

God's Little Children: Early Moravian Imagery as an Expression of Spirituality

Garry D. Nation

Serious Christian Institute

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	3
God's Little Children: Early Moravian Imagery as an Expression of Spirituality	5
Early Influences on Moravianism.....	6
The Roots of the Moravian Movement.....	6
The Awakening at Herrnhut	8
The Sifting Time	9
Moravianism in Colonial America.....	11
The Moravian Emigration to America	11
Moravian Communal Life.....	13
Theological Language and Imagery in the Moravian Colonies.....	15
Imagery Related to God	15
Imagery Related to Christ	16
Imagery Related to the Spirit and the Church.....	17
Conclusion	18
References.....	20
End Notes.....	23

Abstract

For Moravians, especially in the American colonial period, doctrine was something one experienced and not merely thought. One of the leading images that encapsulated their spiritual self-image was the image of childlikeness. The writer suggests that the adoption of childlikeness as the supreme Christian virtue is the key to understanding (if not harmonizing) the varied and contradictory elements in early Moravianism and appreciating the Moravian contribution to evangelical spirituality.

Keywords: Moravianism, spirituality, childlikeness

God's Little Children: Early Moravian Imagery as an Expression of Spirituality

The Moravian movement began small and never grew to a significant size, yet it is one of the most distinctive in the history of Christianity, its influence far outstriding the number of its adherents. The Moravian influence on John and Charles Wesley alone would make them noteworthy, but even more their far-flung missionary activity, hymn writing, and the planting of intentional communities affected not only the Christian churches but secular society in America as well.

One of the most striking and perhaps the most frequently recurring image in early Moravian expressions of faith and spirituality, especially in its colonial American context, is that of being a little child of the Heavenly Father. This paper is an exploration of the significance of that image in relation to the substance of the Moravian vision of the Christian faith.

Early Influences on Moravianism

The peculiar outlook of the Moravians in colonial America and the language by which they expressed it was, of course, shaped by their peculiar history. The knowledge of certain particular elements of their history is indispensable to understanding Moravianism. This section will describe those elements and provide the historical and sociological context for the Moravian faith in the American colonial period.¹

The Roots of the Moravian Movement

The burning of Jan Hus in 1415 led to a religious and nationalistic upheaval in Bohemia that produced factions among the Czechs as well as hostilities with the Papacy and armed conflicts with the Holy Roman Empire. One group of Hussites, the *Jednota Bratrska* (Latin: *Unitas Fratrum*, or Unity of Brethren) settled in Kunwald, east of Prague, seeking freedom more for their pietistic religious practices than for political independence. In 1467 they formally separated from Roman Catholicism and established their own episcopacy. Anticipating the Protestant Reformation at several points, they recognized the principles of *Sola Scriptura* and the priesthood of all believers.

Despite periods of persecution, the Brethren flourished and maintained their distinctives in relation not only to Rome but also to the later arriving Protestant movement. By 1600, at the

peak of their “golden age,” the Brethren were numerous and influential throughout Moravia and Bohemia. They very literally lost all, however, in the Thirty Years War and the vigorous persecution that followed the Peace of Westphalia. A once strong national church became in 1624-28 a dispersion of refugees, exterminated in Bohemia and driven as unwelcome guests into Moravia, Silesia, and Poland.

That the name and memory of the *Unitas Fratrum* survived at all is credited to the single-handed work of Bishop John Amos Comenius—a man rightly renowned for many achievements, including the foundations of modern education. As he witnessed the swift disintegration of his church before his eyes he kept alive the hope of its future renewal. In 1660 he published the *Ratio Disciplinae*, or constitution and principles of the dispersed Brethren, complete with a historical preface, and worked to maintain the episcopal succession of the church. Most of all, in his writings and all his efforts, he stressed the ideal of a “hidden seed” which would spring forth again at the appointed time. ***This image of “hidden seed” remains to this day as a strong memory and theme among the Moravians,*** reminding them that historically they are a remnant people miraculously preserved, they believe, by the hand of God.

Count Ludwig Nicolas von Zinzendorf (Figure 1) is, without dispute, the most dynamic personality in the history of the Moravians. His leadership decisively set their course and confirmed their identity—both for better and for worse. There is not space here for a full discussion of Zinzendorf and his place in the Moravian movement, but there are two moments in that movement’s history in which his role was crucial and that have bearing on the present subject.



Figure 1 - Count Nicolas Ludwig von Zinzendorf

The Awakening at Herrnhut

The Moravian awakening at Herrnhut, it may be argued, is the single most determinative moment in the Moravian movement, establishing a preeminent precedent for spiritual motivation, expression, and expectation.² One significant point is that the group gathered there on Count Zinzendorf's estate were not all Moravians, but comprised a variety of dissenters from various nationalities (including Poles, Germans, and Bohemians) and religious backgrounds (ranging from Roman Catholic to various Protestant types), so that the term "Moravian" is no longer an ethnic term but an inclusive metonymy for the Brethren.

They probably would not be "brethren" at all had not Zinzendorf read Comenius's *Ratio Disciplinae* and been powerfully swayed, especially by the eloquent preface which ignited his zeal and confirmed his ecumenical stance. The Count led his diverse congregation first to commit themselves to a "Brotherly Agreement" drawn from the *Ratio* in a resolution adopted May 12, 1727. The point of the resolution was to stress the points of agreement between the factions rather than the differences, and also to dedicate the lives of all to the service of Christ.

It is not, however, the formal unity which was achieved through this resolution that the Brethren harken back to, nor is it the imagery of the "Brotherly Agreement" that stirs their imagination and zeal. It was rather a powerful and spontaneous, joint experience of the Holy

Spirit that gave the Moravians the momentum to solve their mutual conflicts and generated the zeal which in turn prompted one of the most remarkable mission movements in Christian history.

That even occurred on August 12, 1727 during a Wednesday communion service following an intense season of prayer lasting for about a week. By Zinzendorf's own account, the gathered members of the diverse congregation "were all dissatisfied with themselves. They had quit judging each other because they had become convinced, each one, of his lack of worth in the sight of God...." There was something sublime about the visitation they received in that communion service, those being present "hardly knowing whether they belonged to earth or had gone to heaven." Zinzendorf expressed it as "a sense of the nearness of Christ."³ Another one of those present compared it to the promise of the prophet Joel, nothing less than a Pentecost event and the outpouring of the Holy Spirit.

We all saw the hand of God and His wonders, and we were all under the cloud of our fathers baptized with their great Spirit. The Holy Ghost came upon us and in those days great signs and wonders took place in our midst.... A great hunger after the Word of God took possession of us.... Every one desired above everything else that the Holy Spirit might have complete control. Self-love and self-will, as well as disobedience, disappeared and an overwhelming flood of grace swept us all out into the great ocean of Divine love.⁴

It was, according to Zinzendorf, a complete divine takeover of the congregation.⁵ Out of the event came a fervor for prayer that led to the organization of a round-the-clock prayer chain which continued in Herrnhut for one hundred years.⁶ There also came a fervor for the gospel of Christ that impelled the sending, first of individual missionaries (such as Leonard Dober and David Nitschmann who, in order to preach to the enslaved in the West Indies, sold themselves into slavery), then of missionary colonists to various places across the globe. Between 1732 and 1742 this community of 600 dispatched more than 70 missionaries throughout the world.⁷ Clearly this experience exerted a powerful influence in shaping the religion, self-consciousness, and (as can be seen in the vivid, emotional quotations above) the imagery and passion of the Moravians.

The Sifting Time

The second determinative moment, and one of Moravianism's most fascinating and disturbing episodes, is the so-called Sifting Time, a name it acquired in its aftermath.⁸ If the Brethren look back in fondness on the Herrnhut awakening, they look back with deep discomfort

and embarrassment on the period of sifting. Yet the impact of that experience left its enduring mark on the movement, not least upon its language and imagery. It is difficult to get original sources for this time—the Moravians themselves destroyed much of the material produced then. There is much that does remain, however, including Zinzendorf's *Nine Lectures*.⁹ Although the Moravian communities in America were not as deeply affected by it as was the Herrnhut congregation, they could not escape being impacted by what happened during this period, as will be seen later.

Briefly, the Sifting Time comprised a decade of admittedly excessive religious enthusiasm and mysticism in which the Count, for manifold and complex reasons, became obsessed with the blood and wounds of Christ. It was a season of anti-rationalism, extreme sentimentalism, and a preoccupation with sensate imagery of the Passion. Jesus was preeminently the "*Bruder Lämmlein*," Brother Little-lamb. Zinzendorf exhorted the faithful from Matthew 11:25 to be "little fools." Adjectives were multiplied to describe the wounds of Christ: worthy, beloved, miraculous, powerful, holy, eternal. To these were added more sensuous descriptives: purple, juicy, dainty, warm, soft, hot. Believers were called upon to associate themselves devotionally to the cross and wounds of Christ, identifying with a smothering array of terms that ranged from the far-fetched to the bizarre: from little cross-wood splinters to little pigeons flying in the air around the cross; from little fish swimming in the bed of blood to little bees who crawl deep into the side-hole of Jesus and take succor from the wound.

Familial imagery also came into play as Zinzendorf portrayed the relation of Christ to the Church in the most extravagant, even lewdly sensual imagery. So at least the secondary sources unanimously disclose. Hutton, a Victorian-age writer, is positively aghast at the sensuality of Zinzendorf's language. None of the history writers choose to give examples and this writer has been unable to locate any that might fit that description, so evidently those are among the things that were successfully expurgated from the record. What remains, however, is a vision of the Trinity in which God is the Father, the Holy Spirit is the Mother, Jesus is the Son, and the Church—begotten out of the side-hole of Jesus—is the daughter-in-law of God.¹⁰

Gollin additionally observes an elitism at play during the Sifting Period that collided with Zinzendorf's ideal of the equality of all churches.

Yet in fact it is clear that Zinzendorf continued to believe that some churches were a little more equal than others, and that the Moravians in particular enjoyed an elect status because by virtue of their beliefs and religious works they were a little closer to salvation

than most.... Although the tendency towards this think of themselves as an aristocracy of the elect was most pronounced during the Sifting Period, it lingered on wherever Moravian missionaries espoused the belief that they had been especially chosen by God to spread His gospel among the heathen.¹¹

That Zinzendorf finally awakened in 1750 to the problems he had brought on the church and began taking corrective steps may have saved the Moravian movement from becoming a heretical cult. Nevertheless, the mark was made. A mental picture etched into a collective mind over a decade cannot easily be effaced.

The hasty sketch presented here certainly does not present the vital core of Moravian history but does show some major influences and sources for the conceptual imagery of the Moravians and provides a context for interpreting that imagery. The more specific context for the early Moravian experience in America is the subject of the next section.

Moravianism in Colonial America

The Moravian Emigration to America¹²

Motivated by the desire to evangelize the Indians and settlers in America, the Brethren at Herrnhut made arrangements establish their own colony in Georgia. Begun in 1735, the Savannah experiment was beset with difficulties from the outset. After five years of labor, just when the colonists were getting a foothold, territorial hostilities broke out between England and Spain. Caught in the middle and alienated from both sides because of their conscientious refusal to bear arms, they chose to leave their investment behind and cut their losses.

In a timely fashion, the English evangelist George Whitefield invited them to help him develop some land he had purchased in Nazareth, Pennsylvania for a Negro school. Later, Whitefield and the Moravians parted ways and Whitefield had to call off his plans in Nazareth due to financial straits. In 1741, the Moravians purchased a choice tract of land from Whitefield and built their first log cabin. By Christmas, Zinzendorf had arrived with a new group from Herrnhut. Moved by a hymn they sang as they worshipped together, Zinzendorf named the new settlement Bethlehem. While Zinzendorf busied himself trying (unsuccessfully) to organize a united synod of German churches in Pennsylvania, a group from London's Fetter Lane Chapel (a Moravian congregation) embarked for Pennsylvania. It was June 25, 1742 when the Bethlehem congregation was formally established.

Late in 1752, Bishop August Gottlieb Spangenberg (Figure 2) was dispatched with a party to search for a large tract in North Carolina. A plot was found and reserved, but due to the tangled spiritual and financial affairs of the church in the aftermath of the Sifting Time it was not purchased and settled until autumn, 1753. The tract was called Wachovia, an anglicization of Wachau (the name of an Austrian estate of the Zinzendorf family). The first settlement was called by the biblical name Bethabara (“house of passage”).



Figure 2 - Bishop August Gottlieb Spangenberg

Both Bethlehem and Bethabara became hubs of missionary and evangelistic activity, centers of Moravian socialization, and generally civilizing influences on the early American frontier.¹³ In 1766, work was begun in Wachovia toward the building of Salem, and within six years Salem had achieved preeminence over Bethabara. The establishment of Bethlehem marks the beginning of Moravian community building in America, while the founding of Salem marks the beginning of the end of that practice.

Two names must be remembered relative to the Moravian experience in colonial America. The one is, of course, Zinzendorf, who exerted a profound sway over his far-flung movement, not only through direct leadership and preaching, but in no small measure through his

prolific hymn-writing as well. The other name is that of Spangenberg, the architect of Moravian communal life in America.

It is to the structure of that communal life and the often poetic imagery that undergirds it that this study now turns.

Moravian Communal Life

Moravian life during the colonial period was governed by three types of structures: the choirs, the *oeconomie*, and the broad area of rites and customs.¹⁴

The choir system does not refer to music but to the organization of the community into small groups. The practice began in Herrnhut with “bands” or classes that segregated the married couples, single men, and single women. The original intent was to foster religious fervor without the distraction—or “pollution”—of sexual attraction.¹⁵ In the course of time the bands were expanded to choirs that covered the whole community and encompassed economic and social functions as well as religious ones.

The choirs governed the upbringing of children, assignment and training in an occupation, distribution of necessities, and at the same time were basic to spiritual instruction, fellowship, and communal discipline. Each choir had its own dwelling place, meetings, structures, tasks, and even its own hymns. Underlying the choir system was an egalitarian model. Gollin notes how the system ironically worked so well to fulfill its goals that it undermined the communal economy. Essentially taking the place of the family, it trained its children for leadership and the professions but not to be followers and to work at the humbler but necessary occupations.¹⁶

The *oeconomie* was developed by Spangenberg to enable a small group of inexperienced settlers to meet the vicissitudes of frontier life. The communal economy was not demanded by religious convictions but by practical necessity. Spangenberg himself admitted it was a provisional situation, and it would have ended sooner than it did for both Bethlehem and Wachovia had not Indian wars and outbreaks of typhus set back community progress. By the end of the colonial period, the *oeconomie* of Bethlehem had already been dissolved, and that in Wachovia had been replaced by a kind of socialism. Nevertheless, there were two Moravian spiritual values reflected in the provisional *oeconomie*, one having to do with the self-identity of the community as a family and the other with an ethic in which work is the purpose of living.¹⁷

What is most instructive about the early Moravian way of thinking, however, is the accumulation of rites, customs, and jargon peculiar to the communes. Noteworthy among the religious practices of the *Gemeine* or congregation were the *Singstunden* and the love feasts. Love feasts usually consisted of a song service and a simple meal such as bread and coffee. They were held on all sorts of occasions: work-related events, fellowship among the choirs, the comings and goings of missionaries and friends, and relations with outsiders (*Fremden*, strangers). Zinzendorf, for example, recommended that the Bethlehem settlers invite all the neighbors in the district to a love feast, there to politely inform them that the congregation considered itself autonomous and not participatory in the duties of the neighborhood.¹⁸

The *Singstunde* was a song service in which stanzas were selected by the leader around some theme. *Fremden Stunden* were also held, usually services in English, for visitors. These were kept separate from the *Gemeine Stunden*.

The Moravians kept daily devotions with texts chosen from the Old and New Testaments. During the peak of the Sifting Time extremes these texts probably were abused in the manner of a horoscope (it is known that Zinzendorf personally was given to bibliomancy at this time), but by far the common and accepted usage of them was pietistic, not superstitious.

The most controversial practice of the Brethren was the use of the lot to make decisions. It was used both within the local community, and also from Herrnhut in passing decisions binding upon the American communities. Zinzendorf highly favored this form of decision making and used it routinely, whereas Spangenberg tended to restrict the lot to particular situations. Theoretically it was only to be used if there was no way to arrive at a decision otherwise, but in practice—especially during the Sifting Time—the lot was drawn for any and every sort of decision. Behind the use of lots was a mistrust of rationality and sophisticated principles of decision making. Dependence upon the lot represented a reinforcement of the value of childlikeness.

There is one point that must not be missed if the rites of the community are to be properly interpreted: their pervasiveness throughout the whole of everyday life. Gollin drives this point home:

Religious ritual was so interwoven with communal decision making that it becomes almost impossible to make a clear-cut distinction between sacred and secular activity. The recourse to the lot, whereby God was expected to give his final verdict in a matter of communal policy, was clearly indicative not merely of a specific type of political

authority but also of the penetration of religious ritual into all major communal decisions.¹⁹

In other words, the community viewed itself as, ideally, a theocracy not different in kind from that of Leviticus. A century later this was not the case. Whereas the religious rituals of the Moravians suffered little change (except for the demise of the lot), over a period of time they gradually became the markers of their religious life but did not rule over the whole of their lives the same way.

Theological Language and Imagery in the Moravian Colonies

Thus far we have considered the historical and geographical context of Moravian theological expression. In this section we have arrived at our central focus, the language and imagery itself, drawn from congregational diaries and hymns from the colonial period. Specifically, we are looking for the kinds of language the Moravians used not only to communicate their message to the outside world, but also to keep alive their spiritual aspirations within the group. Our purpose is to see how the Moravian manner of expression both reflected and shaped Moravian spirituality.

Some organizing principle is necessary in presenting material like this. Here it will be arranged as it relates to the theological themes of God, Christ, the Holy Spirit, the Church, and the Christian Life. One problem encountered in a study such as this is arriving at a cutoff point. Research even within a narrow scope of sources has produced mounds of data, yet after a certain point the information becomes repetitive. The reader may assume that those citations given here are typical modes of expression regarding a theme unless otherwise noted.

Imagery Related to God

The theology of Zinzendorf and of the Moravians he led is a concept of a God who is so transcendent and exalted that man's rational and logical attempts to comprehend Him are futile.

There is nothing more dangerous or useless than a little brain, filled with thoughts about theology, trying to penetrate the godhead.... For if [the angels] were able to penetrate the godhead and were to focus even briefly upon the progression of eternity, they would go mad in their own way. That is how infinite and endlessly beyond the comprehension of all living creatures is the divine.²⁰

It stands to reason, then, that if God is so thoroughly incomprehensible there would probably be relatively little theocentric imagery in religious practice. That appears to be the case. God as

God, or the Father as First Person in the Trinity, is not heavily stressed in Moravian theological expression.

God is spoken of in what amounts to formal language. Though God is not impersonal or uncaring but “Him who loves souls,” He is distant, the One who “sits above.” “High on His everlasting throne The King of saints His work surveys,” says a hymn by Spangenberg. He gives providential care and protection, generally by dispatching His angels, though sometimes there are tragedies and His providences are hard to understand.²¹ In sum, the overall imagery is monarchical. The patriarchal imagery that Zinzendorf also developed does not appear in the colonial materials.

Imagery Related to Christ

In contrast to the Spartan and pedantic language the Moravians employed toward God, their Christocentric expressions are multiform and colorful. It is not fair to regard them as Christo-unitarian, but it is certainly understandable how the casual observer might get that impression as a brief cross-section of representative references reveals.

If the Father is the distant God Transcendent, Christ is the close-by God Imminent. This is more than a confessional stance for the Moravians. They revel in this reachable deity. He is Jehovah in Isaiah 6, and angels fall prostrate in worship of Him. He is the Creator-Redeemer. He is Love in person. He is nevertheless condescending and self-humbling. In Zinzendorf’s Bethlehem Christmas hymn, “Yon dirty child in rags and cast-off clothes is God with us.”²²

In relation to the Church, Christ is the Head indeed, but His headship seems to be understood as of an official rather than organic nature: “Head and Master of Thy congregation.” Likewise, the term “High Priest” in Moravian usage seems to have more to do with Christ’s rule over the Church than with His sacrifice. In 1741, Christ was declared through the lot to be the Chief Elder of the *Gemeine*, and ever afterward that epithet was a favorite; it is ubiquitous in the Moravian literature. The Moravians also favored the Bridegroom image, although the sensuality of the Sifting Time has been thoroughly expunged from its use in later generations.²³

Beyond all question, the Moravians held a strong affinity for Christ as the Lamb of God. References could be multiplied at this point. As expressive as any are the words of Joseph Hart: “Suffering Saviour, Lamb of God, How has Thou been used; With God’s sin-avenging rod Soul and body bruised.”²⁴

The extremes of the early Moravian preoccupation with Christ's sufferings has already been noted. Consider this passage from the Litany of the Wounds:²⁵

From all self-righteousness;
 From all lack of discipline;
 From all unbloodied grace;
 From hearts that have not been bled upon;
 From indifference to your wounds;
 From estrangement from your cross;
 From being weaned from your side;
 From unanointed gossip about the blood;
 From eternal mortal sin;
Preserve us, dear Lord God

Zinzendorf seems to present a ransom doctrine of atonement, but at the same time the piety he fostered among the Moravians tended toward an emotional/moral influence doctrine.²⁶

Beyond the wounded and suffering Lamb motif, there is also a *Christus Victor* theme in the Moravian piety of that period, although the latter is far outweighed by the former. There are hymns that portray Christ blasting rocks and tombs away in resurrection and exaltation, the "Great Conqueror" over man's foes, which include "Hell's host," "sin's chain," and "death, His captive."²⁷ There are too many other subordinate Christological themes to list individually (from the hundreds of hymns alone), but the common element is that they represent the benefit of Christ to man: Friend, Source of beauty, Healer of souls, Treasure, Guiding Star, etc.

Imagery Related to the Spirit and the Church

If God the Father is distant in Moravianism, the Holy Spirit, for all his recognized activity in the congregation, is almost obscure as to His Person. He is a functional Helper to Christ, the Teacher of the Christian. He is the "mighty, quickening" Spirit, and He is a blessing to be received by man. "Now send the promised unction down, and all our hearts inspire"; and, "Oh pour upon us, holy Lord, unceasing showers of heavenly grace."²⁸

Zinzendorf's vision of the Church was as a universal body, not local and certainly not sectarian. Where did that place his Moravian flock? Zinzendorf worked diligently, even stubbornly to establish the Moravians as an *ecclesiolae in ecclesia*, little churches within the Church; but neither the imagery nor the reality kept up with the ideal. One of the hindrances to the ideal was the remnant heritage of the Moravians whose very existence began as a gathering of outcasts. Their heritage nourished a long-enduring "little flock" mentality and the sense of

being but a small group in a large world. Still, they maintained a vigorous missionary outlook and an ideal also of “bearing fruit for the Master”; and unlike much of the contemporary charismatic movement to which they might be compared, they regarded the outpouring of the Spirit as more about power in witness than personal edification in their faith.²⁹ Evangelists and missionaries are called “fishers” and “warriors.”³⁰

The Christian life is first of all a childlike humility, as in Anna Nitschmann’s hymn, “My Saviour, that I without Thee can nothing do, rejoices me.”³¹ Therefore, the Christian life is one of childlike trust. Christian Grogor expressed it thus:

Lord, at all times may’st Thou within us find
A loving spirit and childlike mind;
And from Thy wounds may we receive the power
Through all life’s weal and woe, in every hour
To cling to Thee...
Like children, finding all our joys in Thee.³²

Again, for the Moravians the Christian life is a seeking after an experiential nearness of Christ, and especially the inward experience of Christ’s sufferings. A communion service, for example, is blessed and meaningful because “those communing became signally aware of our Lamb’s martyred body and blood.”³³

Finally, a Christian life of maximum usefulness to the Lord requires a baptism or outpouring of the Holy Spirit and subsequent dedication—absolute commitment—to the Lord’s service. In Spangenberg’s words,

Open the fountain from above
And let it on our spirits flow.
So shall our lives Thy power proclaim....
Open a door which earth and hell
May strive to shut, but strive in vain....
Oh multiply Thy sower’s seed,
And fruit we every hour shall bear.³⁴

Conclusion

Gollin summarizes the theology one meets in Moravianism in these words;

The Moravians never developed a systematic theology. One is thus confronted not with a logically cohesive body of doctrine, but with isolated fragments of dogma held together by force of custom.³⁵

If that is the case, how may it be possible to come to a conclusion regarding the meaning of the variegated imagery the Moravians used as they expressed their faith and spirituality? It is possible if there is a coherent underlying motive for the apparent nonchalance, or at least informality that marks Moravians theology.

For the Moravians, especially in colonial times, doctrine was something one experienced, not merely thought about and retained. It is not farfetched to see in Zinzendorf and the Moravians an early religious anticipation of the great Romantic Movement of the early nineteenth century with its sweeping reaction against all forms of rationalism. If this is the case, then, what is the image or conceptual model for this proto-Pietistic revolt?

This writer sees the adoption of childlikeness as the supreme Christian virtue as the key to understanding (if not harmonizing) the varied and sometimes contradictory elements in early Moravianism. By childlikeness is meant an eschewing of worldly sophistication, an embracing of deliberate naïvete as well along with a rejection of self-assertiveness. It entails an openness to being led, and consequently an openness to being duped. It explains how, for example, an empathetic fascination with the suffering of Christ could so readily be transformed into a grisly orgy of blood, sweat, and side-holes. Untended children are, after all, prone to go to extremes.

It is not suggested here that there are no other motives or dynamics involved. The conclusion to this study is the proposal that above all else in this world, Count Zinzendorf and those who followed him sought as their ideal simply and in simplicity to be dear little children of Jesus.

References

- Adams, Charles B. *Our Moravian Hymn Heritage*. Bethlehem, PA: Department of Publications, Moravian Church in America, 1984.
- Addison, William George. *The Renewed Church of the United Brethren, 1722-1930*. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1932.
- American Moravian Church, North. *The Moravian Manual*, 3rd ed. Bethlehem, PA: Times Publishing Co., 1901.
- American Province of the Unitas Fratrum. *Offices of Worship and Hymns*. Bethlehem, PA: Moravian Publishing Office, 1891.
- Beauchamp, William M., ed. *Moravian Journals Relating to Central New York, 1745-66*. New York: Dehler Press, 1916.
- Clewell, John Henry. *History of Wachovia in North Carolina*. New York: Doubleday, Page and Co., 1902.
- Dallimore, Arnold. *George Whitefield*, v. 1. Westchester, IL: Cornerstone Books, 1970.
- Davis, Chester. *Hidden Seed and Harvest*. Winston-Salem, NC: Wachovia Historical Society, 1959.
- Eller, E. M. *Houses of Peace*, 2nd ed. Winston-Salem, NC: Board of Christian Education of the Moravian Church, South, 1952.
- Fries, Adelaide L. *The Moravians in Georgia, 1735-1740*. Baltimore, MD: Genealogical Publishing Co., 1967.
- _____, ed. *Records of the Moravians in North Carolina*, 2 vols. Raleigh, NC: North Carolina Historical Commission, 1922 and 1925.
- _____. *The Road to Salem*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1944.
- Gray, Elma E. *Wilderness Christians: The Moravian Mission to the Delaware Indians*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1956.
- Greenfield, John. *Power from on High*. Atlantic City, NJ: The World Wide Revival Prayer Movement, 1931.
- Gollin, Gillian Lindt. *Moravians in Two Worlds*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1967.
- Hamilton, Kenneth Gardiner, trans. and ed. *The Bethlehem Diary, v. 1, 1742-1744*. Bethlehem, PA: Archives of the Moravian Church, 1971.
- Hutton, J. E. *A History of the Moravian Church*. London: Moravian Publication Office, 1909.

Levering, Joseph Mortimer. *A History of Bethlehem, Pennsylvania*. Bethlehem, PA: Times Publishing Co., 1903.

Moravian Church in America. *Hymnal and Liturgies of the Moravian Church*. Bethlehem, PA and Winston-Salem, NC: Moravian Church in America, Northern and Southern Provinces, 1969.

Schwartz, Edmund. *History of the Moravian Missions among Southern Indian Tribes of the United States*. Bethlehem, PA: Times Publishing Co., 1923.

Surratt, Jerry L. *Gottlieb Schober of Salem*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1983.

Von Zinzendorf, Nicolas Ludwig. *Nine Lectures*. Translated and edited by George W. Forell. Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Press, 1983.

Weinlick, John R. *Count Zinzendorf*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1956.

End Notes

¹ In order to prevent redundancy and needless multiplication of citations, the summary of Moravian history given here is a composite of several accounts that are in fundamental agreement. Sources include:

- American Moravian Church, North, *The Moravian Manual*, 3rd ed. (Bethlehem, PA: Times Publishing Co., 1901);
- William George Addison, *The Renewed Church of the United Brethren, 1722-1930* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1932);
- Chester Davis, *Hidden Seed and harvest* (Winston-Salem, NC: Wachovia Historical Society, 1959);
- Gillian Lindt Gollin, *Moravians in Two Worlds* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1967);
- J. E. Hutton, *A History of the Moravian Church* (London: Moravian Publication Office, 1909);
- Joseph Mortimer Levering, *A History of Bethlehem, Pennsylvania* (Bethlehem, PA: Times Publishing Co., 1903);
- John R. Weinlick, *Count Zinzendorf* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1956).

Specific references follow only for direct quotations or controversial interpretations. Edmund Alexander de Schweintiz's *History of the Church Known as Unitas Fratrum* (Bethlehem, PA: Moravian Publications Office, 1885) is widely acknowledged to be the first full and scholarly (and sympathetic) history of Moravianism. Its influence is heavy, especially upon Moravian historians. Unfortunately, that volume along with some other desirable primary and secondary sources was not available for the preparation of this paper.

² One book that has captured this spirit as well as any other is John Greenfield's *Power from on High* (Atlantic City, NJ: The World Wide Revival Prayer Movement, 1931). Published to commemorate the 200th anniversary of the Herrnhut awakening, it is a devotional tract relating the story of the baptism of the Holy Spirit that came upon the Moravian Brethren. Not only does it have the virtue of copious quotation from eyewitness source material, it also calls the reader, whether Moravian or non-Moravian, to harken to values represented in that awakening.

³ Ibid, 28, 15, 16.

⁴ Ibid, 14.

⁵ Ibid, 21.

⁶ Ibid, 29, 30.

⁷ Weinlick (198-206) has a good chapter focusing on the history of this period. Gollin (11-16) excels at relating the theological perspective and imagery. Hutton's abashed account (271-82) is also useful and interesting for a different, more Victorian perspective.

⁸ Weinlick, 45-55.

⁹ George W. Forell, trans. and ed. (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1973).

¹⁰ Forell, in his introduction to *Nine Lectures*, cites theologians who extol Zinzendorf's "lonely reminder of the maternal Person in God" (ix). In the context of the period, though, it seems more probable that the vaunted feminism of Zinzendorf's Trinity was actually an overstretched literalization of a sentimental metaphor, not a sublime insight into the Godhead.

¹¹ Gollin, 14,15.

¹² Sources for this section include Addison, Davis, Gollin, Hutton, and Levering. Additional sources include John Henry Clewell, *History of Wachovia in North Carolina* (New York: Doubleday, Page and Co., 1902); Arnold Dallimore, *George Whitefield*, vol. 1 (Westchester, IL: Cornerstone Books, 1970); E. M. Eller, *Houses of Peace*, 2nd ed. (Winston-Salem, NC: Board of Christian Education of the Moravian Church, South, 1952); and Adelaide L. Fries, *The Moravians in Georgia, 1735-1740* (Baltimore, MD: Genealogical Publishing Co., 1967).

¹³ For more on the Moravian missions to the Indians, see Elma E. Gray, *Wilderness Christians: The Moravian Mission to the Delaware Indians* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1956); Edmund Schwartz, *History of the Moravian Missions among Southern Indian Tribes of the United States* (Bethlehem, PA: Times Publishing Co., 1923). For original source material, see William M. Beauchamp, ed., *Moravian Journals Relating to Central New York 1745-66* (Syracuse, NY: Dehler Press, 1916).

¹⁴ Addison, Hutton, and Levering are retained as sources for this section, but Gollin is the most helpful. Also Fries (ed.) includes a glossary in each volume of *Records of the Moravians in North Carolina*, 2 vols. (Raleigh, NC: North Carolina Historical Commission, 1922 and 1925).

¹⁵ Gollin, 68, 69.

¹⁶ Ibid, 75, 76.

¹⁷ Ibid, 143-47, especially regarding the work ethic.

¹⁸ Kenneth Gardiner Hamilton, trans. and ed., *The Bethlehem Diary*, vol. 1, 1742-1744 (Bethlehem, PA: Archives of the Moravian Church, 1971), 80. We can see in the language and imagery of *Gemeine* vs. *Fremden* a tension between the universalist ideals of the Moravians with their insular sectarian practice.

¹⁹ Gollin, 20.

²⁰ Zinzendorf, *Jungerhaus Diarium*, April 4, 1758. Quoted in Gollin, 10.

²¹ *Records*, vol. 1, 610, 417; *Offices of Worship and Hymns* (Bethlehem, PA: Moravian Publications Office, 1891), no. 914; *Bethlehem Diary*, 143; *Records*, vol. 1, 154, 163, 322.

²² *Offices*, nos. 412, 545, 576, 605; *Bethlehem Diary*, 225.

²³ *Offices*, no. 1001; *Records I*, 370; *Offices*, nos. 231, 521; *Records I*, 320, 347, 394; *Offices*, no. 1062.

²⁴ *Offices*, no. 31.

²⁵ See Gollin, 13 for the German version.

²⁶ *Offices*, nos. 278, 206. See also *Records I*, 44, 595 and *Bethlehem Diary*, 47, 190, 227-28.

²⁷ *Offices*, nos. 234, 495, 895.

²⁸ Ibid, nos. 913, 412.

²⁹ Ibid, nos. 521, 519.

³⁰ Ibid, no. 512; *Bethlehem Diary*, 38.

³¹ *Offices*, no. 409.

³² Ibid, no. 523.

³³ *Bethlehem Diary*, 101.

³⁴ *Offices*, no. 914.

³⁵ Gollin, 9.