious and political goals to bring and bind people to him. He was adept at making porous the boundary between private and public life, inviting generals and princes into his bourgeois home in Rome for either raucous meetings of good humor, pious biblical study and collective worship, intellectual debate and exchange, or all of the above. Bunsen was a joiner, participating in pre-existing networks. These included public associations, such as The British Foreign Bible Society, The London Society for Promoting Christianity Among Jews, the Basel Missionary Conference under Spittler and Zeller. His network encompassed members of each of these groups to varying degrees.

Bunsen's patronage networks were robust and complicated. He was himself the recipient of financial and reputational patronage from the Prussian monarchs Friedrich Wilhelm III and especially his son, Friedrich Wilhelm IV. Bunsen's official position as a Prussian diplomat was important to the international affairs of Prussia with its neighbors in

Italy, Switzerland, and England. However, Bunsen's extra-official, semi-private patronage initiatives were the location where much of his networking labor was done and where he sought to exert power over issues that mattered to him: liturgical reform, the expansion of Prussian religious presence abroad, the development of Christianity grounded in scientific learning in philology, archaeology, and biblical criticism, and the strengthening and revitalization of the church by shifting the focus of spiritual power to the congregation away from the church hierarchy.

The lasting historical impacts and legacies of Bunsen's career were enabled by his network: patronized by benefactors throughout, and supported by allies who he bound to his network with religious sentiments and political hopes. Bunsen's strength was in his unique ability to act as a central point between various networks and individuals, and he seemed to have a hand in many aspects of Prussian and English political and religious life: the selection of and defense of figures ranging from religious dissenters and their allies in English universities to Prussian ministers and church officials like Julius Stahl (one choice which he likely grew to regret). Bunsen's allies had a hand in making sure that his liturgical and hymnological contributions saw wide circulation in England and America, and the effects of their work can be measured in Jerusalem, London, and Rome.

Chapter 4: Unity, Spirit, and Power: Bunsen's Liturgical Ambitions for an Awakened Congregation

> It was in the year 1817 that being in Rome I began to make researches into the origin and history of the Liturgy of the ancient and modern churches under the conviction that the time was near when liturgical arrangements would generally be found the only means of reviving our church establishments and of becoming a bond between different confessions.[276]

When he first moved to Rome and began his work with the Protestant *Gemeinde,* Christian Bunsen began to work formally on a new liturgical arrangement for the Prussian church. In Bunsen's view, a new liturgy was the only way to reverse what he saw as decay and weakness within the church. At the same time, officials from within the Prussian state and church hierarchy were also invested in arranging a new liturgy in order to create a uniform Prussian Protestant nation bound together by religious worship. In this chapter, I am going to examine the political, social, and religious implications of Chrisitan Bunsen's role in liturgical production and its relationship to broader trends in Prussian and European Christianity.

What is a liturgy, and what can it do? A liturgy is a formula according to which a ritual, or sequence of rituals are performed as a public expression of faith. Within the Protestant churches of Germany, a complete liturgy would prescribe the exact details for the worship services on Sundays, holidays, and for the celebration of holy communion, baptisms, funerals, burials, weddings, the ordination of pastors and chaplains, the confirmation of children, and even the use of ornamentation and decoration of church spaces. Devotional music, songs, and hymns were included as addenda to official church liturgies and served a

[276] Bunsen to Archbishop Whately, Jan 25th, 1834, in: MS 2164, Lambeth Palace, p. 10.

vital role not only as theological lessons for congregants, but also as a means of arousing pious sympathies and enabling a sense of communal action within the worship service.

In the nineteenth century, churches across Europe began to reevaluate their liturgies in order to accomplish specific goals. On the one hand, some theologians and church officials were hoping to reverse a decline in church attendance. In the Prussian case, as with the other German states, the issue was more complex. With two major "Protestant" confessions alongside a sizeable Catholic minority, Prussian secular officials were concerned with presenting a unified Protestant church. Meanwhile, bitter debates were taking place between three ideological groups: revivalist theologians who sought to emphasize emotion and feeling in religion, rationalists who instead sought a scientific understanding and non-supernatural approach to Christianity, and moderate "mediating" theologians who attempted to walk the line between the other two camps.

For Bunsen, the stakes for liturgical reform could not have been higher. He feared that failure to correct the spiritual decay might result in disaffected Protestants becoming Catholic, whose church, in Bunsen's view, at least offered a rousing sense of belonging. He described these fears in a letter to his sister:

> Long has it been clear to me that in Protestant Germany no Church exists. Pious individuals there are, standing singly, **but the Church itself has fallen and is destroyed, because faith no longer exists in collective masses…** Many a one has in despair become [Catholic]. Many would construct a church of their own, not that of Christ, but few go the way of the first great Reformers… It is my conviction that all communion essentially consists in a common belief in the facts of the redemption of the human race through Christ … but when this belief, **roused by a sense of inward need and a feeling of sinfulness, begins to work among a set of men, and a congregation is to be thereby formed or revived, three points must be considered: first, agreement by means of a theological expression of the points of faith; then,**

> **by congregational discipline; thirdly, by a common form of worship**.[277] [emphasis added]

Bunsen's letter to his sister in 1821 offers a clear look at a few important themes surrounding his liturgical motivations. Bunsen believed that the German churches had been long suffering from spiritual decay and faithlessness. For Bunsen and those in his circle, the dismay over this perceived faithlessness was nothing short of an existential crisis, and a new liturgy ("a common form of worship") provided the only solution. The common form of worship prescribed by the Church of England and its Book of Common Prayer served as the inspiration for Bunsen's designs.

This chapter will begin with an exploration of the debates around the so-called *Agendestreit* in order to contextualize the impulses which motivated the desire for liturgical reform and the political concerns for state officials who implemented the reforms. An examination and comparison of two liturgies will follow: the *Berliner Agende* and the Capitoline Liturgy written by Bunsen, as well as selections of "secular" liturgies by Ernst Moritz Arndt. The investigation will be threefold: First, I will attempt to trace out what these three liturgical forms attempted to accomplish at the levels of both church and social life. Secondly, I want to show how liturgical contributions by Bunsen and his like-minded colleagues served explicitly political purposes, both on behalf of the Prussian nation and also for Bunsen's career and prestige within the English and Prussian court. Lastly, I want to show how Bunsen's liturgical works, including his efforts at a hymnbook for German Protestants were an attempt to regain something precious that had been lost during the Enlightenment, and as a part of an explicitly anti-rationalist, romantic gesture to tap into a more authentic and

[277] Bunsen to his sister Christina, January 6th, 1821, in: Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 181

pure form of Christianity. These efforts by Bunsen and those in his circle were motivated by a desire to re-spiritualize the body of German Protestants in an era of declining church influence and to contribute to to the project of creating a proto-national, uniform German culture.[278]

The King's Liturgy, *Unionspolitik*

In late 1821, a new liturgy was imposed from above by the Prussian King Friedrich Wilhelm III in order to unify the Lutheran and Calvinist churches.[279] From the monarch's point of view, liturgical unity among Prussian churches was central to the creation of a unified Protestant culture. As patriotic fervor was surging in the early nineteenth century among student groups, in the press, and in the arts, Prussian government officials became increasingly concerned with social unrest. State officials saw the church as a vehicle to inspire order and discipline, but also as a means to inspire social cohesion and loyalty to the state. The stakes of liturgical reform were thus quite high. Officials were concerned with the stability of the Prussian state through sectarian unity amongst Protestants, but also with the pernicious influence of Catholicism from within and beyond Prussia's borders. Furthermore, liturgical standardization had international implications in that it served as a potential basis

[278] Bunsen's hymnological works in particular were an effort to find explicitly "German" hymns. In this way, Bunsen's liturgical productions can be seen as contemporaneous to, and supporting of, the project of folkloric collection by the Grimm Brothers, and the verse projects of Clemens Brentano. Although Bunsen worked in the Prussian diplomatic service, he was keenly aware of the emerging national and cultural "German" identity.

[279] The first edition of the *Kirchen-Agende für die Hof- und Domkirche in Berlin* was published at Christmas in 1821, with an amended second edition soon to follow in 1822, which added sections for the ordination of pastors, the confirmation of children, burials, and the Protestant catechism.

for an alliance of Protestant superpowers.[280] Frances Bunsen described how the King's attention had turned towards the unification of the churches after a visit to England:

> The impression produced by England on the mind of Frederick William III, on the occasion of his visit there, after the occupation of Paris by the allied armies, was strong and enduring in many respects; **but nothing that he had witnessed was so congenial to his feelings as the solemnity of the quiet Sunday and the spectacle of the multitudes who, at least, showed the desire and seized the opportunity of worshipping God and of receiving edification on that day**, which was thus shielded by custom from worldly occupations. He was intensely anxious to heal the wounds of his own ravaged and dissevered dominions, by effectually securing the advancement of Christianity, as the best means of renewing well-being in every direction, and he had a strong impression of the peculiar duty inherited by the House of Brandenburg, to create peace and unity between the observances of the Reformed (or Calvinistic) Churches and those of the Lutheran Confession.[281]

The Prussian monarch was envious of the uniformity of Christian observance in England during his visit. While there is likely some truth to Frances Bunsen's identification of his motivations stemming from an anxiety to "heal the wounds" of his country, and to "secure the advancement of Christianity," it is also surely the case that the Prussian state was anxious to secure a uniform national identity based in Protestant Christianity, especially as Prussia had gained a sizeable new Catholic population.

The Prussian annexation of provinces in the Rhineland region, Silesia, and parts of Saxony occurred just seven years after a series of administrative reforms in the Prussian state abolished the previously existing governing church-bodies for the Lutheran and Reformed confessions (the Lutheran *Oberkonsistorium* and the Reformed *Kirchendirektorium*,

---

[280] At the very least, Friedrich Wilhelm III and especially his son, Friedrich Wilhelm IV, were concerned with their status as a Christian state in relation to the other principle Christian powers of Europe, especially England.

[281] Frances Bunsen in Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 323. As we shall see in Bunsen's dogged debates with the Oxford Movement over the tolerance and admission of religious dissenters, the "unity" of the Anglican church in England was more ephemeral than the King may have thought.

respectively). As Prussian state officials moved to bureaucratize and centralize church administration, the monarch Friedrich Wilhelm III saw an opportunity to unite the two Protestant confessions, eliminating a demarcation which he considered to be anachronistic.[282] The king proclaimed the Union through a cabinet order in September of 1817, which claimed that the union would not convert the Reformed church to Lutheranism, nor the Lutheran to Calvinist, but rather that both together would become a new, "evangelical-Christian" church, in the spirit of their respective founders.[283] The Union was observed on the day of the 300th anniversary of Martin Luther's nailing of his 95 Theses to the Wittenberg church door in October 1817, when the new worship services were held in the Berlin Cathedral, the *Nikolaikirche,* and the Garrison Church in Potsdam in which Lutherans and Calvinists observed communion together.

Resistance was substantial in the early years after the introduction of the new liturgy to accompany the unification of the Protestant confessions, Pietist nobility and "awakened" artisans resisted its implementation, while at the same time many Lutherans, especially in Silesia, were especially dismayed. Many of these "Old Lutherans" (*Altlutheraner*) did not want to give up their Lutheran identity and instead emigrated to the United States, Canada, Australia, and South Africa in the 1820s and 1830s.[284] Of the 7,782 Protestant churches in

[282] Prussia, which was overwhelmingly Lutheran, had been ruled by a Calvinist dynasty since 1613.

[283] A good summary of these events can be found in: Ilja Mieck, *Handbuch der Preussischen Geschichte Vol. 2: Das 19. Jahrhundert Und Grosse Themen Der Geschichte Preussens*, edited by Otto Büsch (Berlin: W. De Gruyter, 1992) p. 170.

[284] The most significant of these expatriated Lutheran communities are the Lutherans of the Missouri Synod. The LCMS claim almost 2 million members spread across over 6,000 congregations in the United States.

Prussia, 5,343 had willingly adopted the King's liturgy by May of 1825, with roughly 32% resisting its adoption.[285]

One point of tension emerged because of the prescriptive properties of the new liturgy, which placed limits on the length of sermons and songs. Sir George Rose, a British envoy to Prussia, regarded the new liturgy with apprehension because "the time of the service is not to exceed an hour of which the liturgy is to occupy one half, and the sermon the other; that of the hymns, not above three stanzas are to be sung, but it is so much the habit and the pleasure of the Lutherans, in Silesia especially, to exceed very considerably this last allowance."[286] Friedrich Schleiermacher had originally supported the cause of confessional union, although only by the limited action establishing a "loose bipartisan union."[287] By 1824, he had accused the king of breaking the law by forcing the adoption of the *Berliner Agenda*. Schleiermacher saw the king's move as tyrannical overreach, and was actually censured for writing a pamphlet opposing the King's liturgy because of the top-down enforcement of its implementation.[288] Bunsen, as we will see, also found the King's design to be severely lacking, and both men thought it would be much better to have the liturgy voluntarily adopted by the various congregations of Prussia, rather than imposed unilaterally from above:

> I come to the conclusion that interference from above, by State authority, even with the best intentions, is a very doubtful, and, as regards Church matters, mostly a ruinous, proceeding; and that a wise Government ought in fact to do nothing but acknowledge, encourage, and recommend to acceptance or imitation, what may

[285] Christopher Clark, "Confessional Policy and the Limits of State Action: Frederick William III and the Prussian Church Union 1817-40," *The Historical Journal*, 39, no. 4 (1996), p. 989.

[286] Clark, *Confessional Policy*, p. 988.

[287] Klaus Wappler, *Der theologische Ort der preußischen Unionskurkunde 27.09.1817* (Berlin, 1978), p. 19.

[288] For more on Schleiermacher's resistance to the implementation, see: Jerry F. Dawson, *Friedrich Schleiermacher: The Evolution of a Nationalist* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2011), pp. 132-137.

> independently form itself in the bosom of the Church (i. e., a Christian community). What is done on the part of Government must not (and least of all in Church matters) be a trial or experiment, but the establishment of what actually exists.[289]

Even as Bunsen was an ardent patriot and loyal subject of the Prussian crown in most matters, he felt that the imposition from above of the liturgy was bound to fail. It would be easy to parse Bunsen's words on the issue to muddy his perspective. After all, in the eyes of the thousands of churches across Prussia, does it really make a difference if a government unilaterally imposes the liturgy from above, or if it "acknowledges, encourages, and recommends to acceptance or imitation" the liturgy, instead? Still, it is clear that Bunsen thought that participation in church life, exemplified by its liturgy, as something that must develop organically from within the community. It was those beliefs that informed the creation of Bunsen's own liturgy.

The Development of Bunsen's Edition

> When I at length resolved … to work out an idea which has been cherished in my mind since 1817 to form a Protestant Liturgy for public worship, I found that I had therein met my own need, and understood the bent of my mind, and I felt in that occupation an inward peace and confidence which had long been wanting; what I attempted succeeded, and what I reflected upon became clear. Wherefore, at the beginning of the year, I engaged, before God, that, if I felt His Holy Spirit helping me, I would devote myself to this work for His Church at any sacrifice.[290]

Although Bunsen's liturgy was first published in 1828, he had already been working towards major liturgical reform since at least 1818.[291] This work involved the collection of

[289] Bunsen to Christina, February 14th, 1823, in: Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 205.

[290] Bunsen to Christina, January 6th, 1821, in: Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 180.

[291] The earliest mention in Bunsen's archival record show his desire for a reformed and revitalized liturgy for the German churches in July of 1818, and by the end of that year, he had fully resolved to devote his energies to that purpose. See: Bunsen, *Memoir,* vol. 1, p. 179.

liturgical and hymnological documents from churches across Germany on what could sometimes be months-long research trips by his subordinates at the Prussian embassy.[292] But what began as an academic, aspirational project for Bunsen suddenly became one of political opportunity and urgency in 1822, when the King published his *Berliner Agende.* By happenstance, the King was on an extended visit in Italy with his two sons when the King's Liturgy was published.

> I had obtained a copy of the newly published Liturgy from the hands of another officer … I set to work at once, the day after, to write two essays, in which I laid down my own fundamental principles in short sentences, and sketched the preliminary features of such a formulary, with particular reference to the Liturgy published by the King's order. This was completed, more rapidly than I can myself comprehend, in two days and a half: so that I could still before the King's arrival write down my own arrangement for morning and evening and for the Sunday worship.[293]

The furious and frenetic rush to complete his own version of the Liturgy immediately after examining a copy of the *Berliner Agende* shows that Bunsen was about to make a bold, even daring attempt to assert authority regarding the official Prussian church affairs. It is worth noting that, at this time, Bunsen was only the secretary at the Prussian Legation. Although he would come to form good relationships with the Crown Prince and future monarch Friedrich Wilhelm IV, at the time of this event at the end of 1822, the 29-year-old Bunsen had not yet established either reputation or influence in the Prussian court. Thus, what happened next seems all the more surprising:

> It so happens that General [Karl Ernst Job Wilhelm von] Witzleben, the King's aide-de-camp and confidential adviser… is the person whom the King had peculiarly employed and consulted in the arrangement and construction of the liturgical order of

[292] Bunsen's work including the use of state-appointed chaplains as research assistants, as was detailed in Chapter 1.

[293] Bunsen to his sister Christina, December 7th, 1822. See: Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 201.

> public worship at Berlin because he considered him to be a man of piety and right feeling.[294]

Witzleben, a Lieutenant General in the Prussian army, would later become the Prussian Minister of War. As the General-adjutant of the king, Witzleben's proximity to the center of state power made him one of the most influential men in Prussia, and now he would wield influence over the composition and implementation of the Prussian liturgy. He was considered by Bunsen to be woefully inadequate to the task of creating a reformed liturgy for German churches. After speaking with Witzleben, Bunsen wrote of their conversation:

> I did not enter into the matter of my own written essay, but rather spoke of the historical studies and researches which I had made, and gave utterance to that which would most further my purpose of making him perceive, that this was no work for the uninformed, or for beginners in learning, if a complete and comprehensive Liturgy, similar to that of the Church of England, was aimed at-- for that is indeed what is wanted, if the whole work of the union of the two churches is not to come to a standstill.[295]

In these private words to his sister, one sees that Bunsen was trying to navigate his way through the political landscape of the Prussian court. Bunsen surely risked offense, even impudence, by suggesting to Witzleben, a Prussian General and minister to the King, that he was a "beginner in learning," and yet he did so diplomatically. Bunsen's goal was to make Witzleben question his own work on the *Berliner Agende*, while also portraying himself as an authority on the subject. Bunsen's intervention shows that he was circumspectly aware of his position and the difficulty he might face in taking control of the top-down process of liturgical reform, and yet his boldness in the attempt is remarkable for such a minor embassy official as Bunsen was at the time.

---

[294] Bunsen to his sister Christina, Dec. 7, 1822. See: Bunsen, *Memoir,* vol. 1, p. 201.

[295] Bunsen to his sister Christina, Dec. 7, 1822. See: Bunsen, *Memoir,* vol. 1, p. 201.

While Bunsen shared the King's goals of reviving church attendance and uniting the confessions of German Protestants, he found the execution to be not only lacking, but also flawed. Bunsen, not satisfied with just having written an essay to correct the mistakes he perceived in the King's liturgy and intervening with General Witzleben, privately suggested that he wanted to resign from Prussian diplomatic service and devote himself full-time to liturgical research, "by which I can hope to become of more service to the State than in political affairs."[296] Bunsen's plans were interrupted by an unexpected promotion by the king during his visit in Rome. Perhaps due to his charisma and fast friendship with the king's two sons during their stay in Rome, Bunsen was elevated to "Counsellor" of the Prussian embassy and was asked to serve as the *Chargé d'affaires* while the ambassador Niebuhr went away on vacation.[297] Unable to resign after such a substantial elevation of his office and salary, Bunsen resolved to use his new rank and rising stature in the King's court to continue his liturgical projects. To that end, he entrusted his essays critical of the *Berliner Agende* with General Witzleben upon his departure from Rome, to be presented to the King in Berlin. He had to wait over two years for the opportunity to weigh in on the matter again.

In February of 1825, Bunsen received a letter from Witzleben describing how the *Berliner Agende* had been accepted by 4,828 congregations in Prussia, with further details about how the King intended to implement the liturgy into the provinces by allowing the

[296] Bunsen to his sister Christina, Dec. 7, 1822. See: Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1. p. 201. Bunsen had been mentioning his intention to not stay in the diplomatic service to Niebuhr, as well as to his wife and sister for some time, hoping that he would land a university appointment through which he might have more influence over church affairs.

[297] Bunsen could not have known that Niebuhr resolved in 1823 to retire from state service. Bunsen thereafter became *de-facto* the primary Prussian diplomat in Rome, a position which would later be made permanent with his promotion to full Minister Resident.

provinces to modify the liturgies.[298] Bunsen described Witzleben's letter as "highly condescending," perhaps because Witzleben recalled Bunsen's disapproval of his plans in 1822.[299] Still, Witzleben asked for Bunsen's opinion on the issue, which led to his composition of yet another essay. "He does me the honor to ask my opinion: and thereby has given the opportunity, ready to my hand, to write a treatise, which might in future bear witness against him."[300] Bunsen's words to his mentor and superior diplomatic officer, Niebuhr, show that he was still attempting positioning himself to circumvent the power and authority of Witzleben on the issues of liturgical reform, even as the King's liturgy had already been implemented in thousands of Prussian churches by the mid-1820s.

Theological Background, *Erweckung*, and Experience

It is helpful to consider the religious landscape of Prussian Protestantism in the early decades of the nineteenth century as a diverse and constantly undulating terrain, which adjusted continuously to the events and individuals which acted upon it. On one hand, there were influential professors and theologians. Their debates took place primarily in the literary sphere of biblical criticism, in essays, books, and newspapers, but the consequences of their theological arguments reverberated beyond those pages and had influence over the decisions

[298] Some sources have described the number as about 500 churches higher only a few months later. For example, Christopher Clark cites a source which says that 5,343 out of the total 7,782 Protestant churches of Prussia had adopted the new liturgy: R.F. Eylert, *Charakter-Züge und historische Fragmente aus dem Leben des Königs von Preußen Friedrich WIlhelm III,* vol. 3 (Magdeburg, 1846), pt. 1, p.353, cited in: Clark, *Confessional Policy*, p. 989.

[299] Bunsen to Niebuhr in: Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 256.

[300] Bunsen to Niebuhr in: Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 256.

of the church and state with regard to the character and flavor of Christian worship in Prussian society.

Among the theologians of the early nineteenth-century, whom one can roughly discern three groups of actors. At one end of the spectrum, there were the rationalists, who sought to discredit the possibility of supernatural revelation.[301] Chief among these rationalists were theologians like Julius Wegscheider (1771-1849), who worked at the University of Halle. Wegscheider and his allies sought to demystify the Scriptures and strip Christianity of any claims which made it seem unscientific (such as Christ's miracles, resurrection, etc.). On the other end of the spectrum was the orthodox party of Neo-Lutherans and conservative theologians who sought to re-emphasize the role of traditional liturgies and reassert the Lutheran confession as a separate and supreme form of Christian faith. This party was exemplified by the theologian Ernst Wilhelm Hengstenberg (b. 1802), who edited the orthodox newspaper the *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung* (EKZ). The *EKZ* published a bold attack on the rationalism, specifically targeting Wegscheider and accusing him of profanity and vulgarity, and demanding governmental intervention.[302] The third and final group were those who attempted to straddle the line between rationalism and orthodox conservatism, the so-called Mediation school of theology (*Vermittlungstheologie*). To this school of thought, sometimes also called "Liberal" or "positive" theology, both pious belief and scientific knowledge could operate simultaneously. This branch of theology was primarily associated with Friedrich Schleiermacher. A discussion of Protestant theology in the nineteenth century

[301] Supernatural revelation meaning simply, that religious truths were "revealed" to mankind through direct communication with a higher power.

[302] Hengstenberg was also an ally of Friedrich Julius Stahl, whose opposition to Bunsen appears at the end of Chapter 3.

would be impossible without mentioning Schleiermacher.[303] Schleiermacher was perhaps the most influential Protestant theologian in Prussia during Bunsen's time, and indeed, made an enormous impression on Bunsen when they first met in 1814.[304] Bunsen's wife writes: "The winter of 1815 to 1816, spent at Berlin, was in many respects important, and in none more so than through the influence gained over Bunsen's mind by the preaching of Schleiermacher, aided by the personal impression of his mind and character."[305] Bunsen and his allies belonged to this latter group of liberal theologians. This school of thought found its way out of the trap between the rationalists and supernaturalist hard-liners by emphasizing the inner life of the Christian believer as the location of religious experience. It was from within this group that the ground was set for a new spiritual movement based on revivalism and religious awakening.

Of the *Erweckungsbewegung*, the theologian Karl Barth wrote: "the revivalist movement is concerned with the dialectic of the heart's experiences, with the wonder of the Christian man, as an individual and in community with others."[306] Indeed, it is the heart which is the key to understanding the theological commitment of Bunsen and his fellow travelers, especially the embassy chaplains in Rome like Richard Rothe and August Tholuck who assisted him in his early liturgical projects. Tholuck described the feeling of the ideal "awakened" inner life: "Do you wish for the portrait of my inner life? It bubbles and boils

---

[303] Karl Barth wrote of Schleiermacher in 1946: "The first place in a history of the theology of the most recent times belongs and will always belong to Schleiermacher, and he has no rival." See: Karl Barth, *Protestant Theology of the Nineteenth Century* (Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1959) p. 425.

[304] Bunsen was reportedly "most welcome" in the society of Schleiermacher and his friends. See Bunsen: *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 62.

[305] See Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 85.

[306] Barth, *Protestant Theology*, p. 514.

and hisses and roars, as when water with fire commingles, til heavenward flies the steaming froth, and wave follows wave forever. But there raises an arm, a shining neck, It is He, a joyful sign! He swings the goblet in his hand."[307]

The impetus and motivations for Bunsen's liturgy come from his own theological commitments, which can be located on the theological spectrum alongside other awakened revivalists like Rothe and Tholuck. Although Bunsen had strong friendships with many figures associated with the *Vermittlungstheologie* of Schleiermacher, occasionally they seemed too cautious to Bunsen. In a letter to one such figure, the liberal theologian Gottfried Lücke, Bunsen wrote:

> Your commentary upon St. John does not satisfy me, because I am convinced of the insufficiency of all explanations, except that which takes *those words* simply as the teaching of Christ to the beloved disciple [St. John], as the annunciation of a divine fact. Schelling, too, holds this view. **Christ is to me the revealed, self-revealing God. Otherwise [David] Strauss must be admitted to be right**.[308] [emphasis added]

Bunsen's opposition to the rationalism of David Strauss is clear to see. As we saw in Chapter 1, Strauss had become the personification of all that was wrong within the German theological faculties. For Bunsen, any theological work or system which posited anything less than the full divinity of Christ, meant giving an inch towards Strauss' ideas and was therefore unacceptable. So, even in the texts of his friend Lücke, which potentially disenchanted the divine power of revelation, Bunsen saw a threat, or at least a mistake. The central issue for Bunsen was that Christianity ought to be based on an organic, "bottom up" congregation of believers who were motivated by warm and vibrant feelings of inner spiritual belief:

---

[307] Tholuck, *Guido and Julius*, p. 33.

[308] Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 556. Bunsen is referring to Lücke's *Kommentar über die Schriften des Evangelisten Johannes*, a four volume work published in Bonn between 1820-1832.

> **The Hymn Book, like the Liturgy, and like Bunsen's whole mental and spiritual life at that period, rested on the basis of a strict, unquestioning, but warm and living, evangelical orthodoxy, the expression of which he then still found in the Confessions of the Protestant Church, and in the Lutheran system of doctrine.** He was devoted with his whole heart to the cause of the Union between the two great branches of the Protestant Church in Germany, the Lutheran, and the Reformed or Calvinistic; but his residence in the distant and tranquil Rome preserved him from taking part in or even from obtaining full cognisance of, the unhappy disputes of that day on the introduction (by authority) of the Agende, or Liturgical Form put together under the eye of King Frederick William III., and the mischievous effects upon public opinion of this isolation from practical struggles could only be overcome at a much later period.[309]

In part, Bunsen's observation of the implementation of the King's Liturgy happened from abroad during the 1820s and 1830s, so his dispute with the liturgy was on a more theoretical level than a practical one.

Character of Bunsen's Capitoline Liturgy

Bunsen's Liturgy was first printed in 1828 at the royal court press in Berlin for a cost of 1500 Thalers donated by Friedrich Wilhelm III. It is striking to consider how impudent Bunsen's approach may have seemed. How could this diplomat deign to suggest to his King that the liturgy he had published was insufficient? Nevertheless, Bunsen prevailed by suggesting that his version was more appropriate for the needs of the particular context of his Protestant community in Rome.

The "Capitoline Liturgy" (thus named because of the Prussian Embassy's location on the Capitoline Hill in Rome) adhered to the King's official liturgy insofar as they both followed the 1526 Lutheran liturgical formula of a three-part service consisting of the opening, the reading of the word, and the sacraments. But, it differed from the King's version

[309] Recollections of a friend, 1825, in: Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 272.

in a few important ways: In the 1822 Berliner Agende, sections of the eucharistic prayers were placed before the sermon, including the *Vaterunser* and *Fürbittengebet* (Lord's Prayer and Prayer of Intercession). The King's intention here was to prescribe those prayers and the sermon itself as the high point of the service.

In contrast, Bunsen's Capitoline Liturgy was designed to activate the congregation itself. Bunsen wanted to inspire the congregation to feel as if they were taking an active role in the service. Specifically, Bunsen's liturgy focused more on collective prayer and singing, than on passively listening to a sermon. He believed that a more active participation would allow worshippers to understand themselves as an essential part of the service. In other words, by giving their contribution to a worship service, the congregation would have more investment in the collective spirit of the service and would therefore feel a more emotional attachment to the faith. Bunsen and his colleagues believed that the *Berliner Agende* could not accomplish this as it was written. The embassy chaplain Richard Rothe claimed the King's version was "a fully stillborn child, and nothing other than an assembly of various and random liturgical things, without any individual unity or aspects of a living organism."[310] This harsh condemnation by Rothe is indicative of the overall sentiment that the *Berliner Agende* was making a critical mistake by centralizing the sermon, and thereby the preacher, as the central figure in the service. Instead, Bunsen's idea was to inculcate the individual congregants with a feeling of sincere involvement and commitment. In order to do this, his liturgy deployed constant congregational activity: standing, sitting, kneeling, singing, moments of silent prayer, and so on, in addition to awakened-Pietistic prayer formulations.

[310] "[The Berliner Agende was] eine völlig totde Geburt, nichts als ein Aggregat allerlei liturgischen Stoffs ohne alle individuelle Einheit und allen lebendigen Organismus," See: Adolph Hausrath, *Richard Rothe und Seinen Freunde*, vol. 2, (Berlin: G. Grote'sche Verlag, 1902), p. 284, cited in Foerster, *Bunsen*, p. 82.

After the first embassy chaplain (Heinrich Schmieder) arrived in Rome, he began working with Bunsen right away on his liturgical studies. Bunsen's liturgical project was rooted in three distinct sources: the liturgy of the ancient Christian church, the Anglican Book of Common Prayer, and the German tradition of hymns and *Kirchenleider*. In attempting to syncretize these three distinct and seemingly disparate theological backgrounds, Bunsen's liturgy was a continuing project devised as an appeal to the authority and legitimacy of the early Christian church as a "purer" form of Christianity. As for the Anglican influence, Bunsen saw the English liturgy as valuable for the same reason - namely, that the English model had been able to preserve some key elements of worship which had been lost on the Continent since the time of the Reformation, especially song:

> Now I maintain that the English Liturgy was constructed from a grand point of view, and adapted, with much wisdom, to the wants and to the people of that time, and that it represents Christian worship far more thoroughly than anything that I have seen in Germany, Holland, or Denmark. Singing is not excluded, on the contrary, in addition to that of the congregation, the ancient style of choral song has been retained, such as the Tractus, Graduale, used in the Church of Rome,—the simple grandeur of which mode of composition, from Palestrina to Marcello, exceeds all else that I know.[311]

Despite his admiration of Anglicanism, Bunsen had to be clever (and careful) about how to bring English liturgies into the German context. In a letter to a German theologian Gottfried Lücke, Bunsen writes "We should take cognizance … of all the really good productions of former times in use among the people, and make them known at a time which has lost the

[311] Bunsen to Lücke, July 1st, 1818, in: Memoir, vol. 1, p. 145. The "*Tractus*" Bunsen refers to is Latin for Tract, which is kind of liturgical form of singing during the celebration of the Eucharist during which the congregation wants to indicate penitence rather than joy, although it is not necessarily sorrow. The "*Graduale*" or Gradual, is similarly a liturgical singing style which is used during penitential celebrations of the Eucharist. The interesting thing about Bunsen's admiration of these ancient forms is that they normally only sung in Catholic monasteries, which shows that Bunsen had admired the full spectrum of joyous and sorrowful emotion available in other confessional churches. Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina (1525-1594) and Benedetto Marcello (1686-1739) were important figures of Italian sacred musical production.

principal ideas of Christianity and of Christian worship."[312] Here, and throughout Bunsen's writings, his admiration for the English church seems to derive in part from the artifacts of the Reformation-era liturgy which survived in the Anglican tradition while fading on the continent.

Borrowing from the Anglican liturgy, Bunsen divided his own into three functions: the *Beichtamt*, including the recognition of sin, the Lord's Prayer, a Psalm, the Kyrie,[313] and Gloria. This was followed by the *Evangelienamt*, which included readings from Scripture and the sermon, closing with the *Altaramt*, and the sacraments. Bunsen claimed that these three functions or offices, or *Ämter*, were thus named to instill in all Christians a sense that they were also priests whose job it was to worship God, as well as to allow each worshipper to relate to their fellow congregants. For Bunsen, this impulse was more loyal to the Lutheran tenet of the Priesthood of all believers. This did not mean that everyone was his own priest, but rather that every Christian was a mediator for others. Therefore, the unity of the congregation was of the utmost importance, because salvation takes place within the community.

Reflecting on his own liturgy being utilized by the chaplain Schmieder, Bunsen wrote: "Were but all preachers like Schmieder, and all devotional arrangements like this—full of life and Christian spirit- then would the German evangelical church be the first in the world.[314] This infusion of "life" into his liturgy had the double impulse of strengthening the Protestant churches of Germany, and in so doing also increasing German standing in the wider Christian

[312] Bunsen to Lücke, July 1st, 1818, in: Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 145.

[313] The Kyrie eleison is a Christian prayer which translates as "Lord, have mercy upon us."

[314] Bunsen to his sister, July 24th, 1819 in: Bunsen, *Memoir,* vol. 1, p. 166.

world. Of his potential impact, Bunsen wrote: “The smaller congregation would be in this manner an image of the larger. Whether I am to influence a wider circle, or whether my work is to be a grain of seed, planted and hidden, in order that it may someday be developed and expanded — that lies in the counsel of God; and upon that I meditate no further.”[315]

The role of sin in Bunsen’s Liturgy;

A major difference between Bunsen’s Capitoline liturgy and the King’s was the expansion of the recognition of sin (*Sündenbekenntnis*) to a full-fledged *Beichtamt*, thus mirroring the Anglican morning and evening prayer model. The recognition of sinfulness was central to Bunsen’s liturgy and gave it a starkly different texture than that of the *Berliner Agende.* Bunsen’s intention was to prepare the congregation for reception of God’s mercy by having them vocally and actively consider their sins each day. The emphasis of sin and sinfulness is characteristic both of Martin Luther and the *Erweckungsbewegung*, exemplified by August Tholuck’s best-selling epistolary novel *Die Lehre von der Sünde…*, published in 1823 and later translated into English as: *The Two Students Guido and Julius; or, The True Consecration of the Doubter.* Tholuck’s semi-autobiographical novel of his awakening experience became a founding text of the *Erweckungsbewegung*, just 5 years before his being hired by Bunsen to work as the embassy chaplain in Rome in 1828. In his book and his sermons, Tholuck preached: “Ohne die Höllenfahrt der Sünderkenntniß ist die Himmelfahrt der Gotteserkenntniß nicht möglich,” or “without the descent into Hell which is the recognition of sins, the ascension to heaven by discovering God is not possible.”[316] For

[315] Bunsen to his sister, February 14th, 1823 in: *Memoir,* vol. 1, p. 205.

[316] Tholuck, *Lehre von der Sünde*, p. 45.

Bunsen, Tholuck, and other "awakened" theologians, the intention was to promote a challenging and emotionally difficult experience within the congregation, in order to bring them to a similarly awakened state.

During the second part of the service, Bunsen's liturgy decentralized the place of the sermon, which in the King's liturgy, was meant to be the high point of the service and serve an edifying, even educational purpose. Instead, the centerpiece of Bunsen's liturgy was the Christian prayer of self-offering or sacrifice (*Selbstopfergebet* or *Gebet der Selbstdarbringung*). The active offering of their spiritual selves in gratitude and praise was intended to bring the congregation closer to Christ, by having them viscerally understand their place in the Christian faith as indebted to Christ's sacrifice:

> Mindful now, oh Holy Father, of your inexpressible love and your godly commandments, we give you thanks, not as we should, rather as we are able, and place our wants and desires, deeds and aspirations, proficiencies and abilities, and our mortal lives themselves. Oh Lord, please implement this sacrifice, so that the fire of your godly love will burn up all the sinful desires of the flesh, all of our own wills, our anger and hatred, and all of our ungodly ways. Your will alone governs in our hearts, your peace constantly fills [our hearts], and our entire lives, in pure love against each other, before you becoming holy, before you to be a satisfactory offering; for this, we, through your all powerful effects in us, will be truthfully constructed in the love of your loving son.[317] [original German in footnote]

Bunsen's liturgical research led to his reintroducing the Epiclesis, or Invocation, into the sacrament of the Eucharist, in which the power of God's blessing is invoked upon the

[317] Capitoline Agenda, p. 13, cited in Foerster, *Bunsen*, p. 83. "Eingedenk nun, o heiliger Vater, Deiner unaussprechlichen Liebe und Deines göttlichen Gebots, sagen wir Dir Dank, nicht wie wir sollten, sondern wie wir vermögen, und stellen unser Wollen und Begehren, Thun und Trachten, Können und Vermögen, und dieses sterbliche Leben selbst. Vollziehe Du, o Herr, dieses Opfer, also daß das Feuer Deiner göttlichen Liebe alle sündliche Lust des Fleisches, allen eigenen Willen, allen Zorn und Haß, und alles ungöttliche Wesen in uns verzehre, Dein Wille allein in unsern Herzen regiere, Dein Friede sie stetiglich erfülle, und unser ganzes Leben, in reiner Liebe gegen einander, vor Dir ein heiliges, Dir wohlgefälliges Opfer sei; auf daß wir, durch solche Deine allmächtige Würkung [sic] in uns, wahrhaftig erbaut werden zum Leibe Deines lieben Sohnes."

bread and wine. Bunsen based this on the liturgies of the ancient and early Christian church, which he saw as more authentic and legitimate, and uniquely capable of bridging the differences between the confessions. This was, in part, a romantic nostalgia on his part for a time during which the church was not divided by confessional or sectarian disagreement, and when Christians in general, he thought, were more devout. In pursuit of this mission, he regularly sent his chaplains (acting more as state-funded research assistants) back to Germany on trips to gather hundreds of ancient liturgical documents as the basis for his research. Bunsen described one of his chaplains, Tippelskirch:

> Tholuck will arrive in Rome, so that Rothe will be free to depart. As his definitive successor I am to have Herr von Tippelskirch, from Konigsberg, who first studied law, and is an enlightened Christian, the more so as he is thoroughly learned, and devoted to the calling of a teacher of the Gospel. **He will make a tour through Germany, to collect for me all the ancient German liturgical publications**.[318]

The last noteworthy element of Bunsen's Capitoline liturgy was the introduction of prayers proclaiming holy intervention in the real world, which would give congregants the impulse to view their entire day (and indeed, their entire lives) as spiritualized and part of a holy process. This spiritualization of the *Alltag* was characteristic of the pietistic influence on the *Erweckungsbewegung*.

Many of the aforementioned changes are deeply steeped in and influenced by *Erweckungstheologie*. Richard Rothe, along with August Tholuck, Wolfgang Schmieder, and Heinrich von Tippelskirch, were all chaplains who helped Bunsen work on his liturgy while also delivering sermons in Rome.[319] Bunsen chose all three theologians who were influenced

[318] Bunsen to his wife in on February 23rd, 1828 in: Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 311.

[319] Rothe and Tholuck were both students of August Neander, and associates of Hans Ernst von Kottwitz, leading figures of the Berlin *Erweckungsbewegung.* These comrades of Bunsen are also explored in chapters 1 and 5.

by the *Erweckungsbewegung*, hoping that they would allow the Protestants in Rome to realize the merits of awakened Christianity. The prayers which deeply emphasized and guided the individual to express and feel gratitude for God's actions in the world would, in Bunsen's and other "Awakened" theologians' view, encourage the "correct" ethos and consciousness of the congregation, which would then lead to much needed reform and revival of the Church. At the same time, Bunsen was interested in a philological and critical reconstruction of Christian history. Easter week was so important to Bunsen, that he published separately a book concerning a liturgy specific to the holiday: *Die heilige Leidensgeschichte und die stille Woche* in 1841, culminating with a Good Friday service which recounted the story of the Passion and Suffering of Christ as told in the Gospel of John. Bunsen thought that the book of John was the most historically accurate and depended on his own translation from the Greek edition in order to philologically capture the historical "truth" of Christ's crucifixion and death.

Contemporary critics, and subsequent scholarship offered a range of judgments about Bunsen's liturgical contributions: for one, that the critical and philological basis of Bunsen's liturgy meant that he was, himself, becoming a rationalist.[320] This may have been because many pious, conservative critics thought that critical inquiry into the origins of divine scripture inevitably would lead to worshippers beginning to doubt the revelatory and miraculous side of the faith. Other critics accused Bunsen of meandering too far away from genuine Lutheranism with his emphasis on self-sacrifice (even Schleiermacher found this to be too radical), while still others accused him of being a crypto-Catholic (for example

[320] Although Bunsen himself was an anti-rationalist, his relatively moderate position on the theological spectrum opened him up to attacks from more vehement conservatives in Germany and England.

because of his emphasizing the invocation during the Eucharist and the moments of silent prayer and kneeling). Bunsen's defense against these charges was that he intended his liturgy to adhere more closely to the idealized *Gemeindekirche* of early Christianity, free of the trappings and corruption of any church hierarchy and prior to any schisms or reformations of the church. Contrary to these critics, I see that Bunsen's liturgical arrangements were peppered with *Erweckungstheologie*, insofar as they emphasized the relationship between the worship service and the consciousness of the congregation as part of a continual act of gratitude for Christ's crucifixion.[321]

In 1882, over four decades after Bunsen's departure from Rome in 1839, the German embassy preacher Karl Rönneke wrote that Bunsen was the "true founder of the Protestant community in Rome."[322] Rönneke published an edition and overview of Bunsen's original Capitoline Liturgy. Channeling Bunsen, he was opposed to Christians simply going to hear a sermon ("in die Predigt zu gehen"). Instead, he wanted to achieve a living, communally-active experience:

> We believe we aren't going astray, when we claim that very many visitors of the evangelical worship service, even in Rome, did not understand the elevated meaning of the liturgy, that for some people, many aspects of the worship service that are not done through praying, reading, and sermons, remain dead forms, so that the heart does not feel itself as participating in the service. The main reason for this is without doubt the lack of understanding regarding the construction and formation of the entire liturgy, nor the specific order and meaning of the individual pieces. Must not then the wish be near, once again to become more intimately familiar with the meaning and

[321] This was largely also true not just the order and arrangement of the services, but the content of the sermons of Rothe, Schmieder, Tholuck, and the other chaplains working under Bunsen in Rome. See Chapter 1. This is also the case argued by Frank Foerster in: Foerster, *Bunsen*, p. 83.

[322] Karl Rönneke, *Die Liturgie oder die Ordnung des evangelischen Hauptgottesdienstes insbesondere die in der K. Deutschen Botschaftskapelle zu Rom gebräuchliche nach ihrer Bedeutung und Gliederung für die christliche Gemeinde* (Halle: Verlag von Eugen Strien, 1882), p. 2.

> structure of the liturgy, and wherever possible to benefit from its complete understanding?[323] [original German in the footnote]

It is interesting to see the German embassy chaplain in Rome in 1882 making the same pleas for the importance of the liturgy that Bunsen was writing about over sixty years before. Rönneke clearly saw himself and his congregation as indebted to Bunsen's work. Remember, Protestantism was unlawful in Rome until 1871, and was only able to be practiced in the specific, exceptional confines of extra-sovereign diplomatic territory like the Prussian embassy, so Rönneke had the advantage of over 65 years of development for his congregation.

Hymnology, Sacred Music, Creating a German National Tradition

The selection and curation of sacred music to accompany the orders for communal worship was not incidental or extraneous. Indeed, the hymns were rather a vital − even central − affair in the eyes of many powerful figures within and beyond the church leadership. It is useful to think of the various hymnodies that were published in the in the 1820s and 30s as representative texts, speaking to the flavor and texture of each of the theological impulses and cultural priorities of their authors. Perhaps unsurprisingly, then, the publication of these texts would often generate bitter debates amongst the various factions of

[323] Rönneke, *Die Liturgie*, p. 10. "Wir glauben nicht fehlzugehn, wenn wir behaupten, daß sehr viele Besucher des evangelischen Gottesdienst, auch in Rom, die hohe Bedeutung der Liturgie keineswegs genügend würdigen, daß für Manchen jener Theil des Gottesdienst, der nicht durch Gebet, Schriftlesung und Predigt in Anspruch genommen ist, nur todte Form ist und bleibt, so daß sich das Herz zu einer innern Betheiligung nicht getrieben fühlt. Der hauptsächlichste Grund hierfür ist ohne Zweifel der Mangel an Verständnis für den Aufbau und die Gliederung der gesammten Liturgie, sowie für die besondere Ordnung und Bedeutung der einzelnen Theilen. Muß da nicht der Wunsch nahe liegen, einmal die Bedeutung und Gliederung der Liturgie etwas näher kennen zu lernen, und womöglich deren volles Verständniß zu gewinnen?"

the German ecclesiastical landscape. Bunsen in particular was concerned with the role of hymnology in his liturgy, and especially of the importance to select the correct songs:

> It has long been my wish to have a complete Liturgy for our congregation, and I have discussed and consulted with my most honored chief [Niebuhr], and with the chaplain [Schmieder], to make out what can be done for this purpose. **Almost everywhere do we find the admirable ancient hymns driven out of use by modern ones without power or spirit: all fixed prayer forms, as well as the psalms, have been gradually discontinued, in order that people may every Sunday hear and sing something recommended by novelty. This is a glaring abuse of evangelical liberty, and the consequences have been deplorable.** Most true is it, that all parts of public worship ought not to be prescribed and unchangeable, but certain portions of the service ought to be changed, if one does not want to allow in great corruptions. All depends upon the formation of really Christian congregations, and they cannot exist without a common outward point of union. All other bands connecting human society seem to be either dissolved, or approaching their dissolution: even England, which rises so high above all other States, that precious jewel of Europe, appears to be sinking.[324] [emphasis added]

In the above quote, Bunsen's lamentations regarding the use of modern holy songs are representative of awakened Christianity of the time, which sought from the earlier songs of the Reformation not only inspiration but also the powerful sheen of symbolic legitimacy that they carried with them through the centuries. Hymns and songs had a centrality in Bunsen's view of worship that could either invigorate or damage the spirit of a congregation. Furthermore, once again Bunsen is invoking the need for "power" and "spirit" to be returned to religious music.

Indeed, the collective singing of sacred songs can create a form of social power. The German theology professor Jürgen Henkys argued that sacred songs bring people of various backgrounds to experience collectively the normative understanding of the church through the

[324] Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 178. Anglophilic statements like this appear throughout Bunsen's correspondence and archive, especially as it pertains to church politics and social order.

singing as a kind of physical involvement of mental and spiritual social behaviors.[325] As the emotional high point of the service, the songs serve to imprint "the coherence of the many into a single faith."[326] As he was always attempting to remain loyal to the earliest tenets of the Reformation, Bunsen may have been drawing from Martin Luther's earliest liturgical intentions with his deep emphasis on sacred music as part of the worship service. In Luther's first liturgy in 1523, the *Formula Missae,* Luther prescribed the chanting of song in Latin. But in Luther's vision, the congregation was now expected to participate in the singing, instead of only the choir.

The Official Songbook (Berliner Gesangbuch)

"Singing piety is the piety which ascends most directly and most gloriously to heaven."
-Friedrich Schleiermacher

Following the 1817 cabinet order of King Friedrich Wilhelm III to unify the two confessions of Prussian Protestantism into a single church, it was decided that the unified church should also sing from a single hymnal. Friedrich Schleiermacher was newly elected as the leader of the *Berliner Kreissynode,* the new governing body of the unified church in Berlin. Among their first decisions was to form a *Gesangbuch-Commission* (GBC) to create this new hymnal. The GBC, whose work began in the summer of 1818, was made up of seven members with Schleiermacher at the helm. As the most influential and prominent

[325] Prof. Jürgen Henkys (1929-2015), like Bunsen, also worked as a translator and curator of hymns, and taught as a professor of theology at Humboldt Universität in Berlin. His hymns are still included in the current-day *Evangelische Gesangbuch*, the hymnal used by the Protestant Church in Germany.

[326] "Zusammengehörigkeit der vielen in dem einen Glaube." See a good intro to this phenomenon at: Jürgen Henkys. *Singender und gesungener Glaube: hymnologische Beiträge in neuer Folge* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999), p. 11.

figure in Prussian church politics, Schleiermacher was the obvious choice for the creation of a state-sanctioned hymnal.[327] The GBC spent over 9 years producing a manuscript to present to the Prussian Ministry of Spiritual Affairs.[328] The finished product was published in the Fall of 1829 and was used in many of Berlin's churches by the beginning of 1830, with roughly 150 provincial churches also using the Berliner Gesangbuch by 1841.[329] It should be noted that a substantial amount of human and financial energy went into the production of the Berliner Gesangbuch by the GBC: Between February 1819 and March 1827, the archival record indicates at least 340 formal meetings, with another 14 meetings during the period of final revisions before publication in 1829.[330]

Composition of Berliner Gesangbuch[331]

Origin	# of Songwriters	# of Songs
16th century	26	56
17th century	112	318
1700-1750	54	229
1750-1800	21	83

[327] Schleiermacher was the head of the commission, but he did not have complete control over the process, occasionally his wishes were outvoted by other members.

[328] An incredible and detailed overview of the archival record of the GBC and its processes, including reproductions of many of the archival files themselves can be found in the work of Bernhard Schmidt. See: Bernhard Schmidt. *Lied, Kirchenmusik, Predigt im Festgottesdienst Friedrich Schleiermachers : zur Rekonstruktion seiner liturgischen Praxis* (Berlin, New York: W. de Gruyter, 2002.), pp. 173-263.

[329] See: Johann Friedrich Bachmann, *Zur Geschichte des Berliner Gesangbuch* (Berlin: Wilhelm Schultze, 1856), p. 224.

[330] Schmidt, *Lied - Kirchenmusik - Predigt*, p. 176.

[331] Henkys, *Singender u. Gesungener Glaube*, p. 27.

The Berliner Gesangbuch published by the GBC included songs for every occasion, ritual, and holy day of the Christian calendar. During this period of formal meetings of the GBC, the issue of song selection became increasingly controversial. Jürgen Henkys (cited above) wrote that Schleiermacher, in his position at the helm of the GBC, was not guided by tradition in his selection of songs, nor were his choices arbitrary, but that he just wanted to do what was best for the worship service, the congregation, and the church.[332] Yet, even the curation of material for publication cannot but fail to betray a position or ideology on the part of the editors. On one level, there was the issue of selecting which songs and hymns for inclusion in general. The seven members of the GBC would suggest a song to the group, which would then be adopted by a simple majority vote. As seen in the table above, the majority of preferred songs mostly came from authors born in the seventeenth-century and the first half of the eighteenth century.

Perhaps more contentiously, each song taken up by the GBC then went through a process of careful editing, correction, and revision. This allowed each member the opportunity, for better or worse, to inject his own theological impulses into the songs, to erase or modify segments, which may have seemed too harsh or dogmatic, or otherwise to modify much older songs to serve the purpose of the GBC's early nineteenth-century outlook. The modifications would then be debated and adopted only by a two-thirds majority of the GBC. There are hundreds of examples of such revisions, but a few may suffice as illustrative of the theological and ideological impulses held by the members of the GBC.

[332] Henkys, *Singender u. gesungener Glaube,* p. 28.

The Easter hymn "O Welt sieh hier dein Leben," written in the seventeenth century by Paul Gerhardt, was the subject of much discussion by the GBC.[333] In the 13th stanza, the original song text was:

> "Ich will daraus studiren
> Wie ich mein Hertz soll zieren
> Mit stillen sanften Muth
> Und wie ich die soll lieben,
> Die mich doch sehr betrüben
> Mit Wercken so die Bosheit thut."[334]

But the version that was published in the *Berliner Gesangbuch* became:

> "Ich will darin erblicken,
> Wie ich mein Herz soll schmücken
> Mit stillem sanften Muth
> Und wie ich mich soll üben,
> Aus Herzengrund zu lieben,
> Wenn mich verfolgt der Feinde Wuth."[335]

The changes here were substantial. The change of "studi[e]ren" (to study, scrutinize) into "erblicken" (to behold) indicates perhaps that the GBC wanted to suggest that pious feelings of the heart were to be *experienced*, rather than attained through study. Yet, the last 3 lines of the stanza are the most significant. The personification of evil (the devil) was replaced by the GBC with the "anger" of the enemy. This attempt to demythologize the devil as a force of evil in the world was grounded in a theology which sought instead to offer moralizing lessons: Practice love and keep anger from your hearts. The turn away from a more

---

[333] Paul Gerhardt (1607-1676) was a Lutheran minister and theologian whose hymns were immensely popular in the seventeenth century. 90 of Gerhardt's hymns were published in the most widely sold and used hymnbook of the century, the "Praxis Pietatis Melica."

[334] Translated: "I want to study henceforth, how i should adorn my heart, with quiet, soft love, and how i should love those that deeply sadden me, with deeds done by the devil/evil."

[335] From the minutes of the GBC, cited in: Schmidt, *Lied, Kirchenmusik, Predigt*, p. 207. The new version translated: "I want to therein behold, how I should adorn my heart, with quiet, soft courage, and how i should practice, to love out of kindheartedness, whenever I am persecuted by the enemy of Anger/Fury."

supernatural understanding of good and evil towards a focus on man's mastery of his own emotions was illustrative of the kinds of moral lessons that the GBC editors hoped could be imparted by their hymnbook.

Changes such as these came to the overwhelming majority of the songs included in the state-sanctioned *Berliner Gesangbuch*. Almost 97% of the songs were edited from the original in order to offer moral lessons, to seem less harsh, and to conform with what the GBC thought would be most palatable to contemporary audiences. These changes were seen as unacceptable corruptions by Bunsen, who decided to take matters into his own hands.

Bunsen's *Gesangbuch*

In addition to his liturgy for church services, Bunsen also published a book for household use modeled after the Anglican Book of Common Prayer, the *Versuch eines allgemeinen evangelischen Gesang- und Gebetbuchs* (1833). This book can be contextualized amidst a background of similar hymnals and prayer books which appeared between 1818-1830.[336] Just as when Bunsen obtained a copy of the King's liturgy in 1822, Bunsen's reception of the *Berliner Gesangbuch* published by the GBC was one of disappointment and frustration. Once again, Bunsen felt that a grave injustice was being done to Christian faith by those in powerful positions and proximity to the King and the Prussian church hierarchy:

> The publication of the incredibly faulty *Berliner Gesangbuch* stimulated me to write a series of letters on the subject, which I closed with a representation of the canons or rules of criticism I had formed. The first was written in the hope that it might not come too late to warn the King and the congregations against accepting a work founded on untenable principles.[337]

[336] See Foerster, *Bunsen*, p. 87.

[337] Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, pp. 361-2.

Bunsen even went so far as to publish five anonymous articles in the *Evangelischen Kirchenzeitung*, in which he lambasted the GBC's book as "misguided" for making such significant textual alterations to the original hymns. In the preface to his own hymnbook, Bunsen wrote that he was convinced of the "Idea of unity of the holy songs from David until the Virgin Mary and from them through to the holy singers of the church of our day."[338] The theme of continuity was therefore central to Bunsen's hymnological projects, which was in turn central to the overall revival of the church in Germany.

Bunsen's hymnbook was divided into four sections, or *Liedkreise*. The first section was for morning and evening songs (*Morgen- und Abendlieder*). These songs were to be sung each day in order to inculcate in the singer a sense that the passing of each day and night was a part of a Christian process of praising God. The second section included songs for Christian holidays (*Festlieder*), which would allow the worshipper to see himself as part of the development and process of God's revelations. The third section pertained to songs specifically for Sunday worship services (*Sonntagslieder*), which were selected exclusively to buttress the liturgy. These Sunday songs, in particular, were those best suited for collective singing. The last section (*Feierlieder*) was reserved for songs specific to various church rituals: communion, baptism, funerals, burials, and so on.[339]

The key question for the authors of these books was which songs and prayers to include. On the one hand, the *Erweckungsbewegung* brought with it a demand for older religious songs, while nascent nationalistic impulses encouraged the collection of uniquely

[338] Christian Charles Josias von Bunsen, *Versuch eines allgemeinen evangelischen Gesang- und Gebetbuchs.* p. LXII.

[339] A fantastic overview of these songs can be found in: Foerster, *Christian Carl Josias Bunsen*, p. 89-90.

German songs. Bunsen had opposed the inclusion of 17 songs in the *Berliner Gesangbuch* by the eighteenth-century composer Christian Fürchtegott Gellert, whose music was vehemently opposed by Bunsen.[340] Gellert's music was representative of the style of modern song that Bunsen and his allies came to reject as corrupted and ego-centric, and lacking in the kind of power and legitimacy that he attributed to older songs:

> First of all, I sought out the finest hymns, because most of the more modern ones (particularly since the time of Gellert), although pious and devout, are common-place in sentiment and expression, and unworthy of general use…. I am fortunate enough to have the assistance of…Kocher of Stuttgart, whose object in Rome is the study of ancient Church music…I have made out with him that he must seek for all the hymns I collect, the best melodies that are to be found, whether in Italy or Germany, that they may be published together. Thus have I now gone through 2,500 hymns in our old hymnals and other collections, and selected nearly 150 first-rate…Not one of Gellert's is among the number, and only two of Klopstock's; not any for the other modern writers.[341]

For his edition, Bunsen and his colleagues chose 934 songs, which in addition to Psalms, included older hymns from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, including songs by Johann Arndt. These selected songs were chosen for their proximity to either the Reformation of the sixteenth century or their adherence to the spirit of that early church as both more authentic and more specifically "German" in origin.

In strong opposition to the *Berliner Gesangbuch*, the utmost priority to Bunsen was that the songs would be in their original version, and he only allowed light alterations for the sake of understandability. Bunsen believed that the power of Christian song was uniquely capable of cultivating Christian piety, but also a sense of German identity. Indeed, Bunsen

[340] Christian Fürchtegott Gellert (1715-1769) was an immensely popular poet and songwriter of the German *Aufklärung*, whose songs were set to music by Haydn, Beethoven and Mozart.

[341] Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 182.

once referred to the church's liturgy as the "*heiligste Volkssache*" in the country, symbolizing its importance as a sacred document for both the nation and the church.[342]

Ernst Moritz Arndt

Among the other hymnological and liturgical productions of the period, the nationalist poet and writer Ernst Moritz Arndt published his first collection of poems in 1818, *Gedichte von Ernst Moritz Arndt Erster Theil.* Arndt is often referred to as the father of German nationalism, and much of the literature on Arndt has focused on his strongly xenophobic sentiments. Still, some of Arndt's hymns were successful and belonged enough that a few even exist still today in the official hymnbook of the German Evangelical Church, including "Ich wieß, woran ich glaube:"

Ich weiß, woran ich glaube

1) Ich weiß, woran ich glaube, ich weiß, was fest besteht,
wenn alles hier im Staube wie Sand und Staub verweht;
ich weiß, was ewig bleibet, wo alles wankt und fällt,
wo Wahn die Weisen treibet und Trug die Klugen prellt.
2) Ich weiß, was ewig dauert, ich weiß, was nimmer lässt;
auf ewgen Grund gemauert steht diese Schutzwehr fest.
Es sind des Heilands Worte, die Worte fest und klar;
an diesem Felsenhorte halt ich unwandelbar.
3) Auch kenn ich wohl den Meister, der mir die Feste baut;
er heißt der Fürst der Geister, auf den der Himmel schaut,
vor dem die Seraphinen anbetend niederknien,
um den die Engel dienen: ich weiß und kenne ihn.
4) Das ist das Licht der Höhe, das ist der Jesus Christ,
der Fels, auf dem ich stehe, der diamanten ist,
der nimmermehr kann wanken, der Heiland und der Hort,
die Leuchte der Gedanken, die leuchtet hier und dort.
5) So weiß ich, was ich glaube, ich weiß, was fest besteht

[342] Rönneke, *Liturgie*, p. 5. Bunsen's invocation of the "holiest object of the people" indicates that he had begun to see his project as explicitly nationalistic in nature.

und in dem Erdenstaube nicht mit als Staub verweht;
ich weiß, was in dem Grauen des Todes ewig bleibt
und selbst auf Erdenauen schon Himmelsblumen treibt.

Arndt tried to devise a national liturgy with his 1814 book *Entwurf einer tuetschen Gesellshaft* (Design for a German Society), which suggested a series of public festivals celebrating important Germanic moments: the battle of Leipzig, a festival to memorialize fallen soldiers, complete with regalia and costumes which would be specific to each event.[343] In describing these festivals, one can begin to see the gravity with which Christian piety and communal worship went hand-in-hand, just as with Bunsen's liturgy:

> It is self-evident to Christians that **festivities always begin with silent prayer and pious worship.** On the feast of the Battle of Hermannsschlacht and the Battle of Leipzig, an oak leaf would be the sign on the hat of men; on the day of the Tribunal they would draw themselves with a cross: for this hero and the Spaniards were the first warriors for the honor and freedom of Europe, who trusted the cross and its strength more than the fist and the power of the iron, and according to them Russians and Prussians under this sign accomplished the incredible deeds of piety and enthusiasm. This is my German society, which I mean, this is my dear and holy German Fatherland, which I think are my faithful, brave and honest Germans, who I love and honor. May the good ones find in these simple words something that reverberates in their hearts! and may the whole great German people, by concord, love and loyalty, soon be but a single fraternal company! Then the most heartfelt prayers and the most sacred dreams of my heart are fulfilled.[344]

---

[343] George S. Williamson, *Longing for Myth in Germany* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004), pp. 93-98.

[344] Ernst Moritz Arndt, *Entwurf einer teutschen Gesellschaft* (Frankfurt am Main: P.W. Eichenberg, 1814), pp. 36-37. Original German: "Es versteht sich bei Christen von selbst, das die Festlichkeit immer mit stillem Gebet und frommen Gottesdienst begonnen wird. Am Feste der Hermannsschlacht und der Leipziger Schlacht würde ein Eichenblatt am Hute der Männer das Zeichen seyn; am Hoferstage würden sie sich mit einem Kreuze zeichnen: denn dieser Held und die Spanier waren die ersten Streiter für die Ehre und Freiheit Europas, die dem Kreuze und seiner Kraft mehr vertraueten, als der Faust und der Gewalt des Eisens, und nach ihnen haben die Russen und Preussen unter diesem Zeichen die unglaublichen Thaten der Frömmigkeit und Begeisterung vollbracht. Dies ist meine teutsche Gefellschaft, die ich meine, dies ist mein liebes und heiliges teutsches Vaterland, an welches ich denke, dies sind meine treuen, tapfern und redlichen Teutschen, die ich liebe und ehre. Mögen die Guten in diesen leichten Worten einiges finden, das an ihre Herzen klingt! und möge das ganze große teutsche Volk durch Eintracht, Liebe und Treue bald nur eine einzige brüderliche Gesellschaft seyn! Dann sind die innigsten Gebete und die heiligsten Träume meines Herzens erfüllt."

Combining the filaments of piety and patriotism, Arndt wove a tapestry of German nationalism that was explicitly Christian, cognizant of past acts of "Germanic" heroism and valor, and rife with prescriptive moralism. Though Bunsen's hymnbook tried to capture (or create) an essentially German tradition, he was less prescriptive about how one a German ought to behave. Still, the two men shared an outlook which emphasized the role of visible and public displays of piety, and it is certain that Bunsen's "activated" congregation would be a necessary component of the nation that Arndt imagined.

Reception, Implementation, Legacy

Bunsen's liturgical and hymnological publications achieved modest success in particular spaces and contexts. There is some archival evidence that the book was in service in King Friedrich Wilhelm IV's *Sans Soucci* Friedenskirche after 1833.[345] A later edition published in 1846, was over 1000 pages long, containing 440 songs and 253 prayers, was published by a reformatory school in Hamburg associated with the *Erweckunugsbewegung*.[346] Bunsen hoped that this book would be adopted voluntarily by the individual congregations of the land and thus achieve the status of a *Volksbuch*, through which it would enable both an evenness and ubiquity of awakened, Protestant faith. The songbook was ultimately adopted by the Protestant church in Rome, a German hospital in London, a German congregation in Liverpool, and the German immigrant community in Victoria, Australia. It sold about 10,000

[345] This is unsurprising, given the close nature of the lifelong friendship between the monarch and Bunsen, who first met in 1822, 18 years before the ascension of Friedrich Wilhelm IV to the throne.

[346] The *Rauhe Haus* was a Christian philanthropic reform house for impoverished young children founded in 1833 by the German theologian Johann Hinrich Wichern, a close associate of Bunsen. Wichern's relationship with Bunsen is explored further in chapters 2 and 5. The *Rauhe Haus* was made possible by donations of land and money from Karl Sieveking and others associated with the German "Inner Mission."

copies, so was perhaps also used in a small but significant number of households. Theologically, Bunsen's liturgy has been judged by some historians to have had only limited impact. He never held an academic post at a German university faculty of theology, nor did he hold an ecclesiastical appointment in the Prussian church administration.

At a personal level, the liturgy led to increased reputation for Bunsen and likely to further career success. His friend Thomas Arnold wrote:

> I thought that I was not doing what you would disapprove in showing your work to my very old and intimate friend the Archbishop of Dublin. With his influence with the Government there was some chance of your notions producing some fruit. And when Church Reform was likely to come before Parliament, I thought it most desirable that notions so beautifully pure and yet so impressive should be made known to those who might carry them into effect.[347]

Bunsen's liturgical work did indeed win him much favor and influence in certain English circles, which was explored more thoroughly in Chapters 2 and 3, but the important thing to note is that the significance of Bunsen's intellectual productions must also be measured not necessarily by whether or not they were formally adopted by various churches and places, but rather, whether anyone ever read them or not and to what extent the liturgy paved the way for Bunsen's career and reputation in England.

The Sisters Catherine & Susanna Winkworth: Bunsen's Impact in the Anglophone Realm

Through his writing, Bunsen eventually enjoyed the greatest success in translation, owing to his relationship with two sisters in England. Bunsen and his family moved to

[347] GStA-PK, FA Bunsen, B.63 vol. 1, p. 11.

London in 1840 to take up a new post as the Prussian ambassador to Queen Victoria's court. While the philanthropic and colonial projects which occupied his energies in England are covered elsewhere in this dissertation, one can make several observations about the impact of his hymnological and liturgical scholarship in England. Many of Bunsen's closest associates in England were members of the liberal Anglican church, who were tolerant of, or members of, the latitudinarian movement.[348] It was through his association with one member of this movement, the Unitarian Reverend William Gaskell, that Bunsen made the acquaintance in 1849 of two young women who did more to spread Bunsen's ideas than any contemporary.[349] Gaskell and his wife, the novelist Elizabeth Gaskell, were tutors and literary mentors of the Winkworth sisters: Susanna (b. 1820) and Catherine (b. 1827). Susanna, the elder sister, had been exposed to the German edition of the Letters and essays of Barthold Georg Niebuhr, the cherished father figure of Bunsen and his closest associates. Susanna mentioned to Mrs. Gaskell that she was considering translating both volumes of Niebuhr's letters into English. Mrs. Gaskell, aware that Bunsen had been responsible for editing Niebuhr's letters for the original German publication, mentioned Susanna's ambitions to Bunsen. Throughout his life, Bunsen attempted to preserve the memory and legacy of Niebuhr, and because Niebuhr's work and reputation had come under attack in England in the 1840s, Bunsen was probably

[348] "Latitudinarianism" is a term synonymous with the "Broad Church" movement, a group of moderate Anglicans who sought to include religious dissenters. These included Nontrinitarians. Although the term generally refers to Anglicans in England, the concept is useful in describing the ideology of Bunsen and his allies as well.

[349] Unitarians, or Nontrinitarians, believe that Christ was not divine, and reject the doctrines of original sin and predestination. In the United Kingdom, they preached tolerance towards religious Dissenters, and advocated for freedom of conscience.

keen to give English audiences access to Niebuhr's original thoughts.[350] Susanna's translated volumes of Niebuhr's letters were finished and published in 1851 and 1852, with the help of her sister Catherine.

[350] Those who attacked Niebuhr in England belonged to the opponents of German biblical criticism, on the grounds that Niebuhr's historical work (particularly his scholarship on Rome) was insufficiently pious or deferential to the established church. Some Englishmen even charged him with "atheism," although he was more often charged with rationalism.

LYRA GERMANICA

Now let the mourner
grieve no more,
Though his beloved
sleep,
A happier meeting shall
restore
Their light to eyes
that weep.

Now every heart each
noble deed
With new resolve may
dare,
A glorious harvest shall
the seed
In brightest regions
bear.

He lives, His presence
hath not ceased,
Though foes and fears
be rife;
And thus we hail in
Easter's feast
A world renew'd to
life!

NOVALIS.
1772-1801.

HE THAT SOWETH TO THE SPIRIT
SHALL OF THE SPIRIT REAP
LIFE EVERLASTING.
GAL VI. 8.

Figure 1: From the *Lyra Germanica*, a poem of Novalis' introducing German religious thought to popular audience in England.

Thus, the Winkworth sisters entered into an alliance with Bunsen and became a part of his larger project of exposing English audiences to the liturgical, theological, and cultural productions emanating from Germany. In the 1850s and 60s, Catherine and Susanna

translated into English thousands of pages of German text from Niebuhr, Bunsen, and the Anglican Archdeacon Julius Hare, Bunsen's close friend and fellow traveler in the task of church reform. In this way, Bunsen, through the Winkworths, acted as a bridge between the two cultures, introducing thousands of English readers to the corpus of German literature and theology. The most famous of these books was Bunsen's hymnbook. An English translation was published as the *Lyra Germanica* in 1855 by Catherine Winkworth (see Figure 1). It is through the *Lyra Germanica* that Bunsen's work probably had the most proliferation, with the book selling out over 42 reprintings of 2 different editions by the end of the nineteenth century, including two reprintings in the United States. Bunsen's German-language edition of the *Allgemeines evangelisches Gesang- und Gebetbuch* sold over 10,000 copies itself, so combined with the Winkworths English-language edition, Bunsen's production was likely utilized by thousands of households and families in Europe and America.

* * *

Beginning in 1817, Christian Bunsen started to research the reconfiguration of the Liturgy of the Protestant Churches at an academic level. At the same time, the Prussian government was eager to impose its own standardized liturgy in an attempt to merge the two major Protestant confessions which existed in their society, Lutheranism and Calvinism. Officials' attempts to control the character and flavor of Prussian religious life reflected a concern on their part that they would cede the social energies flowing through post-Napoleonic Prussia to revolutionaries, to uncontrollable student fraternities, to apathy, or worse - to the Roman Catholic church. Bunsen and his allies shared many of those concerns, but they disagreed with the implementation of the King's liturgy because they considered it

devoid of the life and vibrancy that he believed could only come from organic, enthusiastic collective worship grounded in a sense of self-sacrifice and recognition of sinfulness which came to characterize the *Erweckungsbewegung* and, more generally, modern charismatic fundamentalism.

Bunsen attempted to influence the King's liturgy indirectly and directly at various points in the 1820s, to no avail. Nevertheless, he successfully lobbied the King to allow him to publish his own liturgy for use in the Prussian exclave community built up around Bunsen's embassy in Rome. Bunsen's liturgy eventually also saw implementation wherever Bunsen had influence: at the German Hospital in London, the Anglo-Prussian Protestant Bishopric in Jerusalem, and reportedly also in German immigrant communities in England and Australia. His hymnological research and songbook publications were a crucial part of his liturgical plan, as they were designed to maximize congregational emotion. At the same time, Bunsen's work has to be situated in the milieu of early nationalistic cultural production like that of Ernst Moritz Arndt, Turnvater Friedrich Jahn, and the Grimm brothers, by creating a "Germanic" tradition based in the songs and liturgical forms of the early modern period. Bunsen's work enjoyed its greatest success in England via the translation of Susanna and Catherine Winkworth.

Chapter 5: An Anglo-Prussian Protestant Bishopric in Jerusalem: Empire, Eschatology, and Conversion, 1833-1886

"…The King had called me in with a view to do something in the Holy Land; and that it might be the will of the Lord, and probably would be that of the King, that in Jerusalem the two principal Protestant Churches of Europe should, across the grave of the Redeemer, reach to each other the right hand of fellowship."[351]

In 1841, the first Protestant Christian Bishopric was established in Jerusalem, to be jointly organized and funded by the Prussian and British crowns, and ministered by bishops selected by the Anglican and Prussian Lutheran churches. The Jerusalem Bishopric project lasted for over four decades, until Prussia withdrew its involvement in 1886. In theory, the Bishopric was intended to serve the spiritual needs of Protestants living in not only Palestine, but also across Mesopotamia, Egypt, and Syria. In practice, the Bishopric was a beachhead for proselytism in the region, and a bold assertion of ascendent Protestantism on the global stage.

This chapter examines the convergence of various powerful groups who were eager to open the Protestant church in the weakening Ottoman Empire.[352] This project brought together German and British orientalists, "awakened" and mainstream missionary groups, Bible societies, and the most influential state officials and church leaders from the two countries, including their respective monarchs. The foundation of a bishopric created a Protestant physical space, which was to give the interest groups and individuals involved in its creation significantly more influence in the region. At a geopolitical level, the Bishopric

[351] Bunsen to his wife, April 26th, 1841, in: Bunsen, *Memoir,* vol. 1, p. 594.

[352] In 1839, the so-called Tanzimât period of modernising reforms began in the Ottoman Empire. Among other reforms, imperial officials had hoped to reduce the likelihood of increased foreign intervention on behalf of Ottoman Christians by granting them greater religious freedoms.

offered England and Prussia the opportunity to insert themselves as a counterweight to the French and Russian colonial protectorates over the Catholic and Orthodox Christians in the Middle East. At another (perhaps overlapping) religious level, the Bishopric was to stand as a symbol of protection by the Prussian monarchy for its co-confessionalists in the region, much as the Prussian embassy chapel had done for Protestants in Rome. Additionally, the Bishopric served as the basis for increasing bilateral ties between Europe's two strongest Protestant nations.

This chapter primarily focuses on the role played by Christian Carl Josias von Bunsen in the Bishopric project. Bunsen was sent by the Prussian King Friedrich Wilhelm IV as a special envoy to England in 1841 to lay the groundwork and negotiate the terms for English support for the project. It also expands upon recent scholarship which suggests that Bunsen himself was not just the diplomatic negotiator of the Jerusalem Bishopric, but instead argues that he was also one of its chief architects.[353] As someone who was perfectly situated to bring together both Continental and English evangelical missionary interests, Bunsen also had the ear of the Prussian King and the respect of English parliamentarians and church officials as word spread of his Anglican-inspired liturgical reforms. Indeed, one should see Bunsen's instrumental role in the formation of this peculiar project as not as extraneous to, but rather the culmination of Bunsen's career of diplomacy, church reform, and Protestant chauvinism along latitudinarian lines.

[353] Frank Foerster, *Christian Carl Josias Bunsen: Diplomat, Mäzen und Vordenker in Wissenschaft, Kirche und Politik* (Bad Arolsen: Waldeckischer Geschichtsverein, 2001), p. 150.

The Research to Date

Many historians and scholars over the past 180 years have written about the Protestant Bishopric, although in the recent past, only a handful of monographs have been written on this topic.[354] Many of these works focus on the broader issue of British missionaries in Palestine or on the broader forty-year history of the Bishopric in the context of European colonialism. Each scholar has highlighted a handful of motivations or aspects of the Bishopric project. The most recent and useful addition is Nicholas Railton's *No North Sea*. Railton's book studies the creation in 1846 of the Evangelical Alliance (EA), an ecumenical organization founded in London by both Germans and Englishmen to foster biblical knowledge and Christian harmony in society. Railton emphasizes the creation of transnational networks formed by the founders of the EA, which spanned Germany, Switzerland, France, and England, while also including important book chapters on the Jewish connection, and missionaries. Bunsen is featured frequently in Railton's study, and his eighth chapter does examine the Bishopric. The book is an invaluable contribution to the topic of the transnational Anglo-German connections in the middle decades of the nineteenth century, but here I want to put Bunsen in the center and re-emphasize that he was the crucial figure in the Bishopric project's creation and should be seen through the lens of his earlier work in church reform along "awakened" theological lines.

[354] Of these, the most thorough and rich are: Charlotte van der Leest's 2008 unpublished dissertation manuscript: *Conversion and Conflict in Palestine: The Missions of the Church Missionary Society and the Protestant Bishop Samuel Gobat*; Nicholas Railton, *No North Sea : the Anglo-German evangelical network in the middle of the nineteenth century*. Leiden Boston: Brill, 2000; Perry, Yaron. *British Mission to the Jews in Nineteenth-century Palestine*. London: Frank Cass Publishers, 2003.

Origins

There was an overlapping set of impulses that led to the foundation of the Jerusalem Bishopric. Foremost among them was the pre-millennial eschatological views shared by some British and German elites.[355] For many of these "awakened" premillennialists, the return of Christ was necessarily linked to the "restoration" of the Jewish people to the land of Israel.[356] Although the desire to convert Jews to Christianity was by no means a new phenomenon in the early decades of the nineteenth century, it gained new traction in "awakened," revivalist circles because it was seen as a way to reverse the pattern of decreasing church attendance and religious apathy. Indeed, the waning influence of the church in the early nineteenth century was seen by some as a signal of the impending end of the world.[357] Pursuing this goal, various church and missionary societies in Europe were founded and began organizing efforts to go to the Levant to convert Jewish people to Christianity.

In England, the main missionary organ was the London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews (also known as the "London Jews Society," or "LJS").[358] In 1833, the LJS bought a tract of land as a mission station led by a Danish missionary named

[355] Premillenialism is the belief that Jesus Christ's physical second coming to Earth will usher in the Kingdom of God, a 1000-year period of peace and prosperity.

[356] Restorationism had been a widely held ideology across Protestant Christendom since the Reformation, but had gained significant traction first amongst Pietists in Germany and Puritans in England and America, followed by political elites in the 1820s and 1830s.

[357] See Eitan Bar-Yosef, "Green and pleasant lands: England and the Holy Land in plebeian millenarian culture, c. 1790-1820" in: Kathleen Wilson. *A New Imperial History: Culture, Identity, and Modernity in Britain and the Empire, 1660-1840* (Cambridge, UK New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004), pp. 155-175.

[358] Originally founded in 1809, this organization is known today as the Church's Ministry Among Jewish People or "CMJ."

Hans Nicolayson.[359] Previously, preliminary efforts by the LJS in Palestine had led its officials to conclude that they needed German speaking missionaries to attend to the Yiddish-speaking Ashkenazi populations, while the Arabic-speaking Sephardim would be ministered to by Arabic-trained British missionaries.[360] Throughout the 1830s, the LJS and several analogous institutions trained and recruited scores of missionaries to do this work abroad, though they had been successfully converting Jews in England since 1809. Their intention was chiefly to convince Jews of the messianic, divine nature of Jesus Christ, although they also worked within the Christian church to emphasize the Judaic roots of Christianity.[361]

In the German-speaking regions of the Continent, missionary societies were also being formed by individuals associated with the *Erweckungsbewegung.* In Basel, a host of revivalist missionary institutions were founded by two pastors: Christian Spittler (1782-1867) and Christian Heinrich Zeller (1779-1860). The *Evangelische Missionsgesellschaft* in Basel *(*known colloquially as the *Basler Mission*), was founded in 1815 by Spittler to train missionaries to spread the gospel, and to build schools and churches in distant locations: Africa, India, China, Indonesia, to name a few. Graduates of the *Basler Mission* typically traveled abroad with English missionary societies, such as the Church Mission Society or the aforementioned LJS. In 1840, Spittler founded a similar pilgrimage missionary society called

[359] Hans Nicolayson was born in 1803 in Lügumkloster in Schleswig, Denmark. At the age of 18, he moved to Berlin to study at the Berliner Missionsschule led by Johannes Jänicke. He eventually anglicized his name to John or Johannes Nicolayson after he began working for the LJS.

[360] See: Yaron Perry, *British Mission to the Jews in Nineteenth-century Palestine* (London: Frank Cass Publishers, 2003), p. 20.

[361] See Kelvin Crombie, *For the Love of Zion: Christian Witness and the Restoration of Israel* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1991), p. 3.

Pilgermission St. Chrischona (known today as Chrischona International), whose first graduates were sent as pilgrims to Jerusalem. Zeller, influenced by Spittler and other Pietistic and awakened institutions, founded a *Rettungshaus* and school for poor children in Beuggen in 1820, just twenty kilometers east of Basel.[362] The *Basler Missiongesellschaft* and the *Beuggen Rettungshaus* must be seen as contemporaneous with other awakened Christian social-welfare institutions such as Theodor Fliedner's Kaiserswerth hospital and nursing school and Johann Wichern's Rauhes Haus in Hamburg (founded in 1836 and 1833 respectively).[363] Such institutions were known as part of Germany's *Rettungshausbewegung*, a movement focused on social reform houses.[364] It was from within these institutions that the impulse to establish Protestant missionary stations in Jerusalem originated in Germany and Switzerland. The *Rettungshausbewegung* served several purposes simultaneously. At the material level, they were intended to alleviate the suffering, especially of children displaced by extreme poverty and pauperism, but also of petty criminals and prostitutes. Spiritually, these private social welfare institutions were based firmly in awakened Christianity, with the hope that spiritual awareness would inoculate their patients and residents against sinful behavior. As seen in previous chapters, Bunsen drew a significant amount of inspiration from these institutions in his own work, but we shall now examine how Bunsen took up the idea

[362] A "*Rettungshaus,*" or "rescue house," was a type of institution grounded in social care, reform, and Christian missionary impulses. Some were akin to reformatory schools, while others were like orphanages. The *Evangelisches Kinderheim* at Beuggen was a school designed to educate and care for neglected and abandoned children. See: Freundeskreis Schloss Beuggen e.V.. *Schloss Beuggen*, *Geschichte – Gebäude – Gegenwart* (Lörrach: H Deiner, 2008).

[363] These institutions are discussed in Chapters 1 and 2, and served as inspiration for similar projects undertaken by Bunsen in London in the 1840s.

[364] Arndt Götzelmann, "Die Soziale Frage,*"* In: Gustav Benrath, Martin Sallmann, and Ulrich Gäbler, *Der Pietismus im neunzehnten und zwanzigsten Jahrhundert* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000) pp. 279–282.

for a mission to the Jews of the Middle East from the awakened evangelicals of Germany, Switzerland, and France.

"Will the day break in the East?" - Missionary Motivations[365]

Leaders of Swiss and German Protestant mission-based institutions like those in Basel and Württemberg hoped to use the political situation as an opportunity to revive the Protestant churches of Europe by emphasizing their own presence in Christendom's holiest city. For Bunsen and his allies, the establishment of a Protestant Bishopric in Jerusalem would serve as the platform from which European Christians could convert non-Christians to their faith. By converting Jews to Christianity, these Protestants hoped not only to increase their numbers globally, but also to boost piety at home, and in so doing to usher in the Kingdom of God.

Bunsen was immersed in the ideas of restoration and foreign evangelizing during his tenure as the Prussian ambassador to the Swiss Confederation, following his resignation from the office in Rome and before his assignment to England. In July, 1840, Bunsen attended a week-long conference of roughly 250 Protestant missionary leaders, pastors, and laymen in Basel. This meeting included the founders of the leading awakened institutions like the aforementioned Christian Spittler and Christian Zeller, alongside the head administrator of the Basler Mission, Wilhelm Hoffman, and the *Antistes* Jakob Burkhardt.[366] The powerful

[365] The chorale song "Will the day break in the East?" was sung by Bunsen and his friends in public on the first day of the conference, signalling their hopes for missionary activity in the Holy Land. See Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 574.

[366] The "Antistes" was the highest spiritual office-holder within the Reformed Church in Switzerland, roughly comparable to a bishop. Jakob Burckhardt (1785-1858) was the Antistes for the Basel Canton, and was also the father of the influential cultural historian Jakob Christoph Burckhardt (1818-1897). Antistes Jakob Burckhardt was described by his nephew as "neither a rationalist nor a Pietist," although many accounts suggest that Burckhardt was indeed steeped in awakened Pietism. See Chapter 9 in:

industrialist and philanthropist Daniel LeGrand was in attendance at the conference, as well. LeGrand was an early advocate of "social Christianity," and used his factory and wealth to promote reform of labor laws, especially the reduction of children's working hours.[367] This diverse group had previously been aware of Bunsen because of his efforts at building the Protestant community in Rome, and they treated him as a celebrity because of these efforts:

> We have all long wished to behold you face to face, you have laid a foundation of life for the Gospel Church, which will not perish; our hearts and our prayers have been with you throughout the trials of the latter years [*referring to the bitter fight over the mixed-marriage issue*], and will continue to follow you. May the Lord Bless you in all your undertakings![368]

The significance of this event for Bunsen was quite powerful. For the first time since taking diplomatic office with the Prussian state, Bunsen was being lauded in person by fellow German-speakers and missionaries for his work in spreading Protestantism into non-Protestant territories. Their support was all the more meaningful, given that he had been forced to resign from Rome after being blamed for the tensions over the mixed-marriage issue by Catholics across Europe. This encounter struck Bunsen as remarkable, as the outwardly pious attendees of the conference sang and prayed together publicly, although the Basel townspeople kept their distance and viewed them curiously, but not with suspicion or animus.

Lionel Gossman, *Basel in the Age of Burckhardt: A Study in Unseasonable Ideas* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002).

[367] Daniel LeGrand (1783-1859) was a Swiss born industrialist who owned a paternalistic ribbon factory in Fouday, France, near Alsace. LeGrand had an adult conversion experience at the age of 29 after coming into contact with Jean-Frédéric Oberlin (known in German as Johann Friedrich Oberlin), the Alsatian evangelical pastor and spiritual founder of social Christianity in France. LeGrand devoted a lot of resources and energy towards printing and disseminating the Scriptures. See: De Felice, "Daniel LeGrand, The Philanthropist of France," in: Norman Macleod, *The Christian Guest A Family Magazine for Sunday Reading* (Edinburgh: Alexander Strahan & Co, 1859) pp. 508-510.

[368] Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 572. See Chapter 1 for a fuller account of Bunsen's troubled negotiations with the Vatican over the mixed-marriage issue.

> The ancient popular customs of congregational and family worship have been renewed and practiced in the first instance by those called Pietists, which are the Methodists of Germany, as Zinzendorf and Spangenberg answer to England's Wesley and Whitfield; the meetings and societies established by them are gradually discarding the signs of separation and peculiarity, and the movement will gradually subside into general and popular feeling; but as yet is met with a spirit of more freedom outside the German limits.[369]

Bunsen's approving tone of the renewal brought to Christianity by German Moravians and English Methodists is noteworthy, as it was around this time that Bunsen began to appreciate the potential energy for evangelism and missionary work that existed in those awakened communities. Bunsen took note that people were more easily accepting of awakened religion in settings outside of Germany, as it became more mainstream and less separatist than it had been perceived to be in the eighteenth century.[370] Because of the slow acceptance of a less "peculiar" flavor of awakened Christianity, Bunsen saw an opportunity in harnessing these energies for strengthening the church within Protestant Europe, while also expanding it globally.

Bunsen described the events of the conference in a lengthy series of letters to his wife. He delighted in the agenda of the conference, remarking to his wife that "the first day of the festival at Basel is dedicated to Israel."[371] Having already been introduced to the issue of Jewish Restorationism while on a state visit to London in 1838, Bunsen gave a speech on the

---

[369] Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 574. Bunsen is referring here to influential Pietists Nicolaus Zinzendorf (1700-1760) who founded the Moravian Church (*Herrnhuter Brüdergemeinde*) and his successor, August Gottlieb Spangenberg (1704-1792) who developed early international missions for the German Moravians. It is curious that Bunsen suggested to his wife that the Moravians and Pietists followed Wesley and George Whitfield, when in fact German revivalism (especially Hallensian Pietism under August Hermann Francke) had been a significant inspiration for English Methodism.

[370] Pietism in Germany had been met with suspicion and avarice by both state and church officials in the centuries preceding Bunsen's career.

[371] Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 574.

issue: “The second day, Wednesday, was devoted to the heathen…. The committee of the Jewish Mission met at eight o’clock in the morning… I went in to hear, but after others had spoken, I was asked to speak, and felt that I had no right to keep silence. I told them of Italy, and then of London and McCaul.”[372] Bunsen had already been working to make connections within missionary circles in London during his visit there in 1838, having given similar speeches at the British and Foreign Bible Society and the London Jews Society.[373] But in Switzerland, Bunsen was able to boast of his English connections to Dr. Alexander McCaul, the Protestant Irish Hebraist who had been sent by the LJS to Poland in 1921 to minister to Polish Jews.[374] By demonstrating his credentials within English missionary circles, Bunsen further impressed the leading figures within the Swiss and German institutions who came to support or inspire the mission to Jerusalem. Bunsen continued:

> And [I] could not resist notifying my favorite idea of arranging a Jewish-Christian-Apostolic Synagogue, with school-teaching in Hebrew, or in the language of the country- by means of which, without violence, to work against the Rabbinical Synagogue, and to point out a possible future for the existence of the Jews as a nation.[375]

Bunsen, echoing Martin Luther over 300 years before him, was convinced that Jews would accept Christ if only they could be shown the superiority of revivalist Protestantism. That he was against the “Rabbinical Synagogue” is rather compelling proof that Bunsen and those in

[372] Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 575.

[373] See Chapter 2.

[374] Alexander McCaul (1799-1863) was described as “the most influential man of the [London Jews] Society” by Bunsen’s wife. See Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 601.

[375] Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 575.

his network were anti-Judaic in their outlook about Jews.[376] For Bunsen and his allies, the Jewish people were a population that was ripe for conversion. It was not necessary for them to become Lutheran, only that they would accept the messianic and divine nature of Christ.

An important influence on Bunsen at the conference came from Gottlieb Wilhelm Hoffman (1771-1846), who had founded the two Pietist congregational settlement-towns (*Brüdergemeinde*) of Korntal and Wilhelmsdorf in Württemberg.[377] "We came at once upon my favorite theme, the colonizing by Protestant communities," Bunsen wrote of their first meeting during the conference.[378] Bunsen admired Hoffman's work to stem the tide of Pietist emigrants fearing religious persecution in Würrtemberg by founding the two colonies, and may have offered Hoffman assistance in securing Prussian permission to open a new colony in Posen.[379] It is useful to think of the Jerusalem Bishopric project, at least as it was conceived by Bunsen in the early stages, as an amalgam. It was simultaneously intended to be a colony in the vein of Korntal, or even like the German Pietist model emigrant-communities of Harmony and Economy in Pennsylvania, and Indiana.[380] It could also serve in its natural

[376] Bunsen seemed to hold the pre-1537 view held by Luther that Jews should be treated with kindness and encouraged to convert to Christianity. Although none of Bunsen's views rise to the level of violence espoused in Luther's 1543 pamphlet *Von den Juden und ihren Lügen*, it is certainly true that he hoped to weaken and work against organized rabbinical Judaism by any means necessary, in order to more easily convert the local Jews.

[377] Korntal was founded in 1818, purchased by wealthy Pietists and given a royal charter by the Würtemmberg King in order to stem the tide of Pietist emigrants who were leaving for Russia and the United States in search of better economic conditions, while also protesting proposed "Enlightened" changes to their church liturgy and hymn-books. Wilhelmsdorf was founded as a "sister" colony in 1826.
[378] Bunsen, *Memoir,* vol. 1, pp. 573-574.

[379] "He brought the intended Statutes with him - we talked them well over, and nothing is wanting to their execution, but - a will from Berlin!" Bunsen wrote. The colony in Poland never materialized. See: Bunsen, *Memoir,* vol. 1, p. 574.

[380] The Württemberg Pietist George Rapp (1757-1834) founded three colonies, Harmony, Pennsylvania in Butler County, Pennsylvania in 1804, (New) Harmony in Indiana in 1815, and Economy, in western

function as a church, which in Bunsen's liturgical formulation also served as a social model for its surrounding community. It would also act as a missionary station, whose intention was to convert Jews in Palestine to Prostestant Christianity, in order to advance the second coming of Christ. While those earlier colonies' reputations were besmirched by an air of separatism, the Jerusalem colony would instead be officially sanctioned by church and state officials. For this, the supporters of the plan would need to win royal support:

> [Daniel] LeGrand began by praying that all might be enabled to pray, returned thanks for all for the intelligence just communicated from the Kingdom of God, and asked a blessing upon the people and the Royal House of Prussia -- possessors of the Gospel -- as Thou hast permitted one King to die in faith, so do Thou conduct the new King in the path of faith.[381]

Daniel LeGrand, aware that the previous king had died only weeks before, may have unsubtly included these prayers in praise of Prussia and its new monarch especially so that Bunsen would hear.[382] As the king's representative in Switzerland, Bunsen's presence at the meeting was an opportunity for these missionaries to impress upon him (and hopefully also therefore, the Prussian state) the urgency of their agenda. For his part, Bunsen was more than just sympathetic to their shared agenda, as he had been working towards similar aims for more than two decades.

At this conference, Bunsen not only laid the groundwork for a transnational network of missionary organs which would come to support the Jerusalem Bishopric with men and funds, but he also was able to act as a mediator between all of the relevant interests. All that

---

Pennsylvania in 1825. Interestingly, Robert Owen, the British industrialist who bought Harmony, Indiana from Rapp, was a colleague of the like-minded Christian Swiss industrialist Daniel LeGrand.

[381] Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 573.

[382] The Crown Prince Friedrich Wilhelm became King Friedrich Wilhelm IV on June 7th, 1840, less than 1 month before the Basel conference took place during the first week of July, 1840.

remained was for Bunsen to convince his friend, the newly-crowned Prussian King that this was a worthwhile endeavor. These men at the Basel Conference (Bunsen, Spittler, Zeller, LeGrand, and the elder and younger Hoffman) had several crucial elements in common despite their disparate backgrounds and careers: an adulthood conversion experience typical of the *Erweckungsbewegung*, a decidedly latitudinarian, "low church" orientation towards non-sectarian Protestantism, and a desire to evangelize the Gospel abroad. They all had experience in forming and maintaining Protestant communities or institutions: hospitals, orphanages, reform schools, missionary seminars, and even entire city-colonies. Now, for the first time, they had a goal in mind which would direct their energies towards Palestine.

Bunsen's impromptu speech at the 1840 Basel conference marked a turning point in his career and is therefore worth examining in some detail. Bunsen claimed that he had not intended to speak at this event, and that he had even wanted his presence there to not be made public.[383] His desire for privacy was likely a political consideration. Bunsen may not have wanted his opponents in the Prussian court, especially during the time of transition after the recent death of Friedrich Wilhelm III, to find out that an important diplomatic figure was directly involved with this group.[384] Hoffman had assured Bunsen that his presence and speech would not be made public, and this gave Bunsen the confidence to address the audience:

> **I desired particularly to mark the blessing which had attended the Missionary work in rousing religious feeling among German Protestants**, commenting upon the sad condition of whole districts and provinces **(to whatsoever Church belonging)** from which the spirit of life had fled and showing that only the conception of **one universal Church** (i.e. assembly of believers animated and united by the same faith

[383] Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 576.

[384] In chapter 3, we examined in more detail the various rivals that countered Bunsen and his allied in Berlin.

> and love) could offer a prospect satisfactory to Christian contemplation.[385] [emphasis added]

Bunsen had already been convinced that evangelical missionary work on the Continent and abroad was working to awaken Protestants in Germany. These sorts of sentiments animated Bunsen from the time of his own conversion experience in 1814 at the age of 23 during a visit to Holland and informed his early activities in Rome. His invocation of "one universal Church" is also noteworthy, because although Prussia had unified its Protestant confessions, he was aware that French, Swiss, and South German Protestants were in attendance as well. Moreover, this latitudinarian rhetoric was an appeal to an ideal vision of an ecumenical, pan-Protestant future in which supposedly minor theological differences were overlooked in favor of their common goals.

Bunsen elaborated a desire to shift missionary strategies. Rather than sending a handful of trained missionaries to convert and minister to local populations abroad, he suggested a more coordinated, centralized, and multi-pronged approach. These were the lessons that Bunsen had learned from his years in charge of what was effectively a Protestant mission in Rome:

> As a secondary result I noted the **gain in knowledge of humanity in general from the spread of Missions and in particular as to establishing the fact of the unity of the human race.** Then further combining means and end into one point of view, I endeavoured to show that the work of Missions … was but the first step taken for the sake of the second; that what has been accomplished as yet **must be looked upon as a proof of the power existing for the renewal of humanity by means of Christianity**, and that we are now called upon to found *Christian Communities* [emphasis Bunsen's], **not to aim merely at single conversions by means of single efforts.** Every Mission station should contain the germ of an entire Christian congregation, that is to say: the family, the school, the association for accomplishing works of Christian love for the care of the helpless in every way.[386] [bold emphasis added]

[385] Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 577.

[386] Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 577.

Bunsen's rather utopian description of the potential of centralized mission settlements to both renew humanity and to posit the unity of all races is striking, but it is important to understand that these sorts of grand, utopian impulses enabled the zeal and commitment which undergirded the Jerusalem Bishopric concept in particular, and evangelical missions in general during the nineteenth century. The properly awakened Christian community was more powerful when combined with institutions and associated organs nearby: schools, hospitals, philanthropic associations, and so on. Only in this way, according to Bunsen, could European missionaries achieve lasting impact abroad, with the added benefit of increasing spiritual feelings in their churches at home in Europe. As Bunsen had remarked earlier in his career, "The church needs to be built up again out of the ruins, into which it has fallen through the unbelief of teachers, and the indifference of the people."[387] The Jerusalem project, in the eyes of Bunsen and his allies, would directly energize the weakening church in their societies.

The centralization of missionary efforts in Bunsen's conception was crucial. With concerted effort and resources, and equipped with correct Christian beliefs, Bunsen suggested that European settlers could win the hearts of natives and welcome them into their ideal community:

> **Instead of multiplying stations, those already existing should be strengthened by absorbing many into one** that from each of such centres increased influence might radiate from such as should devote themselves not only to die, but to live and to work the work of the Lord. **The idea of founding such communities by means of converted natives** I dwelt upon most emphatically-- as the only efficient means of counteracting the various evils brought upon European settlements commenced in genuine Christianity by the admixture of godless and corrupt outcasts from Europe which Hofmann had strongly stated and deplored.[388] [emphasis added]

[387] Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 160.

[388] Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 160.

Bunsen's suggestion to incorporate the "converted native" into the community was meant to strengthen the foundation of future missions, making them more resilient to corruption. This line of thinking was entirely in line with Bunsen's theological and political projects in other areas. As discussed in the previous chapter, Bunsen believed that the activation of the congregation itself was the key to the reinvigoration of churches via liturgical reform. Such an awakening would then unlock the potential of Christianity to unify humanity, in Bunsen's view.

Having become convinced of the necessity and viability of the Jerusalem Bishopric plan, Bunsen set to work to influence his friend, the newly-crowned monarch of Prussia. Friedrich Wilhelm IV received a letter from Bunsen less than two months after the Basel conference, in which Bunsen invoked the millenarian trope of the "signs of the times," in reference to the political situation in the Ottoman empire. Bunsen reported in this letter that he had actually *already* written to Lord Ashley and William Gladstone in England, sketching the plan for a new church to be built in Jerusalem. He told the Prussian king that the plan had been warmly and then passed on to the British Foreign Secretary, Lord Palmerston.[389] It is remarkable that Bunsen was already laying the groundwork for transnational cooperation on the Bishopric *before* informing the Prussian monarch about the plan at all. In these letters, Bunsen also made an appeal to the economic opportunities which might accompany the Bishopric, hoping to entice Palmerston and the English Prime Minister Lord Melbourne.[390] Bunsen also knew that the King was taken with the Anglican Church, and sympathetic to

[389] Bunsen to Friedrich Wilhelm IV on September 17th, 1840. See: Bunsen, *Aus seinen Briefe.* vol. 2, pp. 151-152.

[390] GStAPK, Rep. 92, FA Bunsen, A.41, pp. 117-119, cited in: Kurt Schmidt-Clausen, *Vorwegennomene Einheit* (Berlin: Lutherisches Verlagshaus, 1965), p. 90.

awakened Christianity.[391] These sympathies were important in securing royal support for the plan, and it is safe to assert that the Bishopric likely would never have happened under the previous monarchy.

In the months following his experience at the Basel conference, Bunsen had become thoroughly committed to the project of settlement in Jerusalem. Bunsen was convinced by the necessity to take up the missionary ambitions of leaders like Spittler, Zeller, and LeGrand. But politically, only Bunsen had the necessary influence within the Prussian court to enable the plan. By April of 1841, Bunsen had been called to Berlin and was given instructions on how to negotiate with England to form the Bishopric. En route as a Special Prussian Envoy to England, Bunsen passed through Basel and wrote:

> At Basel I saw many friends; on all sides one felt the spirit of the Mission festival ever active…. LeGrand... awaited me, full of the new idea of Spittler, to settle near Jerusalem a rightly-constituted colony, the kernel of which should be trained at Basel as teachers of religion, practising self-denial and exercising trades. The center of the thought of all hearts is the Holy Land; and many assured me that with prayer and true affection they look to Frederick William IV.[392]

Spittler's *Basler Mission* hoped to benefit by supplying properly-trained missionaries for the Jerusalem Bishopric, giving his institution and the *Erweckungsbewegung* a symbolic victory and a missionary foothold in the region. Bunsen stood to gain the most. He would be the one to convince the Prussian King of the plan's viability and importance, delivering to the missionaries and millenarians the key support they needed. Bunsen's influence with Friedrich Wilhelm IV was significant; it was reported that before Bunsen arrived to confer with the

---

[391] Friedrich Wilhelm IV's religious feelings are well-documented in the historiography, as influenced by the *Erweckungsbewegung.* See Chapter 4, "Monarchy and Religious Renewal in Prussia, 1840-1850" in: David E. Barclay, *Frederick William IV and the Prussian monarchy, 1840-1861* (Oxford: Clarendon Press Oxford University Press, 1995).

[392] Bunsen to his wife, April 26th, 1841 in: Bunsen, *Memoir,* vol 1, p. 594.

King about the Jerusalem plan, the King exclaimed: "I hunger and thirst after Bunsen!"[393] Bunsen played a role in his network in which the others looked to and relied on him, strengthening his position with his peers.

Anti-Catholic Motivations

Anthony Ashley Cooper, known by his title Lord Ashley became a member of Parliament in 1826.[394] He spent his career advocating for social reforms, especially regarding child labor laws and the regulation of squalid insane asylums. Ashley was also a premillennial Christian who was the first politician to publicly advocate for the restoration of the Jewish people to Palestine in January 1839.[395] As the president of the British and Foreign Bible Society, and a board member of the LJS, Ashley was committed to the same methods of missionary-based evangelism as many of the Germans and Swiss leaders who Bunsen met in Basel.[396]

Having met one another years earlier during his time in Rome, Bunsen knew that Ashley was probably the English figure best suited to galvanize the political will necessary to realize the Bishopric. Reflecting on the origins of the plan, Bunsen wrote: "[Ashley] was the man who took up our cause, and who set the Jerusalem plan in motion - we made our plan …

[393] Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 597.

[394] Anthony Ashley-Cooper (1801-1885), became the 7th Earl of Shaftesbury in 1851.

[395] See Anthony Ashley-Cooper, "The London Quarterly Review," Volume 64, pp. 93-107.

[396] Characteristic of Anglican evangelicals in the 1830s and 1840s, Ashley also wanted to use Britains global empire as a vehicle for their missionary ambitions, in order to spread the Gospel across the world. See: Thomas Haweis, *A view of the Present State of Evangelical Religion Throughout the World: With a View to Promote Missionary Exertions.* (London: Williams and Son, 1812), pp. 13, 24.

in the night of December 10th, 1838 - the anniversary of the Allocution of 1837."[397] In this letter to his wife, Bunsen is referencing the Papal Allocution by Pope Gregory XVI of December 1837. Released at the height of the tensions between Prussia and the Vatican following the arrest of Archbishop of Cologne, the Pope had praised the conduct of the Archbishop who had resisted pressure to perform mixed-marriages and protested the actions of the Prussian government.[398] It is not insignificant that Bunsen chose to frame his own narrative of the origin of the project in a way that contextualizes the origins of the Jerusalem Bishopric within the context of a larger struggle against the Roman Catholic Church. Indeed, it is virtually impossible to understand why and how the Bishopric could ever be established without an examination of the confessional tensions between Catholicism and Protestantism. Although the issue of Bunsen's anti-Catholicism was examined in Chapter 1, it is necessary to take another look in order to properly contextualize the Jerusalam Bishopric.

By 1840, Prussian officials (including Bunsen), were still reeling from the mixed-marriage affair in Köln as the Bishopric idea first took shape. King Friedrich Wilhelm IV, eager to move past the issue, was careful not to appear to be provoking Rome with this project. Indeed, the Prussian King had granted significant autonomy to the Catholic churches upon taking the throne, in an attempt to defuse growing ultramontane agitation in Prussia.[399] At the same time, confessional tensions were increasing in the 1840s, as evident by the 1844 pilgrimage to see the "Holy Coat" of Trier, organized by the Bishop of Trier as a show of

[397] Bunsen to his wife, in: Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 608.

[398] See also Chapter 1 of this dissertation, and: Michael Ott, "Clemens August von Droste-Vischering." *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. 5, (New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1909).

[399] See: George S. Williamson, *The Longing for Myth in Germany: Religion and Aesthetic Culture from Romanticism to Nietzsche* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2004), p. 185.

force to the Protestant state and piety which drew at least half a million pilgrims.[400] Domestically, Friedrich Wilhelm IV had immediately envisioned a "Christian state," and while a majority of the Prussian population was Protestant, a significant (one-third) minority of Catholics challenged his vision of a uniform "German" culture.[401] Building upon the project of Protestant confessional unification pursued by his late father discussed in the previous chapter, the Prussian monarch consistently sought to promote Protestantism at home and abroad, which they believed by necessity meant either marginalizing or assimilating German Catholics.

As the architect of the Bishopric plan, Bunsen's personal stance towards Catholicism was crucial, although there has been some debate among scholars about it. Several scholars have suggested that Bunsen was filled with antipathy, even hatred, for Catholics. Schmidt-Clausen and Lückhoff's recent works both suggest that Bunsen's commitment to the Jerusalem plan must be contextualized by his anti-Roman Catholic sentiments.[402] However, Bunsen's foremost biographer Frank Foerster compellingly suggests that this image of Bunsen was shaped primarily by Catholic authors and ultramontane Anglicans who viewed Bunsen as an enemy.[403] To be sure, Bunsen's archival record does contain statements indicating disdain and hostility towards "Papists," and suspicion towards Jesuits. But the beliefs of Bunsen and his allies have to be properly contextualized. As recently as 1837, Bunsen wrote: "Justice and

---

[400] Wolfgang Schieder, "Church and Revolution: Aspects of the Social History of the Trier Pilgrimage of 1844," in *Conflict and Stability in Europe* (London: Croom Hem, 1979).

[401] See: Barclay, *Frederick William IV,* pp. 75-98.

[402] Van der Leest provides a good summary of this debate. See: van der Leest: *Conversion and Conflict*. pp. 55-57; Lückhoff, *Anglikaner*, p. 54; Schmidt-Clausen, *Vorwegenommene Einheit*, pp. 85, 88.

[403] See Foerster, *Bunsen,* p. 159; Foerster, "Bunsens Bild in der Geschichte. Forschungsbericht aus einer Biographie über Christian Carl Josias Bunsen," *Geschictsblätter für Waldeck* 87, 1999, pp. 42-71.

equity towards the whole Catholic population, firmness against hierarchical schemes in the name of Government and the State, and in that of the national liberty, Catholic as well as Protestant- that is our symbol."[404] Such a statement can only be interpreted charitably as positive "toleration," even as he distrusted the church administration. Although he considered conservative elements within the Vatican and ultramontane bishops as subversive, Bunsen did indeed work to mollify disaffected Catholics in Prussia.[405] Bunsen wrote approvingly of the Catholic Emancipation issue in England and generally disapproved of any state sanctioned discrimination against Catholics anywhere where they were in the minority.[406]

Immediately following Bunsen's 1841 arrival in London, the diplomatic corps of London reacted as rumors spread about his intentions. Russian and French ambassadors worried and suspected that Bunsen would be "stirring up Lord Palmerston to remodel the Eastern question."[407] The Austrian ambassador to England complained to the Prussian ambassador (Bunsen's predecessor, Bülow) that Bunsen had arrived "to form a second league of Schmalkalden," invoking the specter of the sixteenth-century confessional war between Catholics and Protestants.[408] The suspicion and animosity of Bunsen and his plan by the Catholic powers of Europe was certainly understandable. While the Anglo-Prussian mission

---

[404] Bunsen to Thomas Arnold, Dec. 1937 in: Bunsen, *Memoir,* vol. 1, p. 449. "Hierarchical schemes" refers to the fear that Catholics may be placed hierarchically below Protestants in the eyes of the Prussian government.

[405] See chapter 1 for examples, including his personal intervention to stop the compulsory attendance of Protestant worship services by Catholic troops.

[406] See Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, pp. 292, 353-354. The Roman Catholic Relief Act of 1829 removed previous legislation which prevented political representation by Irish Catholics in the English Parliament.

[407] Palmerston was the Foreign Secretary at the time. See: Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 606.

[408] Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 606. The League of Schmalkalden was a Protestant military, and then later, political alliance from 1531-1548.

to Jerusalem was not a military alliance, Catholic powers were nervous about an increasingly powerful and assertive form of Protestantism on the global stage.

While Bunsen advocated for equal treatment and rights of Catholics, he certainly saw the authoritarian nature of the Catholic Church administration as a potential opponent for Protestant churches and majority-Protestant nations *in addition to* the Eastern Orthodox churches. Indeed, in the officially-sanctioned "Statement of Proceedings" resulting from the Prussian-English negotiations, the Bishopric itself was also intended to strengthen the Eastern churches against the "encroachments of the See of Rome."[409] Among the other aforementioned evangelical institutions, Bunsen was involved with the Evangelical Alliance from its inception in 1846. Upon stationery with the Alliance letterhead, Bunsen wrote to their "Correspondence Committee" that their shared mission should be to reach pan-Protestant harmony and to "strengthen the cause of Protestantism and to render the ranks of Protestantism more impregnable to the assaults of Popery."[410] Bunsen envisioned an alliance of European Protestants, standing together as a bulwark against "popery," by which he meant politicized, ultramontane Catholicism. From a confessional point of view, then, Bunsen was committed to religious liberty and against the disenfranchisement and discrimination of Catholics. But he often wrote about feeling trapped between Neo-Lutheran movement in Germany and the High Church Oxford Movement in England, in that they represented two bellacose, chauvinist forms of their denominational identity.[411]

---

[409] Hechler, *The Jerusalem Bishopric*, Documents, p. 106.

[410] GStA-PK, VI, FA Bunsen, A21 no. 79.

[411] See chapters 3 and 4 for more about Bunsen's views towards the Oxford Movement and the Neolutherans, respectively.

Geopolitically, Bunsen wanted to pull England and Prussia closer into each other's official orbit at the level of state, which simultaneously entailed a step toward the merger of their idiosyncratic Protestant traditions. As we shall see, it was this merger which was vociferously opposed by the High Church parties from both countries. Catholic-friendly, High Church Anglicans opposed the Bishopric on the grounds that it would draw Anglicanism much further away from Catholicism both doctrinally and politically, while Neolutherans felt that the Bishopric (and any step towards Anglicanism) would flatten their particular doctrinal traditions. So while it is certainly true that Bunsen and his allies pursued the Bishopric plan with a defensive eye towards Rome, and while they hoped to increase their standing globally to match that of the other major Christian churches, it is a mistake to suggest that the Bishopric itself was deliberately anti-Catholic, or that it was specifically designed to oppress or malign Catholics in either England or Prussia.

Motivations of Economy and Statecraft: Protection of Christians in the interest of the state:

With the weakening of the Ottoman Empire after the First Turko-Egyptian War ended in 1833, many Christians saw an opportunity for a restored Jewish state in the Holy Land. This opportunism extended to state officials who also saw the potential for economic and political gain by asserting their presence in the region.

The goal of the new Prussian King was to extend European protection over the Protestants living in Palestine. But matters of statecraft clearly also played a role in the Prussian motivation behind the project. By allying with English interests in the region,

Prussian officials had hoped to assert Prussia as an equally powerful player on the European political field, while also attempting to diminish French and Austrian influence. Christians made up approximately 8% of the population of Palestine in 1850 (or roughly 27,000 out of 340,000 people).[412] France, through a series of treaties with Ottoman rulers going back to the sixteenth century, had extended its protection over the Catholic subjects of the Ottoman Empire. Russia, similarly, through a treaty with the Ottomans in 1774, extended its protection over Greek Orthodox Christians.[413] Both Roman Catholic and Orthodox Christians in Palestine had established protections from the European superpowers, which added a veneer of status and legitimacy to their standing amongst one another.

Prussia under Friedrich Wilhelm III in the 1820s and 1830s had already been tentatively lending its protection over Protestants and Germans beyond its territorial borders, as we saw with his support of Bunsen's embassy congregation and ancillary projects like the Protestant Hospital.[414] But under Friedrich Wilhelm IV, Prussian efforts increased significantly. In March of 1841, the Prussian monarch dictated an "Address to European Christendom," and sent it to the four principal powers (Britain, France, Austria, and Russia), with the intention of creating a broad European protectorate for the Christians and the "Holy Places" in Palestine.[415] The proposal was rejected by all four powers, most probably because it would have undermined their own influence in the region or because it might have

[412] Justin McCarthy, *The Population of Palestine. Population History and Statistics of the Late Ottoman Period and the Mandate* (The Institute for Palestine Series, New York, 1990), pp. 10, 37.

[413] See: van der Leest, *Conversion and Conflict*. pp. 33-35.

[414] See Chapter 1.

[415] See: Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 595; and van der Leest, *Conversion and Conflict*, pp. 61-62.

unnecessarily complicated the international relationships with one another. Still, Friedrich Wilhelm IV was undaunted, and summoned Bunsen shortly afterwards to begin his mission to England. Aside from the "Address to European Christendom," Prussia had made two earlier overtures; one to Austria in August of 1840, and another to Britain in February of 1841, both of which failed.[416] The potential of opening a Bishopric by partnering with Britain allowed Friedrich Wilhelm IV and Bunsen to sidestep the potentially more controversial stance of European royal protection for *all* Christians in the Holy Land, to the narrower goal of just protecting Protestants. As a private, non-denominational Protestant institution, the Bishopric could work to that end while also elevating Prussian prestige amongst its neighbors.

Economically, the Anglo-Prussian institution could potentially serve as an important layover for tradesmen on the way to India via the overland route to the Red Sea through Egypt (and via the Suez Canal after 1869). While the pre-canal overland route was too awkward for bulky goods, it was significantly faster for individuals (officials and messengers, for example) than the sea route around the Cape. The 1838 Treaty of Balta Liman between the United Kingdom and the Ottoman Empire had also opened Ottoman markets to British merchants and abolished monopolies, much to European gain.[417]

[416] Lückhoff, *Anglikaner,* pp. 36-37.

[417] For more about the British economic gains and its consequences in the region, see: James L. Gelvin, *The Modern Middle East*, Oxford University Press, 2005; and Geyikdağı, V. Necla, "Foreign Investment in the Ottoman Empire: International Trade and Relations 1854-1914," *Tauris Academic Studies* (2011) p. 23.

The Negotiations 1841-1842

A series of complex negotiations took place after Bunsen's arrival in England in June of 1841. The Prussian King sent Bunsen with a specific set of instructions from which to base his negotiations. In principle, the aim of the Prussian monarch was to establish "the protection which should be afforded to the subjects of both [English and Prussian] powers in the Turkish dominions, without distinction of creed."[418] The Bishopric was reminiscent of the Prussian Embassy Chapel and its congregation in Rome, insofar as both were intended to establish Prussian royal protection over Protestants living in non-Protestant countries. But such an undertaking was to be significantly more challenging in Ottoman territory than in European territory, and was further complicated by the fact that it was the project not of a single country's ecclesiastical, domestic, and political concerns, but those of both countries.

In July of 1841, Bunsen held a flurry of meetings and conferences to begin the negotiations, first with the Foreign Secretary, Lord Palmerston, and then with the Anglican church leadership at Lambeth Palace. The negotiations led to the so-called "Fundamental Principles," of the new joint church, in which both sides agreed to preserve "'Catholicity' or a lively sense of the internal unity of the universal Church," but also agreed to the "national independence" of both churches.[419] During the negotiations, Bunsen wrote about the insistence that specifically German doctrinal elements must remain in this unified church:

> I, of course, demanded for the German congregation and converts the German service and the Confession of Augsburg. But when I perceived that it was admitted that the

[418] "The Instructions of King Frederick William IV to his special Envoy, the Privy Councillor, Dr. Bunsen", 8 June, 1841, in: Hechler, *The Jerusalem Bishopric*, Documents, 2-3 (English and German).

[419] "Fundamental Principles", London, July 1841, in: William Henry Hechler, *The Jerusalem Bishopric, Documents with Translations chiefly derived from 'Das evangelische Bisthum in Jerusalem' Geschichtliche Darlegung mit Urkunden, Berlin 1842* (London: Trübner and Co, 1883), pp. 28-29 (English and German).

> plurality of tongues and of articles was not contrary to unity, I took the offensive, and argued that they must act in a *catholic* and not in an *Anglican* sense, and that they ought to be foremost in establishing the principle of unity in principle with national individuality; that Rome was digging her own grave by taking the contrary course. [emphasis Bunsen's][420]

Bunsen's priorities during the negotiations were clear. He wanted the Bishopric to represent a unified front of Protestantism in the Holy Land, in which Pan-Protestant unity would supersede linguistic, or even theological differences between the two churches represented there. By setting up the Anglo-Prussian project as the opposite of the course taken by Rome regarding "national individuality," Bunsen was referring to the assertive stance taken by the Vatican over Catholic subjects in Protestant countries.[421] Therefore, one might interpret Bunsen's insistence of retaining German idiosyncratic elements in the Bishopric while also encouraging "catholic" comity as a call for a unified, latitudinarian Protestantism which nevertheless allowed for national difference under its umbrella. This impulse was also plainly visible in his earlier support of the unification of the Calvinist and Lutheran churches in Prussia.

Financially, the Prussian King Friedrich Wilhelm IV was to supply one-half of the endowment to fund the mission (£15,000), and the remaining half was to be provided by the English.[422] The interest of the total endowment (£30,000) came to roughly £600 per year,

---

[420] Bunsen to his wife, July 13th, 1841, in: Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 606.

[421] Bunsen here is clearly thinking about the various Papal instructions in the late 1830s regarding the issue of mixed-marriages in the Rhineland region. See Chapter 1.

[422] To provide a frame of reference: The sum of £15,000 in the 1840s was substantial. A factory worker or skilled engineer might make 100-110£ annually. With £15,000, one could buy roughly two million pounds (lbs.) of bread in 1843 at the rate of 1.8 pence per pound of bread. See: E. Royston Pike, *Hard Times: Human Documents of the Industrial Revolution* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1966), p. 196; and James E. Thorold Rogers, *Six Centuries of Work and Wages* (London: Swan Sonnenschein and Co., Ltd., 1908), p. 539.

which would be paid to the Bishop at Jerusalem annually. The London Jews Society also raised £3,000 for the cause, alongside significant fundraising undertaken in both countries to contribute to the Bishopric.

An Act of Parliament officially founded the Bishopric in October 5th, 1841, and the consecration of the Bishop of the Church of St. James at Jerusalem took place on October 31st, 1841, during the ceremony of which, Bunsen exclaimed, "England and Prussia forever!" During this ceremony, patriotic German songs were sung and speeches were given as to how the two countries ought to emulate each other, while politicians and High and Low Churchmen shook hands to celebrate.[423]

At a personal level, the negotiations also allowed Bunsen to parlay his success as the King's envoy into a full Ambassadorship to England after being chosen from a short-list by Queen Victoria in 1841, who had been impressed by his charisma, Anglophilia, and reputation within English society. This was an especially gratifying moment of redemption for a figure who only two years previously had been forced to resign having failed to bridge the differences between Prussia and the Vatican regarding the mixed-marriage troubles.

Bunsen and William Gladstone

Bunsen lobbied vigorously to secure the political support of future Prime Minister William Ewart Gladstone, who during the Jerusalem negotiations was a Member of Parliament in his early thirties. Less than two months after Friedrich Wilhelm IV ascended the throne, Bunsen wrote to Gladstone:

[423] Bunsen, *Memoir,* vol. 1, p. 625.

> **It is surely impossible not to see the finger of God in the foundation of an English Church and a congregation of Christian proselytes on the sacred hill of Jerusalem** … You may now without an effort obtain for Christianity in the Sultan's dominions, not only for liberty and privileges, such as Christian Europe fought for in the middle ages, but even territorial property, indispensable for the maintenance of the first.[424]

Bunsen consistently deployed such millenarian idioms as "the finger of God" with those whom he felt shared his religious sympathies. Bunsen's intention was to appeal to Gladstone's sympathies at both a spiritual level (by invoking the finger of God, and referencing the sacred hill of Jerusalem), and also a material level by suggesting that the joint Anglo-Prussian Bishopric could bloodlessly win territory in the region. Gladstone, for his part, was supportive of the concept of the project but expressed skepticism regarding its implementation.[425] In a letter to the Bishop of London in October 1841, Gladstone wrote that after perusing the "secret instructions" from the Prussian King provided to him by his "excellent friend, the Chevalier Bunsen," that although he had profound respect for the Prussian King, the Jerusalem plans had "raised a scruple…" and that "his view could hardly without qualification be adopted as the basis & model of the whole design."[426] Gladstone was concerned primarily with the Prussian use of the word "Protestant," which he worried would not be as warmly understood in England as it might be in Prussia, and by the suggested use of

[424] Bunsen to Gladstone, August 3rd, 1840 in: Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 583.

[425] Even this early in his career, Gladstone was a powerful politician in England. By 1841, Gladstone had already been a Junior Lord of the Treasury, the Under-Secretary for War and the Colonies, and would soon become the President of the Board of Trade (1843). He had also raised his profile by publicly opposing the First Opium war in China in 1840.

[426] Gladstone to Bishop of London, 29th October, 1841, Add MS 44361, Western Manuscripts, vol. 276, British Library, pp. 209, 221.

the Articles of the Confession of Augsburg for ordination as a doctrinal symbol.[427] Bunsen showed Gladstone these documents as part of an effort to get Gladstone to become a Trustee of the Jerusalem Bishopric Fund, a position which Gladstone politely but firmly declined on the basis of those disagreements.

Within one day, however, Bunsen prevailed upon Gladstone. In a letter from Charles Blomfield, the Bishop of London, to Gladstone, the Bishop wrote:

> Chevalier Bunsen told me this morning that he had seen you since … your letter to me, and that you had stated to him your willingness to become one of the Trustees of the Jerusalem Bishopric Fund … to act under the direction of the Archbishop [of Canterbury] and the Bishop of London. I am extremely glad of this, being very desirous that your name should be associated with those of the other three Trustees.[428]

Bishop Blomfield had also successfully persuaded by Bunsen as to the merits of the Bishopric project, and Bunsen's ability to reign in Gladstone's doubts was an important victory for the Trustee Fund and the Bishopric project altogether. This small exchange should act as an example of how Bunsen was able to bring together the most powerful members of the British state and church apparatus to enable the Bishopric project to begin. Yet, as we shall see later in this chapter, Gladstone's skepticism portended some further resistance to the Bishopric, especially regarding the doctrinal and confessional gap between Lutherans and Anglicans in both countries.

[427] Gladstone was pragmatically concerned with how the English would react to the Bishopric. Not only was he concerned about Catholics, but also High Churchmen who were significantly more sympathetic to Roman Catholicism than Bunsen and other "Low Church" reformers.
[428] Add MS 44361, Western Manuscripts, vol. 276, British Library, p. 221.

The Protestant Axis: A renewed Alliance between Prussia and Great Britain

In his diplomatic role, Bunsen acted as the middle-man to the Prussian King, as he received hundreds of requests for support and letters of appreciation from English missionaries. Just after the Bishopric formed in 1841, Bunsen received a letter from the London Society for Promoting Christianity Among Jews, inviting him to award the society's salary to the examining chaplain of the Bishop of Jerusalem.[429] That same year, he received a letter from the president of the Church Missionary Society (CMS), James Hough, who asked Bunsen to convey his admiration for the Prussian King for his interest in spreading Christianity in the East.[430] The archival records show a deep pattern of this kind of financial, political, and symbolic support from dozens of Christian groups.

As discussed in this dissertation's second chapter, the Prussian King visited London in late January and early February of 1842, just months after the Jerusalem Bishopric was consecrated. The purpose of the King's visit was to witness the christening of the Prince of Wales, in which Friedrich Wilhelm IV became the young prince's godfather.[431]

[429] GStA-PK, FA Bunsen, A34, p. 298. An "examining chaplain" was a kind of adviser and lobbyist to the Bishop.

[430] GStA-PK, FA Bunsen, A34, p. 287. Note that Hough praised him for "spreading" Christianity, rather than simply protecting it.

[431] The young prince would eventually become King Edward VII, who sat on the British throne from 1901-1910.

[Figure 2: A painting of the occasion "The Christening of the Prince of Wales, 25 January 1842" by Sir George Hayter (1792-1871) of the Baptism in St. George's Chapel, Windsor. The Prussian King Friedrich Wilhelm IV is seen holding a book, just left of the center of the frame, to the left of Queen Victoria. Signed and dated 1842-5, the painting currently hangs in Buckingham Palace.]

The visit was one of the only times the Prussian King would come to England, and it afforded Bunsen significant opportunities to bolster the ideological mission of the Jerusalem Bishopric project to the English public. Although dozens of messages sent to Bunsen requesting an audience with the Prussian King, Bunsen did all he could to ensure that the relationship between his King and England was arranged specifically to involve only his own closest allies within English circles and those who were instrumental in the Bishopric project. At the very top of the list of invitees to a reception with the King on January 29th, 1842 was Lord Ashley. The short list also included the Archdeacon Hare, Thomas Arnold, and Dandeson Coates, the Secretary of the Church Missionary Society, and several other notable persons

within English missionary circles and the Anglican Church.[432] By arranging this meeting, Bunsen ensured that the King would be surrounded by voices which would encourage continued Prussian support of the joint venture in Jerusalem.

Scholarly, missionary, and theological exchange between both countries flourished during the early years of the Bishopric. Politically, Bunsen worked to maintain cozy diplomatic relations between both governments as well. The Bishopric represented a new frontier of cooperation for both countries, this time with distinctive imperial and evangelistic purposes in mind. Some distance grew between the two countries at the outbreak of the Crimean War in 1853, as Prussia declared neutrality (contrary to Bunsen's fervent efforts to convince Friedrich Wilhelm IV to join Britain), but the Bishopric remained a bright spot in relations until its dissolution in 1886.[433]

The historical impact of this decades-long Anglo-Prussian alliance at the geopolitical level was mixed. To be sure, the Bishopric project was but one among a range of issues upon which the two countries would either cooperate or disagree in the nineteenth century. Their cooperation, even specifically pertaining to the status of Christians in the Holy Land, did not lead Prussia to support England and the Ottomans against Russia in the 1850s. Queen Victoria's amicable relationship with Bunsen and Friedrich Wilhelm IV led to a confused British policy when Prussia asserted sovereignty over Schleswig-Holstein, with several

[432] GStA-PK, FA Bunsen, A10, pp. 21-22.

[433] The war led to Bunsen's resignation from diplomatic service in 1854, as he felt that he had lost the confidence of his friend and patron, the King. The two still remained friends, though not as warmly as in their youth.

prominent British politicians dismayed that the Queen was too Germanophilic.[434] But, as was seen in Chapter 2, the Bishopric was a first step in a much-closer relationship between theologians, missionaries, and church figures in both countries. When contextualized within the larger project of transnational cross-pollination between Prussian and English religious organizations, the Bishopric seems representative of a time of warm exchange, and hope for significantly increased cooperation, especially in the 1840s and 1850s.[435]

The Bishopric in Practice

The Bishopric was to be a jointly-run church, in which the Anglican tradition would be followed insofar as its Bishop would serve under the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Prelates of England. At the same time, the church would follow the German liturgical order for its services and would adhere to the 28 articles of the Augsburg Confession. This peculiar form of doctrinal syncretism was of great delight to the latitudinarian factions within both countries, for whom doctrinal orthodoxy presented more of a barrier than an opportunity for the expansion of global Christendom.

[434] Aside from the Crimean War, Britain's Parliament chafed at Prussian territorial claims to the city of Neuchâtel in Switzerland until a bloodless revolution in 1848 returned it solely to Switzerland. Similarly, the British Government had urged peace leading up to, and after the Dano-German War of 1848-1850 over the issue of Schleswig-Holstein and whether or not it would belong to the German Confederation or to Denmark. See: Keith. A.P. Sandiford, "The British Cabinet and the Schleswig-Holstein Crisis, 1863–1864." *History* 58, no. 194 (1973): 360-83.

[435] See Nicholas Railton's important book on the 1857 Conference of the Evangelical Alliance in Berlin for more about the important church and missionary linkages between both countries: Railton, *No North Sea,* pp. 169-193.

The Early Years: Michael Solomon Alexander (Bishop from 1841-1845)

The first bishop chosen to lead the mission in Jerusalem was Michael Solomon Alexander (1799-1845). The choice of Alexander by Bunsen, the London Jews Society, and the other trustees of the Bishopric was made primarily for strategic reasons rather than practical ones. Born in South Prussia in 1799, Alexander was Jewish. He emigrated to England in 1820, and worked as a rabbi in Norwich, where he became acquainted with the London Jews Society. By 1825, Alexander was baptized after converting to Christianity. He subsequently worked as a professor of Hebrew at King's College London from 1832-1841, and worked to translate the New Testament and the Book of Common Prayer into Hebrew for the LJS. Alexander's conversion story, his transcultural upbringing, and his involvement with the LJS made him the ideal symbolic candidate for the post in Jerusalem. Indeed, Bunsen saw this and wrote in his diary: "[Alexander] is by race an Israelite - born a Prussian in Breslau - in confession belonging to the Church of England - ripened by hard work in Ireland - twenty years professor of Hebrew and Arabic in England. So the beginning is made, please God, for the restoration of Israel."[436] Bunsen lobbied for Alexander's nomination on the grounds of his being born Jewish and converting to Christianity, and for his giftedness with both Arabic and Hebrew. Alexander represented the best hopes of the LJS, who clearly hoped that he could convert the other Jewish residents of the region.

Michael Alexander was consecrated on November 7th, 1841 by the Archbishop of Canterbury at Lambeth Palace in London. Bunsen's friend, the aforementioned Alexander

[436] Bunsen, *Memoir,* vol. 1, pp. 608-609.

McCaul, gave the consecration sermon, which was steeped in millenarian ideas: "Signs such as these proclaim that, if the set time to favour Zion has not yet fully arrived, it can hardly be far distant."[437] Bunsen, William Gladstone, Lord Ashley, and Stratford Canning, the British Ambassador to the Ottomans, were all present.[438]

Bishop Alexander's rather short-lived episcopate saw the establishment of several missionary and ancillary establishments. One of the more controversial was a "Hospital for Poor and Sick Jews." As seen in both Rome and London, hospitals were a favorite establishment for missionaries hoping to either convert or prevent conversion, depending on the faith of the patient. The hospital, founded by the LJS, had copies of the Bible in Hebrew, though no proselytism was allowed. Still, when a Jewish patient died in the hospital in 1845, the Rabbis of both major Jewish communities refused to bury him.[439]

Several supporting institutions were also established specifically to provide benefits, training, and care for any Jews who converted and became a part of their community. A short lived Hebrew College (1843-1846) was established to train Jewish converts as missionaries, where they learned languages, divinity, and Anglican doctrinal traditions.[440] A School of Industry was established in 1843 to teach trades (carpentry, woodcarving) in order to allow converts to become self-sufficient.[441] A lodging house for "Enquirers" (those curious about

[437] Geoffrey Finlayson, *The Seventh Earl of Shaftesbury, 1801-1885* (Vancouver: Regent College Publishing, 1981), p. 160.

[438] Van der Leest, *Conversion and Conflict*, p. 84.

[439] Van der Leest, *Conversion and Conflict*, p. 91.

[440] Hechler, *The Jerusalem Bishopric*, p. 112.

[441] Van der Leest, *Conversion and Conflict,* p. 93.

the faith) was established to entice newcomers with free sundries, food, and a place to live.[442] An elementary school was also established, and a store to sell Bibles and awakened Christian literature translated into local and European languages.[443]

Most controversially, Alexander sparked tension in Prussia when he refused to accept converts from the Greek Orthodox Church. Despite the fact that the official position of the agreement between both benefactor states specifically forbade such conversions, Prussian officials, including Friedrich Wilhelm IV, were outraged.[444] Clear cracks were beginning to form in the institution over its intended missionary purpose. Adding to this turbulence, Bishop Alexander refused to allow traveling Prussian clergy to use the church for their services. Instead, he only allowed Anglicans who he himself had consecrated to minister, and even then, only allowing *Anglican* liturgical arrangements. The liturgy to be used in the Bishopric's worship services was officially supposed to be the Capitoline Liturgy which Bunsen had implemented at the Prussian Embassy in Rome, examined at length in the previous chapter. Bunsen had boasted to his wife, "The work dearest to me of all that I ever designed or executed, is to be saved and transported to the Hill of Zion!"[445] Still, the actual adherence to Bunsen's Capitoline liturgy by the congregation in Jerusalem over the decades of the Bishopric is unclear from the archival record. Given the resistance to the Prussian element by the first Bishop, Michael Alexander, it is likely that perhaps only the Lutheran

---

[442] Van der Leest, *Conversion and Conflict,* p. 93.

[443] Literature included John Bunyon's *Pilgrim's Progress* and Alexander McCaul's *The Old Paths*. Van der Leest points out that local Rabbis threatened to excommunicate any Jew who entered the store. See: Van der Leest, *Conversion and Conflict*, p. 94.

[444] Lückhoff, *Anglikaner*, p. 136-139.

[445] Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 627.

missionaries in Jerusalem adopted his liturgy. However, under Gobat, Bunsen's liturgy was said to have been used.[446] This exclusion of Lutherans prompted the Prussian monarch to send Bunsen to intervene on this, and the earlier issue of refusing Orthodox converts.[447] Needless to say, these early years of the Bishopric were something of a disappointment to the Prussian side, who felt that they were not getting what they wanted out of the deal. This prompted Friedrich Wilhelm IV to plan for an independent Prussian Mission in the region, with its own church, schools, and hospitals.[448] With Alexander's sudden death in 1846, the task of nominating a new bishop to the Bishopric fell to the Prussian monarch.

The Samuel Gobat Years (1846-1879)

After Alexander's death, an opportunity was thus afforded to Prussian officials who sought to find a Bishop more amenable to their views as to the main objectives of the Bishopric. Still, this choice required some caution, as the Anglican Archbishop of Canterbury retained absolute veto power over nominations. Bunsen put forward the name of Samuel Gobat (1799-1879).

Gobat was born in the canton of Bern, Switzerland, to a French-speaking family of Calvinists. In 1818, the nineteen-year old Gobat had a dramatic conversion experience which he recounted in his autobiography.[449] His conversion experience mirrored those of other "awakened" Christians in the early decades of the nineteenth century: unbelief followed by an

[446] Lückhoff, *Anglikaner*, pp. 155-156.

[447] Lückhoff, *Anglikaner,* pp. 139-143; Van der Leest, *Conversion and Conflict*, pp. 96-97.

[448] Lückhoff, *Anglikaner,* p. 144.

[449] Samuel Gobat, *Samuel Gobat, evangelischer Bischof in Jerusalem: Sein Leben und Wirken meist nach seinen eigenen Aufzeichnungen* (Basel: C. F. Spittler, 1884), pp. 12-14; and Samuel Gobat, *Samuel Gobat: bishop of Jerusalem: his life and work: a biographical sketch* (London: J. Nisbet, 1884), pp. 12-16.

epiphany of sinfulness upon reading the Bible, and then agonizing, desperate prayer ending finally with spiritual and emotional relief after a solemn promise to dedicate one's life to serving God. Of his experience, Gobat wrote:

> The more I prayed, the deeper became the anguish, the agony of my soul … The agony of my soul was so terrible that I filled my mouth with a handkerchief to prevent my crying aloud while pleading for mercy... I continued thus praying and crying to God until three o'clock in the morning, when I fancied I saw rays of vivid light coming down … and concentrating themselves in an earthen vessel at my right hand … On a sudden I felt as if the burden of my sins was taken away, and I experienced unutterable delight.[450]

Gobat's conversion experience convinced him to spend the rest of life attempting to replicate his experience in others. In 1821, Gobat began training as a missionary at the *Basler Missiongesellschaft,* where he too became convinced of the need to convert Jews to Christianity. As with so many other missionaries from Basel, he was sent to England in 1825 to work for the Anglican Church Missionary Society (CMS).[451] Later that year, Gobat was sent on a long mission to Egypt and Abyssinia, spending three years in each country ministering to Christians.[452] The CMS published Gobat's travel journal in 1834, which served as proof for European audiences that Gobat was a skilled missionary and earned him increased attention from Bunsen and the Archbishop of Canterbury.[453] Gobat successfully

---

[450] Gobat, *Samuel Gobat*, p. 13.

[451] Charlotte van der Leest provides a good summary of the natural relationship between the CMS and the Basel Mission. The CMS had more money than people, while Basel had the opposite problem. Additionally, the Basel students were generally more willing to travel great distances than their English counterparts. See: Leest, *Conversion and Conflict*, pp. 101-102, and footnotes 10 and 11.

[452] This involved preaching to the Christians of Abyssinia and especially distributing a brief edition of the Scriptures translated into Amharic. See: Gobat, *Life and Work*, p. 116.

[453] Samuel Gobat. *Journal of a Three Years' Residence in Abyssinia, in Furtherance of the Objects of the Church Missionary Society* (London: Hatchard & Son; And Seeley & Sons, 1834).

converted Ethiopian Christians whose Orthodox church had resisted foreign interference for centuries, which further endeared him to Anglican and German missionaries.[454]

The recommendation of Gobat by Bunsen indicated that Prussian priorities for Jerusalem were notably different from those of the English. The previous bishop Alexander had been selected on the basis of his status as a Jew who converted to Christianity, highlighting the English desire to convert Jews. For Prussian officials, Gobat's nomination indicated a willingness to convert other *Christians* residing in Jerusalem as well, especially the Orthodox and Coptic Christians whose co-confessionalists Gobat had successfully converted in Abyssinia. Gobat's attachment to awakened Christianity further endeared him to Bunsen and also to the Prussian King. In his letter offering the nomination to Gobat, Bunsen wrote:

> You are no more a subject of the King of Prussia than of the Queen of England; your fatherland is neither Prussia nor England: but his Majesty considers you as having, as a tried messenger of the Gospel, a citizenship in the whole Christian world, and [you are] intimately connected with the Church of the Gospel among all German nations by the course of your theological studies, and by **the truly Evangelical spirit** in which you have taught the Word of God and announced the faith in Christ amongst different nations of Africa and of Asia.[455] [emphasis added]

Bunsen was shrewd in his appeal to Gobat's sensibilities as a missionary who, though Swiss-born, was educated in an awakened, revivalist register typical of the German *Erweckungbewegung* at the Basel Mission. Only six years earlier, as mentioned earlier in this chapter, Bunsen had visited Basel for the missionary conference hosted by the Swiss missionary leaders like Zeller and Spittler. Gobat's religious sensibilities and missionary zeal

[454] Gobat's journal mentions the skepticism of white missionaries held by Abyssinians after they had expelled the Jesuits in the seventeenth centuries.

[455] Letter from Bunsen to Gobat, March 7th, 1846 in: Hechler, *Jerusalem Bishopric*, p. 131.

were above reproach in Bunsen's eyes, all the more so because he knew that Gobat had married the daughter of the aforementioned Christian Zeller, the founder of the *Evangeslisches Kinderheim* at Bueggen.[456] Gobat was therefore a fitting choice to fulfill Bunsen's grander vision of Protestant institutions stretching from the Mediterranean to the Baltic sea, as he furthered an alliance between awakened religion, social-welfare networks like those operated by Zeller, strictly missionary institutions like the *Basler Missiongesellschaft*, the CMS and LJS, supported by the principal Protestant powers of Europe, England and Prussia.

Gobat's tenure as the leader of the Bishopric was a period of growth for the Protestant community in Jerusalem. After several years of negotiations with the Ottoman Porte in Constantinople, a physical church structure was finally permitted to be finished. Christ Church was consecrated in January, 1849.[457] Construction of the church had been met with significant resistance from locals and Ottoman officials and was only finally permitted after sustained, coordinated pressure from Bunsen and Ashley on Anglican church leadership, who in turn persuaded the British ambassador to Constantinople to negotiate with the Ottomate Porte for permission to build a Protestant church.[458]

The primary missionary aim of the Bishopric changed under Gobat's direction. Whereas the previous episcopate under Alexander had attempted in the first instance to

---

[456] Samuel Gobat married Marie Zeller (one of Zeller's eleven children) in 1834 immediately after his return from the two-year missionary journey to Abyssinia.

[457] See: Perry, *British Mission*, p. 108. The church still stands today in Jerusalem's Old City, and is the oldest Protestant church in the Middle East. Services are still held today in Hebrew and English for its congregation of Jewish Christians. Their website includes detailed images of both Michael Alexander and Samuel Gobat.

[458] Van der Leest, *Conversion and Conflict*, pp. 89-90.

convert Jews according to the millenarian aims of the LJS and other Restorationists in England, Gobat expanded the missionary focus to include other Christians. But the tenor of the proselytism changed, as well. Gobat was not content with nominal conversions, but encouraged true "conversion of the heart," as he had experienced. Because many Jews who converted to Christianity lost their jobs and family support, Gobat encouraged his converts to take up a trade in order to demonstrate self-sufficiency and dedication to their conversion experiences.[459]

After an invitation from Gobat in 1851, the Church Missionary Society opened a mission in Palestine, inviting missionaries who had also studied at the Basler Mission in Switzerland. Although not technically a part of the Bishopric, there was close cooperation between the CMS and Gobat, who certainly was a part of it. These CMS collaborators were sent to render "assistance" to Orthodox and Roman Catholic Christians who were skeptical of their faith or curious about Protestantism.[460] Although the direct conversion of other Christians was in contradiction of the so-called "Statement of Proceedings" settled upon by Prussia and England in 1841, Gobat did not seem to care. He had also hired converted Catholics, Orthodox Christians, and Jews to act as "Bible readers" to curious visitors from their respective former faiths. He wrote to Bunsen, saying that he felt it was his duty to warn "his brothers, also of other denominations" of their destructive beliefs.[461] This attitude was

[459] Gobat, *Leben und Wirken*, pp. 296-297.

[460] Abdul Latif Tibawi, *British interests in Palestine 1800-1901: a study of religious and educational enterprise* (London: Oxford University Press, 1961), p. 106.

[461] See: van der Leest, *Conversion and Conflict*, p. 112. Gobat also stated that it was not necessary that those in other denominations become Protestant, only that they had a conversion experience and found love for Jesus Christ, as long as they proclaimed that love in their home churches. See: Gobat, *Leben und Wirken*, pp. 293-295.

clearly favorable to Prussia, though it would eventually land Gobat into some controversy, as we shall see later in the chapter.

Under Gobat, the Bishopric served as a beachhead, enabling and increasing continental European missionary activities in the region. By the time of Gobat's death, the Bishopric included about 1200 members across 12 congregations, and had founded 37 schools.[462] The "Bible" schools were founded in close conjunction with the CMS and were staffed by European missionaries. Such schools were an integral component of the evangelization mission implemented by awakened Christians alongside social welfare institutions.[463] The schools were run free of charge to pupils, and were intended to train students to be biblically literate. Missionaries' wives also taught girls in these schools how to become a good Christian housewife and to run a Christian home.[464] The only book of religious instruction allowed in Gobat's schools was the Bible - no church doctrines were taught. The schools were Gobat's primary method of conversion in the region, and the children were encouraged to spread their newfound biblical knowledge to their parents, as well.

Under Gobat, aside from the influx of English missionary activities, a broad range of German and Swiss Protestant institutions were established as well. The aforementioned Basel

---

[462] *Neueste Nachrichten aus dem Morgenland* 24, 1880 No. 5, p. 139, cited in: Frank Foerster, *Mission im Heiligen Land: der Jerusalems-Verein zu Berlin, 1852-1945* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus G. Mohn, 1991), pp. 35-36.

[463] These schools must be seen as analogous institutions to the Basler-Mission, the *Rettungshaus* in Beuggen, and even the orphanage schools in Halle founded by August Hermann Francke.

[464] Van der Leest, *Conversion and Conflict*, p. 191. Van der Leest's entire seventh chapter on the missionary schools contains the best research to date for the impact of these schools on the local communities.

institution, *St. Chrischona* formed by Christian Spittler built a *Brüderhaus* in Jerusalem. Spittler's plan was to send craftsmen rather than missionaries

Theodor Fliedner's Kaiserswerth Deaconesses opened a station in Jerusalem, as well. As discussed in Chapter 2, Bunsen had invited Fliedner to London in 1846 to confer about Bunsen's own evangelical hospital project. While Flieder was there, he met Gobat, who later requested some of Fliedner's highly-skilled nurses to come work in Jerusalem.[465] In 1851, Fliedner sent four women to Jerusalem from Kaiserswerth: two nurses and two teachers with pharmacy training, two of their salaries were funded by Prussian donations.[466] Fliedner had hoped that the nurses would be able to "educate" Arab girls in Jerusalem while providing care, and Gobat secured more robust medical care for his growing episcopate. The deaconesses' station was funded by Friedrich Wilhelm IV, and consisted of two patient rooms, a children's room, and lodgings for the nurses.[467] The deaconesses also worked as teachers in Gobat's schools. By 1868, the number of nurses had grown to nine, and their hospital had moved into a larger building. In their 35 years of work in the city, 523 girls had been educated by the Kaiserswerth deaconesses.[468]

[465] A thorough examination of the Kaiserswerth Deaconesses' activities under Gobat in Jerusalem can be found in: Aeleah Soine, "The Motherhouse and its Mission(s): Kaiserswerth and the Convergence of Transnational Nursing Knowledge, 1836-1865." In *Transnational and Historical Perspectives on Global Health, Welfare, and Humanitarianism*, eds. Fleischmann, Ellen, Grypma, Sonya, Marten, Michael, and Okkenhaug, Inger-Marie, (Kristiansand, Norway: Portal Forlag, 2013), pp. 20-41.

[466] Van der Leest, *Conversion and Conflict*, p. 120.

[467] Soine, *Motherhouse and its Mission(s)*, pp. 31-32.

[468] Lückhoff, *Anglikaner*, p. 209.

Confessional Tensions: German and English Hopes and Fears for the Bishopric:

> I know from the questions I receive on this subject, that the novelty, and (as yet) dimness of the scheme has made it act powerfully on the nerves of my countrymen; you must give us the benefit of guiding us with a gentle and a steady hand.[469] - William Gladstone to Bunsen

William Gladstone, despite supporting the project, held deep reservations. Though Bunsen was about to convince Gladstone to support the plan, the High Church "Oxford Movement," opposed it from the beginning. Some High churchmen worried that the bishopric would serve as the basis to infect the Anglican Church with German influences, by which the Anglicans would lose their apostolic lineage and legitimacy. The Oxford Movement leader John Henry Newman wrote that he feared Bunsen's "experimental" church in the Holy Land portended unacceptable reforms to the Anglican Church, especially the elevation of the Lutheran Augsburg Confession as a doctrinal document within an Anglican Church. Newman protested against the consecration of Bishop Alexander in 1841, suggesting that doing so sullied the Anglican Church by formally recognizing the "heresies" of Lutheranism and Calvinism.[470] For his part, Bunsen attempted to reconcile these differences with Newman: "This morning I have had two hours at breakfast with Newman. O! It is sad - he and his friends are truly intellectual people, but they have lost their ground - going exactly my way, but stopping short in the middle. It is too late."[471] Bunsen had respect for Newman, but they found themselves on opposite sides of almost every issue that arose regarding church politics, and the Jerusalem project was the most severe example yet. Bunsen's remark that "it is too

[469] Lückhoff, *Anglikaner*, p. 628.

[470] Railton, *No North Sea,* p. 222.

[471] Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 499.

late" suggests that he knew a compromise would never happen, and that he and his allies needed to push forward with their plans despite the resistance of Newman and other Oxford churchmen.

The Oxford Movement never ceased to publicly oppose the Jerusalem Bishopric. They started a campaign of protest in 1853 when Bishop Gobat began proselytising to the Greek Orthodox Christians in Jerusalem. An open letter was signed condemning Gobat by over 1,000 Anglican church figures.[472] To the Tractarians and other conservative Anglicans, Gobat was overstepping the authority vested in him by the original negotiation settlement in 1841. Busen, Gladstone, and the other members of the Jerusalem Trust Fund issued a statement in defense of Gobat, and rallied the support of the Anglican leadership to defend him as well.

In Prussia, the Bishopric was supported by a host of domestic institutions. Chief amongst them was the *Jerusalems-Verein zu Berlin*. Founded in 1852, this association capitalized on the growing academic and theological interest in the Holy Land, and collected funds to be used by Prussian and European missionaries to construct buildings and expand institutions in Jerusalem.[473] The association published a monthly magazine with articles and letters sent back to Berlin, the *Neueste Nachrichten aus dem Morgenland*, to promote interest in the activities of German missionaries and Christians in Jerusalem. The hopes of German orientalists and evangelicals were focused by the *Jerusalems-Verein* as it was formed as a quasi-official organization of the Prussian Evangelical Church. The first elected President of the *Verein* was none other than the former director of the *Basler Mission* and participant in the

[472] Gobat, *Leben und Wirken*, pp. 355-358; Van der Leest, *Conversion and Conflict*, pp. 126-129.

[473] The predecessor to the fundraising apparatus of the *Jerusalems-Verein* was begun in 1843 during the tenure of Michael Soloman Alexander. Over 14 years, the *Collecten-Fonds* raised over 52,000 Thalers. See: Foerster, *Mission*, p. 44.

aforementioned 1840 missionary conference, Ludwig Friedrich Wilhelm Hoffmann, friend of Spittler, Bunsen, and Gobat. Many of the members in Berlin belonged to "awakened" circles within the Church.[474] The association existed and continued to work promoting German evangelism in Jerusalem well after the dissolution of the jointly-run Bishopric, until the end of the Second World War in 1945.

Opposition to the Bishopric was also noteworthy in Prussia, especially among conservative Lutherans. These opponents worried that Friedrich Wilhelm IV sought to bring the Prussian Church into communion with the Anglican Church, and they were especially concerned that the Anglican bishop in Jerusalem would be ordinating Lutheran clergymen. The conservative minister Otto von Gerlach (1801-1849) wrote to the Prussian King in 1842, raising both of those concerns.[475] Bunsen acted as a ghost-writer and published a rebuke of these concerns in the *Darmstädter Allgemeine Kirchen-Zeitung*, and he even solicited help from conservative, anti-rationalist theologian, Ernst Hengstenberg who published an article defending Bunsen and the Prussian King as well.[476]

It is helpful to reimagine the turbulence along the somewhat complex religious landscape in both Germany and England as being a clash between conservative and reformist elements in the state and church apparatus of the two societies. Reformers like Bunsen, Ashley, McCaul, and their evangelical allies in the LJS supported the Bishopric on the basis of the restoration of the Jews, the spread of Christendom, and the eschatological hope for the

---

[474] Foerster, *Mission,* p. 51.

[475] Barclay, *Friedrich Wilhelm IV*, p. 83.

[476] Albrecht Geck, "Pusey, Tholuck and the reception of the Oxford Movement in Germany" in: Stewart J. Brown, and Peter B. Nockles, *The Oxford movement: Europe and the wider world 1830-1930.* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), pp. 168-174.

impending Kingdom of God. They were able to convince and coerce skeptical parties, who saw economic and political opportunities in the project.[477] On the other hand, some conservatives in both countries feared closer cooperation in the project, insofar as it meant that the Anglican Church was becoming German, and vice versa.

Apostolic Succession

Ultimately, tensions between the German and English churches led to the withdrawal of German participation in the Bishopric in November 1886. The episode offers an interesting opportunity to examine the theological differences between the two churches, especially regarding the issue of Apostolic Succession, or the method by which Christian churches are led by bishops who are ordained and consecrated in a lineage going back to the Apostles. This doctrinal issue was of significant importance to the Anglicans, especially the Oxford Movement. Meanwhile, Lutherans generally had little respect for the sacred nature or lineage of church office-holders, viewing this as one of Roman Catholicism's many corruptions. Bunsen wrote sarcastically about these differences in 1838:

> Now there is not one jot of doctrine in the Church of England which you [Englishmen] do not take from Luther or Calvin, and in which we of the United Evangelical Church [of Prussia] do not agree; if, therefore, there be something which separates us [Germans] as heretics from the true Church; it is the Apostolic Succession - they cannot get out of that argument. Christ died only for the English, for they have the Apostolic Succession in common with Rome and Moscow.[478]

The facetious assertion that Christ died only for the English illustrates one of the few points of Anglicanism that Bunsen actually lamented. Indeed, he disagreed with the position put

[477] Including William Gladstone, Lord Palmerston, and perhaps even the monarchs of both countries.

[478] Bunsen to Thomas Arnold, February 13th, 1837, in: Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, p. 428.

forward by William Gladstone that Apostolical Succession was "identical with the continued series of Bishops." He went on to complain to an English confidant that "It is the deficiency of the method of handling ideas in this blessed island which makes it so difficult for your writers, political and ecclesiastical, to find the seeds of regeneration in your old blessed institutions, which to preserve you must reconstruct."[479] Bunsen's dismay about what he viewed as Anglican intransigence was representative of the larger Prussian concern about the Bishopric over time. Prussian evangelicals, hoping for renewal of their church, nevertheless resisted Anglican pressure to ordinate the clergy in Jerusalem as Anglicans.

After the death of Samuel Gobat in 1879, it was once again Britain's turn to nominate a new Bishop. Their choice only lived for two years, and it was once again time for Germany (having since the arrival of Gobat become the German Empire in 1871) to nominate a Bishop. By the 1880s, German foreign policy had shifted under Kaiser Wilhelm I and Otto von Bismarck to become less friendly toward England. Ascendent German national identity across society made the previous distaste about what German Protestants saw as Anglican supremacy in the Bishopric project become altogether unpalatable. Following Germany's withdrawal from the Bishopric, it became a strictly Anglican enterprise, which promptly abandoned missionary work to other Christians and refocused on the Jews of the region.[480]

* * *

The Anglo-Prussian Protestant Bishopric was the product of several overlapping sets of ideologies. A millenarian desire to usher in the second coming of Christ on Earth on the part of both Continental and British missionaries provided the necessary fervor and passion to

[479] Bunsen to John Hill, December 26th, 1838 in: Bunsen, *Memoir*, vol. 1, pp. 493-494.

[480] Van der Leest, *Conversion and Conflict*, p. 242.

pursue such a peculiar and expensive effort, but these ambitions were elevated to the level of state action by only a few individuals, especially Christian Bunsen and Anthony Ashley-Cooper. Their influence at the highest levels of the English and Prussian state and church were necessary to lobby, raise funds, and muster the political will necessary to execute the plan and defend it against detractors. Geopolitical and imperial incentives sufficed to convince even non-evangelical officials within the Prussian and English governments that the plan was worthwhile, especially as it offered the chance to counterbalance the colonial presence of France and Russia in the region. Economic benefits were also expected, and these overlapping material, geopolitical, and spiritual interests led to a concerted alliance between both countries.

While Anti-Catholic animus played some role in the formation of the Bishopric, the more salient ecclesiastical motivations came from eschatological hopes and evangelical desires on the part of its architects to convert as many people as possible, especially Jews. The experiment allowed Bunsen and his allies to propagate a version of Christianity that was distinctly influenced by the *Erweckungsbewegung* and Pietism, emphasizing the personal conversion experience and placing less emphasis on strict orthodoxy. Still, both Prussian and English officials had been anxiously grappling with the status and rights of their Catholic subjects, fearful of potential Catholic loyalty to Rome over their home countries. The Anglo-Prussian Bishopric therefore represented an opportunity for the two principal Protestant powers of Europe to assert themselves boldly and on a global scale, with a reach that had previously only been attempted by the Catholic church.

German, English, and Swiss missionary institutions and voluntary associations provided manpower, training, funding, and logistical support for the Bishopric, and hopes were high among these missionaries that the Bishopric would serve as a powerful symbol for the spiritual renewal of their home churches. Institutions involved with the Church Missionary Society and London Jews Society in England and the Basler Mission in Switzerland and the *Jerusalem-Verein* in Berlin could boast, in their home congregations and in print, that their work was bearing fruit in Christianity's holiest city. Ultimately, important theological differences rooted in each country's commitment to their own doctrinal traditions led to the dissolution of the Bishopric forty-five years after its consecration, which remains today as solely an Anglican institution in Jerusalem, showing the limits of Bunsen's network as the forces behind the Bishopric collided with new forms of hardening, exclusionary nationalism in the 1880s.

Conclusion

This dissertation was not meant to be a biographical account of the life and career of Christian Carl Josias von Bunsen. Historians who research an individual or group sometimes struggle with the issues of curation and selection. By focusing instead on certain episodes or aspects of Bunsen's career and the formation of his political network, a few major themes emerge which are worth lingering on.

I did not choose to focus on Bunsen simply because he was an interesting figure but rather because a fresh look at the archive of his career and his network allows us to rethink and reconfigure how we understand the political terrain of Prussia and England during the early and middle decades of the nineteenth century. This examination of Bunsen's activities has shown that state politics in this era were still highly influenced by personal relationships, which in turn were mediated by overlapping religious and ideological concerns.

There are lessons to be learned about the strategies of Prussian institutions, as well. For decades, historians of Prussia have emphasized the importance to the Prussian state of certain classes of people, such as the landed nobility who dominated the military and government. Yet Bunsen was chosen and supported by important institutional figures, from Niebuhr to the monarch Friedrich Wilhelm IV, in part *because* of his status as an outsider. After all, Bunsen was born in the principality of Waldeck, and became a Prussian by choice. He had no academic appointment, and he was not an aristocrat. Prussian officials realized that Bunsen could contribute to their prestige and success precisely because of his personal characteristics, specifically his ability to bring together disparate groups and advance their interests abroad. By selecting him as the Prussian ambassador to Rome and London, the

Prussian king and state apparatus ensured that Prussia would not only have a skilled diplomat to handle transnational negotiations, but also that with Bunsen as their representative, they would have someone who projected an image of Prussian character abroad: cultured, scholarly, piously Protestant but not intolerant, and patriotic.

We have seen how Bunsen was quite shrewd and calculating when it came to positioning himself in order to pursue his ambitions, especially his religious beliefs. Bunsen invested his social energies in forming relationships with specific groups: Broad Churchmen, "awakened" missionaries and theologians, and generally Protestant Christians of all stripes who were concerned with social welfare and spiritual apathy. Doing so enabled him to create an inclusive and expansive network, rather than one which was exclusionary or prejudicial in nature as may have been the case had he chosen to throw in his lot with the Oxford Movement in England or the Neo-Lutherans in Prussia. This position enabled Bunsen to foster increased ties between Prussia and England at all levels, from his minor roles in awarding small Royal Literary Fund grants to German academics and theologians living in London, to the establishment of a London hospital for German Protestants, up to the level of the radically new imperial-colonial project of the Anglo-Prussian Protestant Bishopric in Jerusalem. While conservatives and hardliners like Pusey and Newman in England and Stahl in Prussia viewed these projects with suspicion and hostility, Bunsen and his circle encouraged and enabled the initiatives at every turn.

If one focuses on the history of Anglo-Prussian relations closer to the end of the nineteenth century (not to mention the bellicosity leading up to the first World War), this period is often characterized as fraught or tense. Despite family ties between the German

emperor Wilhelm II and his grandmother, Queen Victoria (whose mother and husband were also German), the state of relations between the two empires between the 1870s and 1910s was cool, at best. Even decades earlier, in the 1850s, England had chafed at Prussia's decision to remain neutral against Russia in the Crimean conflict. These dramatic events unfortunately obscure what was actually an interesting moment in the 1830s and 1840s for the transnational relationship between these two powers. This moment, characterized by a spirit of cooperation and exchange, coincides perfectly with Bunsen's tenure as the Prussian ambassador. The consummate diplomat and politician, Bunsen's warm reputation and deep connections among the English enabled a period of possibility and opportunity. English ecclesiastical and political elites dined at Bunsen's home in Carlton Terrace, English elites like Palmerston, Gladstone, Arnold, Hare, and Ashley were intimately bound up with Bunsen and his family, and all of them looked toward the Continent with a sense of hope and promise for future cooperation of both powers. From the vantage point of the naval arms race between the two powers of the 1890s, one could be forgiven for feeling surprised to learn that Bunsen had exclaimed, "England and Prussia Forever!" at the consecration ceremony for a Bishopric in Jerusalem which represented an alliance between the Prussian and English churches in 1841.

This dissertation has offered a different way of thinking about the trajectory of Prussian nationalism within the history of Germany in the nineteenth century. Much of the modern historiography of Prussia has been framed within the familiar dialectic between nationalists of conservative and liberal backgrounds, from the republican, reform-minded liberals of the 1848 Frankfurt Parliament to the "blood and soil" nationalists of Bismarck and the *Junker* class in the latter decades of the century. Yet, Bunsen and his allies destabilize

these simple categories. At every turn, we have seen that he was deeply patriotic, from his early years as a university student during the Napoleonic occupation until his death in 1860. He and his allies were staunch monarchists, his liturgy and hymnbook attempted to capture the quintessential Germanic character of Protestant worship and the legacy of the Reformation, and he worked tirelessly to advocate for the promotion and protection of Germans living beyond German borders. Yet, Bunsen and those in his network were not hardline nationalists. He sought to promote a Prussian state which was tolerant of religious differences and dreamt of a German nation which would openly embrace a political and religious alliance with England, characterized by cultural and academic exchange between the two nations and far-flung missionary-colonial endeavors. Bunsen was indeed a patriot, but for him, a strong Prussian-led German nation would have a character which was receptive to certain kinds of (Protestant) foreign influence, cosmopolitan, and worldly.

The status and importance of religious belief factored heavily into this project. There is a modern trope, in which evangelicals who become disillusioned with secular politics turn inward in order to take refuge in the spiritual fulfillment of themselves and their communities. While Bunsen often expressed dismay at the political gridlock in England or the effects of "the dissolving atheism of 1789" on institutions of Europe, and while he certainly sought solace in his religion, Bunsen's beliefs informed virtually every professional and personal interaction in his life and career. To be sure, his concerns were bound up with patriotism, in that he feared religious apathy among Protestants would lead to the weakening and failure of civilization. But religion played a still deeper role in his agenda. It provided the basis for a transnational network which implemented its designs in material ways. Although there has

been some important scholarship on the role of popular instances of piety in Germany in the nineteenth-century, this dissertation has shown that elite religious piety was also of non-inconsequential importance for personal, societal, national, and transnational developments.

Even as Bunsen sought to minimize the influence of the Vatican within Germany and although anti-Catholic sentiments seem to have undergirded the motivations of certain members of his circle, he himself was not a vicious anti-Catholic. Indeed, if anything, he was sometimes jealous of the devotedness of Catholics to their church. Looking over the various ways that Roman Catholicism loomed over Bunsen's actions, a few patterns emerge that can be used to characterize both his network and the time period in which they operated. It is clear that he was deeply worried about losing disaffected Protestants via conversion to Catholicism. The foundation of the Protestant hospital in Rome and his reports to Berlin reflected those fears. The Prussian stance towards cross-confessional marriages in Köln similarly showed apprehension that the phenomenon of Protestant men marrying Catholic women in the Rhineland would lead to increased Catholicization of Prussia's wester territories. Even the original motivations of the Jerusalem Bishopric were born, in part, from a desire on the part of Bunsen and his allies to allow the Protestant faith to compete with Rome in a new, global arena. Adding to this, his statements sometimes do seem like an uncanny foreshadowing of the *Kulturkampf* of the 1880s, especially with regard to his distrust of the hierarchy of the Roman Catholic church. Still, it would be a mistake to teleologically draw a direct line from Bismarck's persecutory and discriminatory legislation back towards Bunsen. Bunsen and those in his group wanted religious faith to be something that developed

organically, at the most granular level: the self, followed by the family, the bible study group, the school, and the congregation. If religious faith and doctrine were controlled from above, it was tyrannical to Bunsen, and this is how we can make sense of his vehement opposition to both the Oxford Movement in England and the Neo-Lutherans in Prussia, their approach to the relationship between Christianity as a set of beliefs and Christians as actual people were too reminiscent of that which emanated from the Vatican. At the same time, we see that Bunsen actually disapproved of the heavy hand with which both Prussia and England dealt with actual Catholic subjects in those countries, and he intervened many times throughout his career in order to soothe, not exacerbate, Catholic grievances.

It is interesting to note the ideological drift that occurred within Bunsen and his network over the middle decades of the nineteenth century. Their opposition to the secularizing and revolutionary tendencies of the period seem at first glance to be typical of reactionary conservatism. Like many conservatives, they considered the *Aufklärung* to be responsible for men turning away from the church, as argued by August Tholuck in his sermon "What is Human Reason Worth?," in which he claimed that academic reason led men astray without the guidance of Christ within the heart. Jacobinism and atheism were constantly derided as destructive forces among the members of Bunsen's network, while on the other hand, praise was given to the steady hands of the benevolent monarchs. However, relying on these anti-revolutionary and anti-secular sentiments alone to characterize a political ideology masks an important nuance of Bunsen and his transnational cohort. These men were conservative, but their conservatism had shifted over the passage of time when they found themselves outflanked on the right by the Neo-Lutherans, who solidified their grip on

Prussian church institutions in the 1850s, and by hardline nationalists who sought to turn away from England rather than embrace it. As such, Bunsen and his network are representative of how conservatives of one generation can politically become relatively moderate, or even liberal as broader historical change happens to make them re-examine their prior positions.

In parsing the historical legacy and significance of Bunsen and his network, one must look at the overall corpus of their work. They achieved the first major Protestant community and presence in Catholic Rome. They expanded Prussia's purview to protect and provide for Protestants living far beyond Prussia, with hospitals in London and Rome and Jerusalem. They attempted to turn the German churches back to the "authenticity" of the Reformation and the early Christian church, as part of the overall move towards fundamentalism within the "Awakened" Protestant milieu. Bunsen's liturgical and hymnological projects saw implementation in limited settings, but these included Jerusalem, London, and a few other communities. His hymnology introduced thousands of English and American readers to the tradition of Germanic holy songs via the popular translation of the Winkworths. Importantly, Bunsen's work enabled and contributed to a long period of warmth, cooperation, and exchange between Prussia and England, which surely had social, religious, political, and economic impacts far beyond the scope of Bunsen and his own circle.

Several exciting and important possibilities emerge upon surveying the terrain covered over the preceding chapters. Further research remains to be done on the extent of the ties between Bunsen's group and missionary endeavors in the United States, though we know that his former embassy chaplain Tholuck was well-read within the North American

fundamentalist evangelical movement in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Exciting new work in the field of the History of Emotions also offers a potential avenue with which to study the formation of Bunsen's network itself, which was bound together with expressions of affection, friendship, and religious ecstasy. A deeper dive into the third chapter of the dissertation might enable a new and fruitful understanding of the nature of male bonding and friendship in the period, especially as it pertained to transnational friendship. Finally, a comparative study of additional networks, especially at the intersection of religious and diplomatic interests, seems like it would be most useful for contextualizing Bunsen's group in the broader landscape of nineteenth-century network formation.

Through this dissertation I have attempted to uncover the primacy of religious belief for Bunsen and the people that he surrounded himself with. Several important studies over the previous years have begun to take seriously the role played by religion in nineteenth-century Germany, especially at the popular level. This study was somewhat different in that I chose to centralize religious concerns among educated elites. The fact that Bunsen was able to create such a wide-ranging and powerful network of like-minded believers means that historians ought to continue to take more seriously the status of religion and religious belief in modernity, specifically revivalist, "awakened" beliefs, even amidst the backdrop of waning church attendance, philosophical materialism, theological rationalism, industrialization, and all the other forces which contributed to the narrative of secularization and disenchantment during the first full century of the "modern" era of European history.

Appendix 1 - Complete list of works translated / written by the Winkworth Sisters:

Life and Letters of Barthold George Niebuhr - 1852

Theologica Germanica - 1854

Lyra Germanica - 1855

The Life of Luther, in Forty-Eight Historical Engravings - 1856

The History and Life of the Reverend Doctor John Tauler of Strasbourg - 1858

Life of Pastor Fliedner - 1861

Life of Amelia Sieveking - 1863

God in History - 1868

Christian Singers of Germany - 1869

Appendix 2 - Bunsen's Liturgical Works and Biblical Essays, by date of publication:

1828: *Liturgie wie sie zum Gebrauch für die Königlich Preußiche evangelische Gesandtschafts-Kapelle zu Rom bewilligt worden ist* (Berlin)

1833: *Versuch eines allgemeinen evangelischen Gesang- und Gebetbuches zum Kirchen- und Hausgebrauch* (Hamburg)

1841: *Die heilige Leidensgeschichte und die stille Woche* (Hamburg)

1845: *Die Verfassung der Kirche der Zukunft* (Hamburg)

1846: *Allgemeines evangelisches Gesang- und Gebetbuch zum Kirchen- und Hausgebrauch* (Hamburg)

1854: *Christianity and Mankind* (London)

1855: *Die Zeichen der Zeit* (Leipzig)

1857: *Gott in der Geschichte* (Leipzig)

1858: *Vollständiges Biblewerk für die Gemeinde* (Leipzig)

Bibliography

Allgemeine Landrecht für die Preußischen Staaten von 1794, 1804.

Kirchen-Agende für die Hof- und Domkirche in Berlin. Berlin: Dieterici. 1822.

Albrecht, Christian. *Vermittlungstheologie als Christentumstheorie*. Hannover: Lutherisches Verlagshaus. 2001.

Arnold, Thomas. *Life and Letters of Thomas Arnold*. London: John Murray. 1877.

Ashley-Cooper, Anthony. Review of "Letters on Egypt, Edom, and the Holy Land" in *The London Quarterly Review* 64. 93-107. New York: Jemima M. Lewer. 1839.

Bachmann, Johann Friedrich. *Zur Geschichte des Berliner Gesangbuch*. Berlin: Wilhelm Schultze. 1856.

Baird, Robert. *Sketches of Protestantism in Italy, Past and Present: Including a Notice of the Origin, History, and Present State of the Waldenses*. Boston: Benjamin Perkins & Co. 1847.

Barclay, David E. *Frederick William IV and the Prussian Monarchy, 1840-1861*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1995.

Barth, Karl. *Protestant Theology of the Nineteenth Century*. Valley Forge: Judson Press. 1959.

Benrath, Gustav, Martin Sallmann, and Ulrich Gäbler. *Der Pietismus im neunzehnten und zwanzigsten Jahrhundert*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 2000.

Berghahn, Volker R. *Imperial Germany, 1871-1914: Economy, Society, Culture, and Politics*. Providence: Berghahn Books. 1994.

Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften. *Acta Borussica. Reihe 2: Preußen als Kulturstaat. Der preußische Kulturstaat in der politischen und sozialen Wirklichkeit, Von der Kirchengesellschaft zur Kirche in der Gesellschaft, Katholische Frömmigkeit und Politisierung preußischer Katholiken (1815-1871)* eds. Wolfgang Neugebauer, and Christina Rathgeber. Berlin: De Gruyter Akademie. 2015.

Blaschke, Olaf. *Konfessionen im Konflikt: Deutschland zwischen 1800 und 1970: ein zweites konfessionelles Zeitalter*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 2002.

Blackbourn, David. *Populists and Patricians: Essays in Modern German History*. London: Routledge Press. 2014.

Blewitt, Octavian. *A Hand-Book for Travellers in Central Italy: Including the Papal States, Rome, and the Cities of Etruria*. London: J. Murray. 1850.

———. *A Treatise on the Happiness arising from the Exercise of the Christian Faith*. London: Simpkin & Marshall. 1832.

Brown, Stewart J., and Peter B. Nockles. *The Oxford movement : Europe and the wider world 1830-1930*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2012.

Bunsen, Christian Karl Josias von. *Darlegung des Verfahrens der Preußischen Regierung gegen den Erzbischof von Köln vom 25. November 1837*. Berlin: Hayn Verlag. 1838.

———. *Die Zeichen der Zeit : Briefe an Freunde über die Gewissensfreiheit und das Recht der christlichen Gemeinde*. Leipzig: Brockhaus. 1855.

———. *Signs of the Times: Letters to Ernst Moritz Arndt, on the Dangers to Religious Liberty in the Present State of the World*. trans. Susanna Winkworth. London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1856.

———. *Versuch eines allgemeinen evangelischen Gesang- und Gebetbuchs zum Kirchen- und Hausgebrauche.* Hamburg: Friedrich Perthes. 1833.

Bunsen, Frances. *A Memoir of Baron Bunsen: Late Minister Plenipotentiary and Envoy Extraordinary of His Majesty Frederic William IV at the Court of St. James; Drawn Chiefly from Family Papers*. 2 vols. London: Longmans, Green. 1869.

Büsch, Otto, Wolfgang Neugebauer, and Frank Kleinehagenbrock. *Handbuch der preussischen Geschichte*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1992.

Caquet, P. E. *The Orient, the Liberal Movement, and the Eastern Crisis of 1839-41*. New York: Springer. 2016.

Caunter, John H. “Sermon VIII ‘Religion Essentially Practical’” in: *Sermons preached in St. Paul's chapel, Marylebone*. London: Edward Churton. 1842.

Chadwick, Owen. "Gregory XVI." *A History of the Popes, 1830-1914*. New York: Oxford University Press. 2003.

———. *The Spirit of the Oxford Movement: Tractarian Essays*. London: Cambridge University Press. 1992.

Clark, Christopher. “Confessional Policy and the Limits of State Action: Frederick William III and the Prussian Church Union 1817-40.” *The Historical Journal* 39, no. 4 (1996), 985-1004*

Collins Winn, Christian T., and John L. Drury. *Karl Barth and the Future of Evangelical Theology*. Wittenberg: Wipf and Stock Publishers. 2014.

Cranmer, Thomas, C. F. Barbee, and Paul F. Zahl. *The collects of Thomas Cranmer*. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans Pub. 1999.

Crombie, Kelvin. *For the Love of Zion: Christian Witness and the Restoration of Israel.* London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1991.

Cross, Nigel. *The Royal Literary Fund: 1790-1918: An Introduction to the Fund’s History and Archives with an Index of Applicants*. London: World Microfilms Publications. 1984.

Curran, Kathleen. *The Romanesque Revival : Religion, Politics, and Transnational Exchange*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press. 2003.

Dalston, German Hospital. *German Hospital, Dalston, Supported by Voluntary Contributions, (in Connexion with Which Is a Sanatorium); Opened 15th October, 1845. For the Reception of Natives of Germany, Others Speaking the German Language, and English in Cases of Accidents*. London: Wertheimer. 1846.

Froissart, Ludovic Damas, Cécile Dauphin, Pierrette Lebrun-Pézerat, and Danièle Poublan. *Ces bonnes lettres: Une correspondance familiale au XIXe siècle*. Paris: Albin Michel. 1995.

Dawson, Jerry F. *Friedrich Schleiermacher: The Evolution of a Nationalist.* Austin: University of Texas Press. 2011.

Dittmer, Lothar. *Beamtenkonservativismus und Modernisierung: Untersuchungen zur Vorgeschichte der Konservativen Partei in Preussen 1810-1848/49*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag. 1992.

Doughty, W.L. *John Wesley: Preacher*. Eugene: Wipf and Stock Publishers. 2015.

Dvorak, Helge, and Klaus Oldenhage. *Biographisches Lexikon der Deutschen Burschenschaft.* Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter. 2014.

Emmerich, Wolfgang. *Zur Kritik der Volkstumsideologie*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp. 1971.

Finlayson, Geoffrey. *The Seventh Earl of Shaftesbury, 1801-1885*. Vancouver: Regent College Publishing. 1981.

Foerster, Frank. *Christian Carl Josias Bunsen: Diplomat, Mäzen Und Vordenker in Wissenschaft, Kirche Und Politik*. Bad Arolsen: Waldeckischer Geschichtsverein. 2001.

———. "Bunsens Bild in der Geschichte. Forschungsbericht aus einer Biographie über Christian Carl Josias Bunsen." *Geschictsblätter für Waldeck* 87. 1999.

———. *Mission im Heiligen Land: der Jerusalems-Verein zu Berlin, 1852-1945*. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus G. Mohn. 1991.

Freeman, Linton C. "A Set of Measures of Centrality Based on Betweenness." *Sociometry*, (1977): 35–41. *

Freundeskreis Schloss Beuggen e.V.. *Schloss Beuggen. Geschichte – Gebäude – Gegenwart.* Lörrach: H. Deiner. 2008.

Füssl, Wilhelm. *Professor in der Politik, Friedrich Julius Stahl (1802-1861): das monarchische Prinzip und seine Umsetzung in die parlamentarische Praxis* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 1988.

Gleixner, Ulrike. *Pietismus und Bürgertum: eine historische Anthropologie der Frömmigkeit, Württemberg 17.-19. Jahrhundert.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 2005.

Gobat, Samuel. *Samuel Gobat, evangelischer Bischof in Jerusalem: Sein Leben und Wirken meist nach seinen eigenen Aufzeichnungen*. Basel: C. F. Spittler. 1884.

———. *Samuel Gobat: Bishop of Jerusalem: his Life and Work: a biographical Sketch*. London: J. Nisbet. 1884.

———. *Journal of a Three Years' Residence in Abyssinia, in Furtherance of the Objects of the Church Missionary Society.* London: Hatchard & Son; And Seeley & Sons. 1834.

Gossman, Lionel. *Basel in the Age of Burckhardt: A Study in Unseasonable Ideas.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002.

Graf, Friedrich Wilhelm. *Die Politisierung Des Religiösen Bewusstseins: Die Bürgerlichen Religionsparteien Im Deutschen Vormärz, Das Beispiel Des Deutschkatholizismus.* Neuzeit im Aufbau, vol. 5. Stuttgart: Frommann-Holzboog. 1978.

Green, Vivian Hubert Howard. *Religion at Oxford and Cambridge*. London: SCM Publishing. 1964.

Gross, Michael B. *The war against Catholicism: Liberalism and the anti-Catholic Imagination in Nineteenth-century Germany*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. 2004.

Hagemann, Karen. *Revisiting Prussia's Wars Against Napoleon: History, Culture and Memory*. New York: Cambridge University Press. 2015.

Hausrath, Adolph. *Richard Rothe und Seinen Freunde*. Berlin: G. Grote'sche Verlag. 1902.

Haweis, Thomas. *A view of the Present State of Evangelical Religion Throughout the World: With a View to Promote Missionary Exertions*. London: Williams and Son. 1812.

Higton, Mike. *A Theology of Higher Education.* New York: Oxford University Press. 2012.

Hare, Julius Charles, and B. G. Niebuhr. *A Vindication of Niebuhr's History of Rome from the Charges of the Quarterly Review*. Cambridge: John Taylor. 1829.

Hechler, William Henry. *The Jerusalem Bishopric, Documents with Translations chiefly derived from 'Das evangelische Bisthum in Jerusalem' Geschichtliche Darlegung mit Urkunden. Berlin 1842.* London: Trübner and Co. 1883.

Henkys, Jürgen. Singender und gesungener Glaube: hymnologische Beiträge in neuer Folge (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999).

Howard, Thomas Albert. *Protestant Theology and the Making of the Modern German University*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2006.

Johnson, Christopher H. *Becoming Bourgeois: Love, Kinship, and Power in Provincial France, 1670-1880*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. 2015.

Johnson, Malcolm. *Bustling Intermeddler?: The Life and Work of Charles James Blomfield*. Leominster: Gracewing Publishing. 2001.

Kannenberg, Michael. *Verschleierte Uhrtafeln: Endzeiterwartungen Im Württembergischen Pietismus Zwischen 1818 und 1848*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 2007.

Keinemann, Friedrich. *Das Kölner Ereignis Und Die Kölner Wirren*. Münster: Materialien Der Historischen Kommission Für Westfalen. 2015.

Kloes, Andrew. *The German Awakening: Protestant renewal after the Enlightenment, 1815-1848*. New York: Oxford University Press. 2019.

Kreft, Werner. *Die Kirchentage von 1848-1872*. Frankfurt am Main: P. Lang. 1994.

Krummacher, Friedrich. *Bunsen und Stahl: zur Verständigung über den neuesten Kirchenstreit: drei Vorträge gehalten vor der Versammlung des Evangelischen Vereins in Potsdam*. Berlin: Wiegandt und Grieben. 1856.

Lücke, Friedrich. *Kommentar über die Schriften des Evangelisten Johannes*. Bonn: Weber. 1840.

Lückhoff, Martin. *Anglikaner und Protestanten im Heiligen Land: das gemeinsame Bistum Jerusalem (1841-1886)*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 1998.

Macleod, Norman. *The Christian Guest A Family Magazine for Sunday Reading*. Edinburgh: Alexander Strahan & Co, 1859.

Mathison, Keith A. *An Eschatology of Hope*. Phillipsburg: P&R Publishing. 1999.

Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, Felix, Grace Wallace, and Paul Mendelssohn-Bartholdy. *Letters From Italy And Switzerland*. Boston: Oliver Ditson & Co. 1861.

McKim, Donald K. “Tholuck.” *Historical Handbook of Major Biblical Interpreters*. 373-376. Westmont: InterVarsity Press. 1998.

Marschke, Benjamin. *Absolutely Pietist: Patronage, Factionalism, and State-Building in the Early Eighteenth-Century Prussian Army Chaplaincy.* Halle: Max Niemeyer Verlag. 2005.

Müller, Max. *Proposals for a Missionary Alphabet, Submitted to the Alphabetical Conferences Held at the Residence of Chevalier Bunsen in January 1854*. London: Spottiswoode. 1854.

Newman, John Henry, John Keble, William Palmer, Richard Hurrell Froude, Edward Bouverie Pusey, and Isaac Williams. *Tracts for the Times*. London: Charles Henry. 1839.

Niebuhr, Barthold Georg, C. K. J. von Bunsen, J. Brandis, J. W. Loebell, and D. B. Hensler. *The Life and Letters of Barthold Georg Niebuhr*. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1852.

Ott, Michael. "Clemens August von Droste-Vischering." *The Catholic Encyclopedia.* Vol. 5. New York: Robert Appleton Company. 1909.

Owen, Ralph Albert Dornfeld. *Christian Bunsen and Liberal English Theology*. Montpelier: Capital City Press. 1924.

Perry, Yaron. *British Mission to the Jews in Nineteenth-century Palestine*. London: Frank Cass Publishers. 2003.

Pike, E. Royston. *Hard Times: Human Documents of the Industrial Revolution*. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1966.

Püschel, Jürgen. *Die Geschichte des German Hospital in London, 1845 bis 1948*. Münster: Murken-Altrogge, 1980.

Railton, Nicholas. *No North Sea: The Anglo-German Evangelical Network in the Middle of the Nineteenth Century.* Leiden: Brill. 1999.

Richardson, Alan. *The Westminster Dictionary of Christian Theology*. Westminster: John Knox Press. 1983.

Reill, Peter Hanns. “Barthold Georg Niebuhr and the Enlightenment Tradition.” *German Studies Review* 3, no. 1 (1980): 9-26.

Rogers, James E. Thorold. *Six Centuries of Work and Wages*. London: Swan Sonnenschein and Co. 1908.

Rönneke, Karl. *Die Liturgie oder die Ordnung des evangelischen Hauptgottesdienstes insbesondere die in der K. Deutschen Botschaftskapelle zu Rom gebräuchliche nach ihrer Bedeutung und Gliederung für die christliche Gemeinde*. Halle: Verlag von Eugen Strien. 1882.

Sandiford, Keith. A.P. "The British Cabinet and the Schleswig-Holstein Crisis, 1863–1864." *History* 58, no. 194 (1973): 360-83.

Sewell, William. *A Year's Sermons to Boys, Preached in the Chapel of St Peter's College, Radley* vol. 1. London: James Parker & Co. 1853.

Schäfer, Gerhard K., and Volker Herrmann. “Geschichtliche Entwicklungen der Diakonie.” In Günter Ruddat & Gerhard K. Schäfer. *Diakonisches Kompendium*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 2005.

Schieder, Wolfgang. “Church and Revolution: Aspects of the Social History of the Trier Pilgrimage of 1844,” trans. Richard Deveson. In Clive Emsley, ed. *Conflict and Stability in Europe*. London: Croom Hem. 1979.

Schmidt, Berhard. *Lied, Kirchenmusik, Predigt im Festgottesdienst Friedrich Schleiermachers: zur Rekonstruktion seiner liturgischen Praxis*. Berlin: De Gruyter. 2002.

Schmidt-Clausen, Kurt. *Vorweggenommene Einheit: die Gründung des Bistums Jerusalem im Jahre 1841*. Berlin: Lutherisches Verlagshaus, 1965.

Schmidt-Voges, Inken. “Einführung: Interaktion und soziale Umwelt.” In *Das Haus in Der Geschichte Europas: Ein Handbuch*, edited by Joachim Eibach and Inken Schmidt-Voges, 411-416. Oldenbourg: De Gruyter Verlag. 2015.

Schmieder, Heinrich Eduard, Paul Schmieder. *Erinnerungen Aus Meinem Leben: 1794-1823*. Wittenberg: Wunschmann. 1892.

Schwedt, Herman H. *Das Römische Urteil über Georg Hermes (1775-1831): Ein Beitrag Zur Geschichte Der Inquisition Im 19. Jahrhundert.* Freiburg: Herder. 1980.

Soine, Aeleah. "The Motherhouse and its Mission(s): Kaiserswerth and the Convergence of Transnational Nursing Knowledge, 1836-1865." In *Transnational and Historical Perspectives on Global Health, Welfare, and Humanitarianism*, eds. Fleischmann, Ellen, Grypma, Sonya, Marten, Michael, and Okkenhaug, Inger-Marie. Kristiansand, Norway: Portal Forlag (2013). 20-41. *

Stahl, Friedrich Julius. *Über christliche Toleranz: ein Vortrag*. Berlin: Wilhelm Schultze. 1855.

———. *Wider Bunsen*. Berlin: W. Hertz. 1856.

Suhr, Norbert. *Philipp Veit (1793–1877): Leben und Werk eines Nazareners. Monographie und Werkverzeichnis*. Oldenbourg: Walter de Gruyter. 1991.

Tatem, A. J., D.J. Rogers, & S.I. Hay. “Global Transport Networks and Infectious Disease Spread.” *Advances in Parasitology* 62 (2006): 293-343.

Thirlwall, Connop, and Arthur Penrhyn Stanley. *Letters to a Friend*. Boston: Roberts Brothers. 1883.

Tholuck, August. *Die Lehre von der Sünde und vom Versöhner: Die wahre Weihe des Zweiflers*. Hamburg: Friedrich Perthes. 1851.

———. *Die Glaubwürdigkeit der evangelischen Geschichte, zugleich eine Kritik des Lebens Jesu von Strauß, für theologische und nicht theologische Leser dargestellt.* Gotha: Perthes. 1838.

———. *Guido and Julius*. Boston: Gould and Lincoln. 1854.

Thorne, Susan. *Congregational Missions and the Making of an Imperial Culture in Nineteenth-Century England*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press. 1999.

Tibawi, Abdul Latif. *British interests in Palestine 1800-1901: a study of religious and educational enterprise.* London: Oxford University Press. 1961.

Tippelskirch, Friedrich von. *Friedrich von Tippelskirch: Ein Lebensabriß von Freunden Des Verstorbenen*. Wiesbaden: Riedner. 1867.

———. *Volksblatt Für Stadt Und Land Zur Belehrung Und Unterhaltung*. Volume 2. Halle: Mühlmann Verlag. 1845.

Van der Leest, Charlotte. *Conversion and Conflict in Palestine: The Missions of the Church Missionary Society and the Protestant Bishop Samuel Gobat.* PhD diss. Universiteit Leiden. 2008.

Wächter, August. "Heinrich Eduard Schmieder." In Historische Commission bei der königl. Akademie der Wissenschaften. *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*. Vol. 54. 115-125. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot. 1908.

Wappler, Klaus. *Der theologische Ort der preußischen Unionsurkunde vom 27.9.1817*. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt. 1978.

Wiegand, Christian. *Über Friedrich Julius Stahl (1801-1862): Recht, Staat, Kirche.* Paderborn: F. Schöningh. 1981.

Williamson, George S. *The Longing for Myth in Germany: Religion and Aesthetic Culture from Romanticism to Nietzsche*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 2004.

Wilson, Kathleen. *A New Imperial History: Culture, Identity, and Modernity in Britain and the Empire, 1660-1840*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2004.

Winkworth, Susanna. *Theologica Germanica*. Andover: W. F. Draper. 1857.

Witte, Leopold. *Das Leben D. Friedrich August Gottreu Tholucks*. Bielefeld: Velhagen & Klasing. 1886.

Wrogemann, Henning. *Missionstheologien der Gegenwart: globale Entwicklungen, kontextuelle Profile und ökumenische Herausforderungen*. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2013.