Johannes Dillinger

The Ghost of the Enlightenment? Communication with the Dead in Southwestern Germany, 17th and 18th Centuries

Published in:
Magic, witchcraft and ghosts in the enlightenment [ISBN: 9780367502775] /
edited by Michael R. Lynn (Routledge, 2022).

Introductory remarks

This chapter investigates popular ghost beliefs in the German Southwest. We define 'ghost' as the spirit of a deceased person that haunts a certain place and is still able to interact with the material world in some way.[1] This study will ask how and with what results people tried to communicate with ghosts. The text focuses on the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. This period lends itself to a more specific investigation of the question whether the Enlightenment might have influenced the belief in ghosts or at least the authorities' reaction to rumours about hauntings.

The aim of this chapter is neither to present a general survey of the Enlightenment's attitude toward traditional ideas about the returning spirits of the dead nor to attempt a discussion of the clash between religious faiths, political ideologies, and Enlightened thinking in the German Southwest. Rather, it focuses on the direct and concrete interaction between so called common people, the authorities, and the local churches on the village level in the context of alleged apparitions of ghosts.[2] This text is almost exclusively based on much neglected primary sources, especially trial records about fraud and illicit magic that mention ghosts as well as reports of official investigations of allegedly haunted houses. The focus will be on Swabia, especially on the Lutheran duchy of Württemberg, simply because its well-organized administration created the greatest quantity and the most detailed

documents about supposed encounters with the spirits of the dead. We will throw some short side glances at the relatively poor Catholic area of Southern Swabia.

To the best of the author's knowledge, there are no other studies that combine the cultural history of the ghost in the context of the Enlightenment with concrete case studies and regional history. Within the framework of this publication, it is necessary to focus on the most relevant sources instead of aiming at a complete survey of all primary sources referring to ghosts from early modern Southwest Germany.[3]

This chapter has three main parts. First, we will give a short survey of the secular authorities' attitude towards ghost beliefs. In the second part, we focus on reports about apparitions of ghosts that did not involve a medium. Of course, if the term 'medium' is to make any sense at all in the eighteenth century context it is to be understood in the broadest sense. A 'medium' was simply a person who claimed to be able to communicate with ghosts in a meaningful way.[4] Lastly, we will discuss ghostly apparitions that did involve mediums.

Talking about ghosts

Even if we focus exclusively on the Lutheran duchy of Württemberg it is difficult to say anything conclusive about the government's attitude toward ghost beliefs. How exactly the authorities behaved when they were confronted with rumours or official reports about ghosts depended on the concrete situation. The government's general stance might be best described as sceptical indifference. The authorities stayed alert and were willing to investigate rumours and reports about hauntings. This

attitude that might be called ‘open’ as well as ‘reluctant’ or ‘undecided’ does not seem to have changed significantly between the seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries. So far, no case has been discovered in which the government positively accepted the apparition of a ghost as real. Any such statement would have been scandalous given the fact that the Lutheran church officially denied the existence of ghosts.[5]

Even though the Württemberg government never explicitly accepted a spectre as real, in a number of cases it behaved as if it believed in ghosts. Instead of rejecting reports about ghosts, the authorities often acknowledged them tacitly. These cases had to do with treasure hunting.[6] In early modern Württemberg, treasure hunting as such was legal. A number of people requested official permits for treasure hunts that the government usually granted. However, the use of any kind of magic during a treasure hunt was officially forbidden. In early modern Germany and beyond, it was common knowledge that ghosts watched over treasures. The apparition of a ghost indicated the spot where a treasure could be found. In many cases, the Württemberg government was at least willing to ignore magical elements of a treasure hunt and not to comment on ghostly apparitions connected with alleged treasure sites. One example might be the treasure hunt that went on in Lauffen in 1711.[7] The innkeeper Veit Conz had bought the ruin of a castle. As his horses did not seem to like the place, he immediately concluded that the ruin was haunted and that a treasure must be hidden there. Conz requested an official permit for a treasure hunt from the ducal administration of Württemberg. Even though the government knew that Conz believed in the treasure because he believed in the ghost it granted the permit provided that Conz did not use magic actively. Conz hired the bricklayer Christoph Schomm who

had a reputation as a treasure magician and a conjurer. Immediately before the Lauffen treasure hunt, a local government official had employed Schomm because the official too thought that his house was haunted and that a treasure might be hidden in it. Schomm had allegedly laid the ghost and discovered the treasure with magical means. Even though all of that came to the government's knowledge, it still allowed Schomm -with the explicit approval of the duke personally - to work for Conz. The Lauffen treasure hunt was an extreme but a typical case. In the interest of finding the treasure the government was prepared to ignore magical practices as well as to tacitly accept the existence of ghosts.

In Württemberg, stories about ghosts only began to damage the chance to get an official permit for a treasure hunt one generation later. In 1744, the government thought a very detailed description of both the haunting and of the still hidden treasure suspicious and did not allow a treasure hunt.[8] Fourteen years later, a private person requested a permit for a treasure hunt. He stressed that before the treasure could be found he needed Franciscan monks to redeemed the ghost that haunted his house. The government rejected this petition outright as "nonsensical" probably not so much because it had mentioned a ghost but rather because it had implied that representatives of the Catholic church were best suited to deal with the spirit world.[9] If a treasure played no or no major role in the reports about ghosts, the government displayed a more critical attitude.

A standard explanation for supposed hauntings was fraud. The government suspected that the inhabitants of allegedly haunted houses faked the apparitions for some ulterior motive. The Württemberg government – as well as other governments in

the German Southwest – repeatedly sent watchmen into haunted houses. They should not only note down what they experienced but should also keep an eye open for any indication of fraud or stage tricks. There were several such cases in the eighteenth century.[10] Even in the Alb, a poor and remote hill country south of Württemberg large parts of which were governed by the Catholic Hohenzollern, the authorities were quick to explain spectres as fraud, indeed as "indubitable malevolence ("Bosheit") ensnaring the riffraff that is prone to faithlessness ("Unglauben") anyway." The entire investigation of a haunted house in the period from1783 to 1784 in Ringingen in the Alb was based on the unchanging assumption that the haunting which had been going on for four years had been staged by a con man. Even though the suspect was arrested repeatedly, he simply refused to confess. What made things worse, at least for the government's officials, was the sensation the ghost created in the vicinity. "I call it a disgrace that in the Enlightened times ("aufgeklärten Zeiten") we have now the village of Ringingen that belongs to my jurisdiction has become the laughingstock of the neighbourhood because of such a silly ghost story," the local bailiff lamented in a letter to the government.[11] Of course, the bailiff presented himself as an advocate of the Enlightenment. However, it would be too easy to claim the interpretation of supposed hauntings as fraud as a result of the popularization of Enlightened scepticism. We find exactly the same arguments in Württemberg in the 17th century. For example, in 1630, the government went to some lengths to unmask an alleged haunting in Kirchheim as a confidence trick. The authorities had a supposedly haunted house searched for concealed doors, false bottoms in the furniture, and so on. They apparently expected the inhabitants of the house to use complicated and elaborate

tricks. In 1697, the authorities suspected some property fraud behind ghostly apparitions in Plieningen.[12]

Another, seemingly Enlightened explanation of ghost sightings was delusion. "We know from experience just how often people deceive themselves with fantasies, imaging that they see a ghost here or there", a Württemberg official wrote to the government in 1747. Persons with a "strong imagination" might believe that they had seen a ghost. In the telling these alleged experiences became even more extraordinary and impressed people of "small intelligence" so much that they also started to see ghosts.[13] Again, the authorities advocated this explanation – ghosts were "empty fantasies" and "pipe dreams" - in the seventeenth as well as in the eighteenth century.[14] Thus, Enlightened thinking might have strengthened this explanation, but it did not create it.

In 1659, the Württemberg government did not only have a supposedly haunted house in Pfaffenhofen officially watched, it even recommended a special prayer to the inhabitants that would drive the apparitions away. This would suggest that the government accepted the Protestant interpretation that denounced all ghostly apparitions as demons.[15] In four cases in 1630, 1670, 1675 and 1704 representatives of the state and the Lutheran church briefly discussed the possibility that the apparition of a ghost and attempts to communicate with it might be connected to witchcraft.[16] However, in all cases, they dismissed the idea quickly. Even if the apparitions were demonic there was just no evidence that would suggest that anybody had made a pact with the devil. Württemberg had never engaged very much in witch hunting. The witch trials began to peter out there in the1630s. Late accumulations of witch trials in

Württemberg in the 1660s and the 1680s were connected with children who accused themselves and others of witchcraft. There was no significant overlap between the discourses on ghosts and on witches.[17] The demonological interpretation of the ghosts was clearly not in any way connected to the Enlightenment. Not even the decline of this explanation can be attributed to Enlightened thinking. Administrative reforms marginalized and ended the witch trials in the seventeenth century before there was any discernible influence of Enlightened philosophy.[18]

Noise and silence: ghosts without mediums

The manifestations of ghosts as described in the sources may be grouped into just two simple categories: apparitions that were not connected to any human medium and apparitions that were. If there was no human medium to talk to the ghost (and, at least to a certain degree - for the ghost) then how did the ghost manifest itself? Which phenomena did common people from the eighteenth century interpret as hauntings? Most alleged manifestations of ghosts found in the sources were described as being of the 'poltergeist' variety: The spirits moved objects and 'went bump in the night'.

Several Swabian sources from the seventeenth century mention ghosts making noise, throwing or removing objects.[19] This remained the most common form of haunting throughout the eighteenth century. In 1715, in the vicarage of Zaisersweiher in Württemberg, doors opened on their own account. Witnesses claimed not to have seen anything but to have heard noises like somebody splitting wood or like violent stomping that shook the windows.[20] In a 1725 case from Frickenhausen, before an

exorcist forced the ghost to appear, all that could be experienced in a haunted house was “something clattering” (“etwas geklepperet”).[21] The ghost that haunted the vicarage of Hemmingen in 1747 often manifested itself with a variety of noises including a rumbling or a light tread like somebody walking with stockinged feet. One visitor of the haunted house thought that he heard heavy rain but found the night entirely dry when he looked out of the window.[22]

The Hemmingen ghost also assumed a variety of visual forms such as a little blue light, a dog, or, most often, a cat that simply could not be kept out of the bedroom. “Every night,” it was reported, “a cat went to bed with the maidservant no matter how hard she tried to get rid of it. Even if she closed the door right behind her, the cat was there anyway.” At times, the ghost stood in front of the bed in the shape of a woman with outstretched arms. Once, the ghost came in that form even in the kitchen and sat down next to the oven. The maid did not even realize that the visitor was a ghost. However, the spectre never spoke. The Hemmingen ghost also manifested itself as a ‘mare.’ The ‘mare’ (Alp) was a magical being that might be a ghost, a malevolent household spirit or the spirit of a living person. It pressed down on persons asleep in their beds like a heavy weight that threatened to suffocate them.[23]

A relatively versatile ghost haunted Vinzenz Diepolt’s house in Ringingen in the Southswabian Hohenzollern territory for years. A lengthy official investigation that started in 1783 noted a number of apparitions. Even if the inhabitants of the house could hear or see nothing, the spectre seemed to make the livestock in the stable restless. However, the ghost was often heard walking through the house like a man with bare feet. At times, it grunted like a pig, barked like a dog, or mooed like a cow.

The acoustical apparition could start with barely audible noises like woodworms moving in the walls that increased in volume and ended in “an awful, loud groan.” Most often, the ghost produced loud knocking or banging noises like a person hammering away with a heavy mallet. These noises could make the windows rattle in their frames and sometimes went on all night. At some point, Diepolt was so deprived of sleep that he lost his nerves and his fear and searched his house with his rifle to shoot the ghost. When the government sent soldiers to watch the haunted house, they did not see anything but heard knocking and banging sounds of varying volume, like objects crashing against iron and, once, as if three logs were tumbling down the stairs. Diepolt’s case was among the few in which the official government reports actually used the word “Poltergeist” that translates literally as ‘rumbling spirit.’ The haunting in Diepolt’s house was so closely connected to acoustical perception that “if the cow in the stable or the cat in the garret made noise … it always brought new fear” of the ghost. In a way, the poltergeist’s din had become the yardstick of the normal sounds of the farmhouse, not the other way round. On three occasions, the Diepolt ghost seemed to talk. One witness said simply that it had a male voice while another explained that the ghost spoke “in a voice that was not quite that of a human being and not quite that of an animal.” Unfortunately, nobody seems to have been able to understand the ghost. The soldiers who had been sent by the government to investigate the haunting heard the ghost talk: “It started to speak but very unclearly and as if the mouth was full of rags. But they did not understand anything apart from the word ‘authorities’ (‘Obrigkeit’) in the middle of its talk and ‘otherwise it will not go well’ (‘sonst wird es nicht gut gehen’)” at the end. It remained unclear if these cryptic

utterings were supposed to threaten or to warn the soldiers as representatives of the authorities. At any rate, it is remarkable that this ghost that had never deigned to say anything remotely comprehensible to Diepolt and his family gave a little speech to the soldiers.[24]

The Diepolt ghost crossed the line between visibility and invisibility. Diepolt said that the ghost often slipped under the bed like a black dog but if he shone a light under the bedstead there was nothing to be seen. A boy Diepolt employed as a cowherd claimed to have seen a mysterious light. This might mean – if it means anything – that the ghost stayed invisible most of the time but could appear in various forms at will. Later on, Diepolt's neighbours claimed that the ghost shied away from light and only became active in total darkness.[25]

As the ghosts usually did not communicate in a meaningful or comprehensible way, what or who the spirit actually was often remained unclear. In 1660, after two years' worth of reports about strange apparitions in Maulbronn it was still an open question if "a ghost, witches or some other monstrosity" was to blame.[26] The ghost in the vicarage of Hemmingen could never be identified even though it was said to have haunted the place for seventy years and had shown itself in human form to several people.[27] Even after four years of torment by the noisy poltergeist, Vinzenz Diepolt from Hohenzollern knew only that "they just have something that is not right in the house" ("sie hätten halt etwas unrechtes im Haus"). [28]

In 1725, even though the inhabitants of a haunted house in Frickenhausen suspected who the ghost might be, they preferred to refer simply to "something that was not right" ("ohnrichtigkeit") when they had to talk about the spectre, probably in

order not to attract the attention of ill-disposed neighbours or of the authorities.[29] The identity of a ghost could become a controversial issue. According to folk belief, the continued existence of someone as a ghost was a form of punishment. Whoever had to walk as a ghost had penance to do for a serious mistake or had other very important things left undone. Thus, if you claimed that somebody had to return as a ghost you criticized him, implicitly but harshly.[30] In 1725 two women quarreled loudly at the marketplace of Nürtingen. Nestlerin had told Schillerin that the neighbours claimed Schillerin's mother would haunt Johann Martin Kayser's house. The ghost was so bothersome that Kayser considered moving out. Schillerin paid Nestlerin back with the same coin. She claimed that Nestlerin's dead cousin haunted the house of his widow. Thus, not one, but two spectres featured in the quarrel between the women. Both ghost stories defamed individuals and their families most effectively.[31] The notion that only people who had unfinished business had to return as ghosts could be used to criticize rumours about hauntings. In 1620, the bailiff of Backnang explained that a rumour about a certain person having come back as a ghost was unworthy of belief simply because the person in question had been an unobtrusive and upstanding character who certainly had no unfulfilled tasks.[32] In 1697, stories about ghostly apparitions in Plieningen were rejected as libel and a cover for property fraud because the person supposed to have turned into a ghost had been a respected member of the community.[33]

People who lived in a haunted house often tried to get rid of the ghost by having the house blessed by a priest or even by having the ghost exorcized. In theory, a formal exorcism by a Catholic priest would imply that the spirit haunting the house

was a demon. In practice, however, a number of monks were apparently willing to read the exorcism without enquiring about the nature of the spirit in any detail. There was some demand for Catholic clergymen who were willing to perform such rites in Protestant Württemberg.[34] There were, however, persons who claimed to be able to drive spirits out of haunted houses that were not Catholic priests, or even Catholics. These conjurers were merely village wizards. They were often Protestant laypersons who claimed to know spells and prayers with which they could drive the ghost out of the house or 'ban' it into a specific place where it could not harm or disturb anybody anymore. In contrast to Catholic priests, these 'lay exorcists' expected some material reward for their services.[35]

A good example of such a 'lay exorcist' was Hans Jörg Hoß from Wolfschlugen.[36] Witnesses referred to Hoß respectfully as a "renowned exorcist" ("renommirten exorcisten"). In 1725, the Protestant Vicar Georg Friedrich Hausch and the sheriff Gebhard Friedrich Mollventer opened an official investigation of Hoß's dealings with a spectre in Frickenhausen, a village in Württemberg about 30 kilometers south of Stuttgart. At that time, Hoß was 73. He was an experienced and self-assured 'lay exorcist.' Hoß was not only known to have laid a number of ghosts, but he was proud of his achievements. He said clearly that his 'exorcisms' were legal. Hoß explained willingly that Nestler, a forester's servant, had told him that since the death of one Johann Georg Schauber his house was haunted. Nestler was a distant relative of Schauber's and seems to have acted on the behalf of Schauber's widow who still lived in the house. Hoß visited the house three times at night. Hoß's final visit to the haunted house attracted some attention. Curious neighbours assembled in

the middle of the night in the street near Schauber's house. They later claimed to have heard hammering. They allegedly saw flickering flames and finally witnessed Hoß coming out of the house carrying a sack, supposedly with the ghost in it.

During his first visits, Hoß explained to his interrogators, he had merely heard strange noises. In the third night, the lay exorcist drew a circle with magical characters on the ground where he stood. Even though this practice is often associated to learned magic it was quite common and popular with rural treasure magicians. The ghost was not supposed to be able to enter the circle. Then, Hoß made the ghost come to him by speaking the formula "in the name of God, I search you. In the name of Jesus Christ, I search you. In the name of the holy spirit I find you." As Hoß maintained, these words "made such a thing ("solches ding") appear and if it were in hell." The ghost came in the form of a man wearing a hat and a white garment the lower part of which was blackish. Hoß challenged the ghost with the traditional formula "All good spirits praise God the Lord" to which the ghost did not reply but merely turned around. Now Hoß said "Trutt, trutt, trutt, I bless you in the name of Jesus Christ, so that you shall avoid this house and yard, door and gate, also all other openings so that this house shall be so pure as the bones of Christ the Lord." The word 'Trutt' or Trude could mean 'nightly ghostly apparition' as well as 'nightmare' or 'witch.' Hoß avoided (or claimed to have avoided) the much less ambivalent term 'Gespenst' ('ghost') but still used a word with strong negative connotations (unlike the more neutral 'Geist' ('spirit')). This would indicate that he was not quite sure what he was dealing with even though he regarded the apparition as a potential threat. Afterward, Hoß ordered the ghost to leave the house and to stay outside in the open. On hearing this, the ghost

showed “various kinds of unpleasant shapes” (“allerlay widrige figuren”) and breathed fire. Therefore, Hoß allowed the ghost to enter a hollow tree “because they dislike being out in the open as much as human beings because unpleasantness makes them suffer, too.” How exactly the ghost left the house remained unclear. The dialogue between Hoß and his interrogators about this is worth quoting: “Did he [= Hoß] put the ghost into a sack and carry it out of the house? No, some of them were very heavy. Did he guide the ghost outside? Laughing, he said nothing, only that it simply had to go.” Finally, Hoß nailed bits of paper with parts of a Protestant hymn “Des Weibes Samen” to the front and rear door of the house.

Hoß seems to have been a bit reluctant to talk to the vicar and the sheriff. He never volunteered any details in his statement but was ready enough to answer if he was asked specific questions. Topics that were supposed to discredit Hoß’s account, such as how he could have seen the ghost in the dark, the ‘lay exorcist’ answered readily enough and it seems at times with ironic simplicity and matter-of-factness.

Hoß never claimed that the ghost actually was the spirit of Schauber. He patiently explained to his interrogators that he had never met Schauber. Thus, he did not know what he had looked like and therefore, even though ghosts were supposed to look like the people they used to be, Hoß could not tell who the apparition really had been. Of course, Hoß might have avoided identifying the ghost as this might have been interpreted as libel. However, there was more to this. Hoß’s reluctance to give the ghost’s name fitted together with his use of the unspecific word ‘Trutt.’ Both seem to indicate general insecurity. Hoß’s entire statement suggested that he did not know what he was dealing with in the haunted house. It also suggests that he did not really

care or did not need to care. Almost all of Hoß's communication with the ghost consisted of ritual formulae. They were essentially independent of the creature or person Hoß was dealing with. His strange reference to hell when he explained his incantation to his interrogators suggests that he thought it possible that he was dealing with a demon. It is remarkable that as Hoß told the story, there had never been a real exchange between him and the ghost. The ghost seems not to have said anything. Even though it took on new threatening forms when it tried to keep Hoß from banning it out into the open, it remained silent.

Hoß presented himself like the equivalent of a Catholic priest conducting an exorcism. He wanted to be seen as the master of the ghosts. He was not interested in a conversation with them. He simply made them appear and sent them away. The ghost did not matter. It had neither a name nor a history. As the ghost could not or would not talk the reason why it came back to haunt the living at all remained unclear. In these respects, Hoß's case was absolutely typical. Most hauntings of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, at least in Southwest Germany, were of this non-communicative type. The questions of who the ghost had been and why it had to walk remained open.

Demands and doctrines: ghosts with mediums

As soon as a medium became involved, the situation demanded that the medium talked for and thus about the ghost. The medium could only justify his or her own role by providing some sort of explanation for the haunting. The medium thus acquired an exceptional, and indeed at times a highly advantageous, status. The

position of the medium was clearly a position of power. It goes almost without saying that these mediums were usually frauds who exploited the ghost beliefs of others for financial gain. The mediums of the eighteenth century were comparable to those of nineteenth-century Spiritualism insofar as they presented themselves as the 'spokespersons' of the ghosts and claimed to function as intermediaries between the ghosts and the living. Thus, the mediums were quite unlike the exorcists and village wizards who also dealt with ghosts. These people merely tried to get rid of the ghosts, to free a house from haunting. Far from presenting themselves as 'mouthpieces' of the ghosts they were essentially their adversaries who claimed to command superior spiritual powers to which the ghosts would have to succumb.

One of the most successful fraudulent mediums of eighteenth-century Southwest Germany was Margaretha Schütterin, the wife of a stonemason from Schwaikheim in Württemberg. Schütterin claimed to have come into contact with the ghost of a monk in 1704.[37] The ghost explained that he and fifteen fellow monks had lived in the house now inhabited by Schütterin 240 years ago. The sixteen monks had to haunt the place because they had important unfinished business. Not only had they hidden a vast treasure but they also had vowed to do certain pious works according to the Catholic tradition like paying for masses, donating candles, and clothing statues in churches. However, the monks had been killed by marauding mercenaries before they could fulfil their tasks. They could only leave the visible world and truly die if Schütterin did those pious works from them. If she did so, the ghosts would show her the place where the treasure was hidden. Schütterin explained exactly why the monks needed to communicate with her and only with her. She had been 'chosen' for this

task centuries before her birth. Schütterin had the same horoscope as Christ. She was the ghosts' redeemer. The medium thus claimed to have supernatural powers that set her apart from everybody else. The parallels with Jesus Christ were obvious.

The tasks the medium claimed she had to fulfil in order to help the ghosts had been well-chosen. In Protestant Württemberg it was comparatively difficult to find out if somebody made donations to Catholic institutions in neighbouring territories. The alleged request of the ghost in combination with the promise to help the medium to a treasure was an excellent basis for a confidence trick. Schütterin began to borrow from friends and neighbours the money she supposedly needed to pay for masses and for lavish donations to the Catholic church. As security she offered shares of the treasure that she would get as soon as the wishes of the ghost had been fulfilled. Schütterin guaranteed profits of up to 100,000 florins, an astronomical sum few people would earn in their entire lives. Like many modern con artists, Schütterin made reluctant investors believe that there was an actual competition for shares in the treasure venture. But money was not all that could be gained. The medium explained that the ghosts had promised that "whoever gave the least thing would be rewarded not only in this life but hereafter, too". In this way, Schütterin managed to swindle 912 florins out of one David Fischer, an affluent baker, alone. Schütterin finally left her husband, whom she may also have deceived with her ghost story, and fled with the money. Fischer brought charges against Schütterin after her flight. This turned out to be another mistake. Fischer was sentenced to a fine of fourteen florins. The court decided that he was guilty of treasure hunting without an official permit. It did not help Fischer

that he maintained that Schütterin had assured him the duke of Württemberg himself had allowed the treasure hunt.

The conglomerate of religion, magic, and commerce was typical for early modern treasure hunts.[38] Schütterin's case was an extreme but by no means an atypical example. Nevertheless, it is remarkable how traditional and Catholic Schütterin's ghosts were. They seemed to represent the ghosts of the old folk tales. They had unfinished business that kept them in the visible world. As if to confirm this traditional idea of ghosts, Schütterin's spirits were the souls of medieval monks. Some of the ritual tasks they had left unfinished and needed Schütterin to fulfil could be associated with the traditional Catholic care of the dead. Purgatory was never mentioned but the entire narrative seemed to imply the Catholic interpretation of ghosts as spirits of the dead sent back from Purgatory to warn the living. Finally, the ghosts claimed through the medium that anybody who would help them would be rewarded in the hereafter. This was clearly - if in a rather crude form - the Catholic concept of God rewarding good deeds. Even though Württemberg was notorious for its aggressive Lutheran orthodoxy, Schütterin's case suggested that more than a century and a half of Protestantism had left the Catholic concept of ghosts in folk belief absolutely intact. This embarrassing revelation might have provoked the harsh reaction of the Protestant minister and the bailiff of Strümpfelbach as well as that of the sheriff and dean of Schorndorf when they learned about Schütterin. They condemned Schütterin's alleged contact with spirits as a violation of the entire first table of the Ten Commandments. As the spirits could – according to official Protestant

teaching – only be demons, a few decades earlier Schütterin's behaviour might have provoked a witch trial.

Schütterin's case shows not even a marked conflict between competing Christian denominations. It shows a largely Catholic folk belief with some essentially inconsequential Protestant criticism voiced by local elites. Influence of the Enlightenment is not discernible at all. The fact that Schütterin was a fraud is not enough to see her case as a break from tradition. The con artist exploited an environment that still accepted traditional concepts of the ghost. The only real challenge Schütterin had to face was a specific gender role. It was highly unusual for a woman to search for hidden treasures. Treasure magic was almost exclusively male magic.[39] The files of Schütterin's case are the only legal documents from early modern Württemberg that use the term "treasure huntress" ("Schatzgräberin"), the female form of "treasure hunter" ("Schatzgräber"), at all. In order to convince her victims that a woman could be a successful treasure hunter the con woman had to create the ghost story with herself as the medium and the chosen redeemer of the ghosts. This story provided the ghosts with a pseudo-historical background that had been lacking in most of the older Southwest German documents about encounters with the spirits of the dead. Schütterin's story offered a glimpse of the historical personages behind the ghosts. Of course, the fraud's story was not about 'real' history. It contained no reliable historical information at all. However, it claimed to be about history. As older ghost narratives had been essentially uninterested in history this was an important deviation from tradition. Still, it would be far-fetched to explain this

deviation from older tradition as evidence for the impact of Enlightened thinking on the popular level.[40]

Whether Schütterin's house where she had supposedly met the ghosts had had a reputation for being haunted before remains unclear. Two other prominent eighteenth-century mediums from Southwest Germany found ghosts in places that had definitely not been said to be haunted before. Nobody had experienced anything that was interpreted as ghostly activity before the mediums entered the scene.

In 1743 the secretary Fehleysen met a person who called himself Paul Benoit de la Rivière and claimed to be a French army officer on leave.[41] Whether it was a 'two man con' from the beginning or whether Fehleysen inadvertently provided Rivière with an idea he exploited must remain open. At any rate, when Fehleysen talked to his new acquaintance, he mentioned a printed book about the alchemist Paracelsus. According to this book, Fehleysen explained, Paracelsus had not only discovered the Philosophers' Stone, but he had also hidden it in Hohenheim, a small town near Stuttgart where Paracelsus' family had originally come from. The Philosophers' Stone was, of course, the greatest treasure imaginable as it could turn base metals into gold. Rivière at once revealed that he was an experienced treasure hunter. Fehleysen brought him into contact with Captain von Dehl who resided in Hohenheim castle. Naturally, Dehl was most interested in finding the treasure, especially as Rivière claimed not to be interested in any material gain so that the treasure, minus a provision for the heavily indebted Fehleysen, would go to Dehl.

Within hours of his arrival at Hohenheim castle, Rivière saw a shadow in the chapel that turned out to be the ghost of Paracelsus himself. It promised to reveal the

treasure to Rivière. However, black evil spirits wanted to keep the treasure hidden. Paracelsus' ghost sent a good spirit who helped Rivière. This good spirit began to dictate lengthy Latin letters to Rivière. The ghost of Paracelsus wanted these letters to be given to Dehl. The letters contained religious and moral exhortations. Before Dehl could get the treasure, the ghost of Paracelsus demanded, he had to become a much better person, a morally impeccable and pious Christian, virtually a new man. The treasure, the ghost stressed, belonged neither to Paracelsus nor to Dehl. It belonged to God. Dehl was merely supposed to become God's administrator who was to use the treasure according to God's will. He was to distribute great parts of the immeasurable wealth the Philosophers' Stone promised to the needy. The point of the letters was to give Dehl the moral and religious instruction he needed to live up to this great responsibility. As might be expected, this conversion took several months during which Rivière and his female companion lived as guests at Hohenheim castle. When Dehl became impatient the letters from the ghost of Paracelsus became more authoritarian: "This is not about me [i.e. Paracelsus], this is about God. If God commands you to do something why do you not do his will? God forsakes the sinner. … Fulfil your promises … and God will be with you for eternity. And you will receive your crown in Heaven." The tone of the letters suggested that it was not Paracelsus but rather God himself who spoke. Following the instructions given in the letters and Rivière's advice, Dehl began to say Latin prayers daily and fasted. Did Rivière try to convert Dehl to Catholicism? Both stressed that they wanted to have nothing to do with Catholics. Rivière claimed that for at least two years he had adhered to Calvinism. The new contact with the beyond that the letters from

Paracelsus had established made old religious identities and traditional denominations much less important.

Even when Rivière had to flee Württemberg after the authorities had learned about the treasure hunt, he kept sending a steady stream of letters to Dehl from the nearby Free Imperial City of Esslingen. Dehl covered all of Rivière's expenses. After about a year of entirely fruitless treasure hunting, a servant of Dehl's brought charges against Rivière. Only after the Esslingen authorities had extradited the self-styled magician to the Württemberg authorities did Dehl reluctantly bring charges himself and accuse Rivière of fraud. During a first interrogation, Rivière said that he had lived in faraway Düsseldorf for some years. The Württemberg authorities inquired in Düsseldorf about a French officer named Paul Benoit de la Rivière. Düsseldorf answered that such a person was unknown in the town. However, some years ago a French teacher who was heavily in debt had left his wife and his children in utter poverty and fled, presumably following the French army. His name was Paul Benedikt Bach: 'Rivière' was the French equivalent of the German 'Bach'.

Still, under interrogation Bach / Rivière protested his innocence. The entire treasure hunt including the alleged communication with the ghost, he claimed, had been an elaborate scheme to bring Dehl back to a Christian life. In a way, the treasure hunt had been a religious metaphor. The treasure of Paracelsus consisted of charity towards the poor, its gold was patience, its jewels piety, and the Philosophers' Stone was the transformation of vice into virtue. Thus, the treasure hunt had been a complete success. Dehl was now a new man. Rivière boasted: "Ten Jesuits would not have achieved Herr Dehl's conversion. But now he is an angel." The court pronounced

Bach / Rivière guilty of fraud and banned him from ever entering Württemberg again. Dehl and Fehleysen were let off with an official reprimand.

The fraud Rivière had given the ghost a new role to play. It was a religious mentor, God-like in its authority and otherworldliness. The ghost of Paracelsus did not need to be redeemed. It did not want Dehl to do something for it. It wanted Dehl to do something for himself, to change his life and to come closer to God. The ghost of Paracelsus was a spirit and a spiritual guide. It seemed less earth-bound than heaven-sent. It was not the ghost that needed to shake off the ties that bound it to the material world. It was Dehl who under the guidance of the ghost had to free himself of overly worldly aims and considerations. Of course, the ghost's message was Christian. However, it had no denominational identity which is remarkable in an aggressively Protestant state like Württemberg and in a period that was still shaped by denominational differences and controversies. The Lutheran Dehl and the Catholic turned Calvinist Rivière both seemed not to care for the established churches any longer. The messages of the ghost offered a new and personal glimpse of the beyond and an interpretation of the will of God. Even if the ghost of Paracelsus seemed not to have left the material world altogether, Dehl was willing to hear in its admonitions the voice of God. The ghost was, at the very least, the gatekeeper of Heaven.

Treasure hunts even if they did not involve alleged apparitions of ghosts often had a quasi-religious aspect. Treasure hunters prayed together. Certain saints like St. Christopher and St. Corona were supposed to help treasure seekers. There were special invocations, spells rather than prayers, that compelled these saints to help treasure hunters. It was a genuine part of the motivation of some treasure seekers that

finding the treasure would enable the ghost guarding it to go to Heaven.[42] However, Schütterin's and Rivièver's cases had a new quality. The communication with the ghost was now really at the centre of the treasure hunt. The ghost was able to communicate in a meaningful way. Rivière turned the ghost into a religious mentor, an almost divine figure that promised redemption instead of needing to be redeemed. The 'logical' next step would be the religious veneration of a ghost. This was precisely the centre of the Weilheim ghost cult.

In 1770, Anna Maria Freyin, the maidservant of Georg Buck, a butcher in the Württemberg small town of Weilheim an der Teck, claimed to have redeemed a ghost.[43] She never explained how exactly she did that or how and why the ghost approached her. The ghost that had at first been dark and threatening became white and beautiful. According to folk belief, the redemption of a ghost meant that its ties with the visible world were dissolved. The ghost showed itself - in white symbolizing its redemption - one last time and disappeared for ever. However, Freyin's ghost, even though she stressed that she had redeemed the spirit, kept coming to Buck's house by night and day. It was even joined by another white spirit. The ghosts had been delivered, that is to say, they had already reached eternal bliss. The apparitions were therefore part of a heavenly sphere even though they remained in contact with the living. This meant nothing less than that a new divine revelation had begun. Anna Maria Freyin had established a direct contact with Heaven.

Freyin, her master Buck, and a fast-growing number of curious visitors saw and heard the ghosts. The ghosts conducted religious services. They quoted passages from the Bible, prayed, sang religious songs, and preached to their visitors urging them to

live morally impeccable lives according to Christian ethics. The role of the Württemberg ghosts was that of a saint, a prophet or rather that of an angel. They revealed the will of God to the faithful.

Within weeks, random gatherings at Buck's house to see the ghosts and worship with them had developed into regular meetings. Buck who had a bad reputation as a drunkard and an idler had been excluded from the Lutheran Lord's Supper. He became the leader of the ghost cult. Buck used his new position to better his financial situation. He borrowed money from the adherents of the ghosts. Buck promised to pay back his debts as soon as the ghosts had revealed to him where a treasure could be found.

The people who met regularly at Buck's came to regard the spirits' utterances as divine revelation. It was claimed that the ghosts were capable of working miracles greater than those which had occurred at the birth of Christ. Buck's followers stated publicly that they got a far better instruction in Scripture by the spirits than by their minister. The religious songs the spirits sang were said to be of unearthly beauty and in themselves proof of the divine nature of the apparitions. Freyin was venerated like a saint. She was called “redeemer of souls... right holy warrior, spiritual mother...worker of miracles“. Even more than Schütterin about two generations earlier, Freyin acquired religious authority that should have been quite out of reach for a Protestant woman at that time. The ghost narrative helped her to defy gender norms and to acquire a position reminiscent of the female mystics in Catholicism. The ghost worshippers celebrated the anniversary of Freyin's decisive meeting with the spirits on epiphany, which had in German the somewhat ambivalent name of “Fest der

Erscheinung". This can be interpreted as 'Feast of Jesus' appearing in the world' or as 'Feast of the Apparition'. Thus, the church holiday was reinterpreted and its name was understood to be an allusion to the apparition of the spirits. Buck adopted a six-year-old boy whom he did not allow to attend Protestant service and catechism. The boy was allegedly on particularly good terms with the ghosts. At least according to Weilheim's Protestant minister, the boy was taught to offer the spirits the type of veneration normally reserved only for God. He reportedly worshiped them on his knees. It is likely that the boy was supposed to take on the role of a priest in due course. Freyin had allegedly begun to write down the sayings of the ghosts, and their prayers and hymns were considered as immediate divine revelation by the sect. This text could have become the holy book of a new Christian community.

The followers of Freyin and Buck cultivated a sense of mission and an aggressive self-confidence. They "alone had bright, open eyes whereas the other people were blind, perverse and pitiable." They claimed to have received a special grace from God. "The matter about the ghosts was something divine and those who were not chosen could not comprehend it." Buck based his criticism of Protestantism on the revelations of the ghosts. The apparitions proved, he explained, that there was "a third place in which the ghosts of the deceased stayed." Buck did not have the Catholic concept of Purgatory in mind. According to Catholic teaching, some souls might return from Purgatory to warn the living. However, they were hardly capable of giving religious instructions. The Catholic neighborhood of Württemberg did not accept Buck's views. It seems likely, even though there is no clear evidence for it, that Freyin and Buck were influenced by Pietism. Following the ideas the minister

Oetinger had published in 1765, some Württemberg Pietists believed in the existence of the Empire in Between (Zwischenreich) where the souls of the deceased awaited their ascent to heaven. Oetinger was active as a minister at Murrhardt only about sixty kilometers north of Weilheim and also in the duchy of Württemberg at the time of the ghost sect. However, he does not seem to have taken any notice of it. Oetinger himself was familiar with Swedenborg's writings and published a book that discussed his ideas. If one wants to see Swedenborg as an exponent of the Enlightenment, one could claim that the Enlightenment influenced the Weilheim ghost sect indirectly. Of course, Pietists never entertained the idea that spirits could give religious instructions. On the contrary, prominent Pietist preachers like Oetinger allegedly preached to the dead in the Empire in Between.[44] The Weilheim ghost sect turned this idea on its head. Thus, it must not be regarded as just another variant of Pietism. The Freyin - Buck group is best understood as a new religious sect. They established a new cult with regular gatherings, a holiday, and rituals such as the gestures of adoration performed at least by the boy.

The ghost worshippers openly rejected the authority of the established church and the state connected with it. According to Protestant tradition, the church suspected the ghosts to be really demons. The central administration of the Württemberg Protestant church decreed early in 1771 that the meetings at Buck's house were to be discontinued immediately. The ghost sect ignored the order. The Württemberg government ordered Christoph von Bühler, the head of the regional administration to arrest Freyin. However, Bühler was not only unable to find Freyin, but a raid on Buck's house ordered by the duke failed because it had been given away. The leaders

of the ghost sect reveled in 'prophesies' reinterpreting harassment as the road to martyrdom and a prerequisite of their final triumph. Buck publicly denounced the Lutheran minister of Weilheim as a “preacher of lies” and the town clerk as a “writer of lies.” The cohesion of the Lutheran community at Weilheim began to suffer. Some parishioners began to doubt the Lutheran orthodoxy and complained that “they were no longer sure what to believe ... [and] wondered whether they should throw their Bibles out of the window.” The ghost sect was detrimental for the reputation of Württemberg’s Protestantism. The Catholics in the neighbouring territories ridiculed the new religious community and the Lutheran authorities who seemed to be incapable of fighting it. “If something like that happened in their country the madcaps would not escape punishment, indeed they would risk life and limb.”

The situation got, from the point of view of the government, even worse when the ghost sect managed to overcome social boundaries. All of the early adherents of the ghost sect had been of questionable social status. They were poor, had no family support, or suffered from a bad reputation. Within two years, however, the background of the ghost worshippers became completely heterogeneous. A government official, an alderman, and a number of craftsmen joined the movement. Even a noblewoman became interested in the sect. The members of the sect were criticized for consciously ignoring social differences.

Three years after Freyin’s supposed first contact with the ghosts, the situation at Weilheim was out of control. The government thought that there was a concrete threat of “revolution.” Thus, it finally intervened decisively. Buck and another leader of the ghost sect were arrested. Even though they refused to confess fraud, they were

sent to Ludwigsburg prison for two years. Even in the late eighteenth century, Ludwigsburg prison had a bad reputation for brutality. Without their spokesmen the group slowly dissolved. In 1773 Bühler managed to arrest Freyin. Under massive pressure she confessed that she had been hiding in Buck's house all the time staging the alleged apparitions of the spirits. Some days later, Freyin fled again, this time for good. The last person who openly confessed to believe in the Weilheim ghosts even after imprisonment and flogging was pronounced insane by the Württemberg authorities in 1774.

At first glance, the treatment of the ghost sect would suggest that the Württemberg government was untouched by that part of the Enlightenment movement that advocated human rights and religious freedom. However, it is remarkable how slowly the government reacted. For three years, the authorities looked on passively or at least without taking any decisive action while a highly unorthodox sect developed right under their noses. The harsh measures the government resorted to in 1773 and 1774 look very much like an ‘emergency break.’ The sect was only stopped when the authorities already expected a “revolution” and the situation was about to get totally out of hand. Should we see this apparent reluctance to intervene on the behalf of the established Lutheran church as proof that the government had adopted Enlightened ideas about religious toleration?

By the time the ghost sect came into existence, the Lutheran establishment in Württemberg had long grown accustomed to a de facto toleration of dissident Protestant minorities. The duke had allowed Calvinists and Waldensians to settle in Württemberg in 1699/1700. The most important dissident group, however, were the

Pietists. Pietism was an integral element of Württemberg Protestantism. During the seventeenth century and in the first decades of the eighteenth century, Württemberg's authorities had looked suspiciously at the so-called Separatist Pietists that formed local conventicles and engaged in household and family worship. In 1743 the duke officially legalized the Pietist movement. After that, the Pietists formerly outspoken critics of the state quietened down. By the 1780s, however, a new wave of Pietist religious enthusiasm emerged. Long before their official acceptance by the Württemberg state, Pietists had managed to become a major influence at the faculty of theology at Tübingen University.[45] When the ghost sect came into existence, the Württemberg authorities had grown accustomed to the de facto and de jure toleration of Pietism. The ghost sect was at first a strictly local group. Buck's house that was now supposed to be haunted was the sect's only meeting place. Thus, there was a superficial resemblance between the sect and a village Pietist conventicle. That the government was prepared not to intervene in any decisive way for a very long time might thus have had more to do with an older and well-established toleration for Protestant dissenters than with Enlightened ideas about religious freedom.

As far as the influence of the Enlightenment on ghost beliefs in Southwest Germany is concerned, the results of this study are almost entirely negative. There is no positive evidence that Enlightened ideas changed, let alone weakened the belief in ghosts or influenced the authorities' reactions to rumours about hauntings. What we do observe, however, is the rise of mediumship. In the seventeenth century, there were no attempts to really communicate with ghosts. The ghosts were mostly poltergeists incapable of meaningful exchange. The experts who dealt with them presented

themselves as the equivalent of exorcists. They wanted merely to get rid of the ghost. Thus, the ghost had no personality and hardly any identity or history. In the eighteenth century, we encounter a new of type of communication with ghosts. Certain individuals claimed to be able to talk to ghosts. Even though these mediums were, unlike the mediums of the nineteenth century, still not really interested in the personality of the ghosts, they began to present ghosts in a much more positive light. Ghosts acquired almost godlike qualities. Communication with them was viewed as a new way to communicate with the realm of the divine. Thus, almost a century before the rise of Spiritualism, alleged encounters with ghosts carried in them the nucleus of a new religion. Even if this development was quite unconnected to the Enlightenment, the new interest in the revelations of ghosts and mediums and the rise of the Enlightenment might have had the same precondition, namely the beginning of religious diversity and the relative decline of the established church.

---

[1] The historiography is just beginning to investigate the history of ghost beliefs before Spiritualism. New groundbreaking publications include Claire Gantet and Fabrice d'Almeida, eds., *Gespenster und Politik*, (Munich 2007); Owen Davies, *The Haunted. A Social History of Ghosts* (London: Palgrave 2007); Christa Tuczay, et al., eds., „*Sei wie du wilt namenloses Jenseits". Neue Interdisziplinäre Ansätze zur Erforschung des Unerklärlichen* (Vienna: Praesens, 2016); Susan Owens, *The Ghost. A Cultural History* (London: Tate 2017); Johannes Dillinger, *Magical Treasure Hunting in Europe and North America. A History* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012).

[2] This aspect of the culture of the ghost is much underrated. Even a recent multi-volume edition of primary sources about ghosts ignores the ghost in the everyday culture of the majority almost completely, Owen Davies, ed., *Ghosts. A Social History*, 5 vol. (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2009-2010).

[3] The author is currently working on a monograph-length study of this topic. See Johannes Dillinger, *Ghosts in Early Modern Southwest Germany* (work in progress). The Covid19 crisis has limited the accessibility of major archives in Germany.

[4] Alex Owen, *The Darkened Room* (London: Virago 1989); Cathy Gutierrez, ed., *Handbook of Spiritualism and Channeling* (Leiden: Brill 2015).

[5] Davies, Haunted, p. 101-132; Jean Delumeau, *Angst im Abendland* (Hamburg: Rowohlt 1985), I:48-64, 112-121.

[6] Johannes Dillinger, "Das Ewige Leben und fünfzehntausend Gulden". Schatzgräberei in Württemberg 1606-1770," in Johannes Dillinger, ed., *Zauberer - Selbstmörder - Schatzsucher. Magische Kultur und behördliche Kontrolle im frühneuzeitlichen Württemberg* (Trier: Kliomedia, 2003), 221-297; and Johannes Dillinger, and Petra Feld, "Treasure-Hunting: A Magical Motif in Law, Folklore, and Mentality. Württemberg, 1606-1770," *German History* 20 (2002): 161-184.

[7] Hauptstaatsarchiv Stuttgart A 209 Bü 1451.

[8] Hauptstaatsarchiv Stuttgart St A 209 Bü 833.
[9] Dillinger, *Ewige*, 242-243.
[10] E.g. Hauptstaatsarchiv Stuttgart A 206 Bü 3257; A 206 Bü 4276; A 209 Bü 1421; A 209 Bü 833.
[11] Staatsarchiv Sigmaringen, Ho 172T1.
[12] E.g. Hauptstaatsarchiv Stuttgart, A 206 Bü 3257; Hauptstaatsarchiv Stuttgart, A206 Bü 2743.
[13] Hauptstaatsarchiv Stuttgart, A 206 Bü 3257.
[14] Hauptstaatsarchiv Stuttgart, A 206 Bü 3202; A 206 Bü 3257.
[15] Hauptstaatsarchiv Stuttgart, A 206 Bü 2186a.
[16] Hauptstaatsarchiv Stuttgart, A 210 I Bü 459; A 206 Bü 669; A 209 Bü 1808.
[17] Thomas Meyer, *"Rute" Gottes und "Beschiß des Teufels". Theologische Magie- und Hexenlehre an der Universität Tübingen in der Frühen Neuzeit* (Hamburg: Tredition 2019), 17-23; Johannes Dillinger, *Kinder im Hexenprozess* (Stuttgart: Steiner 2013), 107-122.
[18] Marianne Sauter, *Hexenprozess und Folter* (Bielefeld: Regionalgeschichte 2010), 184-279; Johannes Dillinger, *Hexen und Magie* (Frankfort: Campus 2018), 144-148.
[19] E.g. Hauptstaatsarchiv Stuttgart, A206 Bü 2743; A 206 Bü 2186a; A 206 Bü 3614.
[20] Hauptstaatsarchiv Stuttgart, A 206 Bü 3674.
[21] Hauptstaatsarchiv Stuttgart, A 206 Bü 4276.
[22] Hauptstaatsarchiv Stuttgart, A 206 Bü 3257.
[23] Hauptstaatsarchiv Stuttgart, A 206 Bü 3257.
[24] Staatsarchiv Sigmaringen, Ho 172T1.
[25] Staatsarchiv Sigmaringen, Ho 172T1.
[26] Staatsarchiv Stuttgart, A 206 Bü 3614.
[27] Hauptstaatsarchiv Stuttgart, A 206 Bü 3257.
[28] Staatsarchiv Sigmaringen, Ho 172T1.
[29] Hauptstaatsarchiv Stuttgart, A 206 Bü 4276.
[30] Johannes Dillinger, "Glaube jenseits der Konfessionen," in Tuczay, et al., eds., 299-308; Johannes Dillinger, "Gespenster von Amts wegen. Männliche Amtsträger als Totengeister im Schnittpunkt von Gender, Herrschaft und Erinnerung," in: ChristaTuczay, et al., eds., *Nachtgeschöpfe und Phantasmen. Interdisziplinäre Perspektiven* (Vienna: Praesens, 2020), PAGE NO CHANGES PLEASE: THE BOOK HAS NOT BEEN PUBLISHED YETNUMBERS?
[31] Hauptstaatsarchiv Stuttgart, A 206 Bü 4276.
[32] Hauptstaatsarchiv Stuttgart, A 209 Bü 78.
[33] Hauptstaatsarchiv Stuttgart, A 210 II Bü 113.
[34] Dillinger, *Ewige*, 233, 242-243, 249-250; Dillinger, *Magical*, 105, 120, 154-159.
[35] E.g. Hauptstaatsarchiv Stuttgart, A 206 Bü 2186a; A 206 Bü 3257; A 206 Bü 4276; A 210 I Bü 459.
[36] Hauptstaatsarchiv Stuttgart, A 206 Bü 4276.
[37] Hauptstaatsarchiv Stuttgart, A 209 Bü 1808.
[38] Dillinger, *Magical*, 153-166.
[39] Dillinger, *Magical*, 161-163.
[40] Ulrich Muhlack, *Geschichtswissenschaft im Humanismus und in der Aufklärung* (Munich: Beck 1991).
[41] Hauptstaatsarchiv Stuttgart, A 209 Bü 833.
[42] Dillinger, *Magical*, 77-79, 85-91.
[43] The following account is according to Hauptstaatsarchiv Stuttgart, A 209 Bü 1421, see also Dillinger, *Ewige*, 263-271.
[44] Richard Haug, *Reich Gottes im Schwabenland. Linien im württembergischen Pietismus* (Metzingen: Franz 1981), 160-162; Eberhard Zwink, "'Schrauben-förmige Bewegung ist in allem' – Oetinger lenkt den Blick auf Swedenborgs 'irdische Philosophie'" in Sabine Holtz, ed., *Mathesis, Naturphilosophie und Arkanwissenschaft im Umkreis Friedrich Christoph Oetingers* (Stuttgart: Steiner 2005), 197-230.
[45] Martin Brecht, „Der württembergische Pietismus," in Martin Brecht, Martin and Klaus Deppermann, eds., *Der Pietismus im achtzehnten Jahrhundert* (Göttingen: Vanderhoeck and Ruprecht, 1995), 225-295; Mary Fulbrook, *Piety and Politics: Religion and the Rise of Absolutism in England, Württemberg, and Prussia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 137-152; Joachim Weinhardt, „Christian Eberhard Weismann (1677-1747): Ein Tübinger Theologe zwischen Spätorthodoxie, radikalem Pietismus und Frühaufklärung," in Ulrich Köpf, ed., *Die Universität Tübingen zwischen Orthodoxie, Pietismus und Aufklärung* (Ostfildern: Thorbecke 2014), 91-122.