

Beyond Beeswax Candles and Lovefeast Buns: The Role of History in Finding a Moravian Identity

Paul Peucker

Adapted from the Walter Vivian Moses Lecture in Moravian Studies, October 9, 2008

Recently I heard about an initiative by a group of Moravians hoping to encourage area newcomers to visit the Moravian Church. They decided to go into the neighborhoods where the newcomers lived, dress up in historic Moravian costume, light lanterns, sing Moravian hymns, and tell the people about the Moravian Church.

In another Moravian community programs are offered for the numerous visitors during the Christmas season, hosted by impersonators playing Count Zinzendorf and his daughter, Benigna. These “Zinzendorfs” bring the tourists the Christmas message as well as information on the history of the Moravian Church.

An article appeared in the *Raleigh News and Observer* of October 4, 2008, about several local churches dropping the name of their denomination. One of them was Christ the King Moravian Church in Durham, who had recently changed the sign on their building to simply “Christ the King.” The Moravian minister was quoted as saying: “We don’t want unchurched people to stumble over the name Moravian, when we are trying to introduce them to Christ the King. We want them to

meet the Lord and we want them to meet us, His church. After that we are delighted to let them know about some great Moravian church history.” In other words: First we need to get them in the doors, and then we will tell them all about our history!

I am sure you are familiar with this phenomenon: History is used to explain what the Moravian Church is and what it stands for. History is so much a part of the identity of the Moravian Church that it comes naturally to a Moravian, when asked about the present, to speak about the past.

Moravians can also be protective of their history. Not too long ago a scholar was scheduled to visit Bethlehem to speak about Moravian history in the 1740s. Before the arrival of the speaker I was approached by several people who were concerned about the lecture: Would the audience understand the speaker’s remarks on Moravian faith and practice during those controversial years? Would people think Moravians still adore the blood and wounds of Christ and continue to make decisions by drawing the lot? It was my impression that

Dr. Paul Peucker is archivist of the Moravian Church, Northern Province. He has published various books and articles on the history of the Moravians and is editor of the Journal of Moravian History.

the critics feared the lecture could harm the romanticized image of the Moravians with their candlelight services, trombone music and lovefeast buns.

I have experienced this protective attitude in my own field as well. Archivists can sometimes be hesitant to give “outsiders” access to records from the blood and wounds era or from the Sifting Time, or even records of controversial times in the more recent past. There seems to exist an underlying worry: What will people think of us? For some reason, we Moravians believe that a blemish on our history can tarnish our identity.

Moravians are proud of their history, their unique customs and traditions. Moravians also define themselves, to a large extent, by their history.

How much is this true of other Christian denominations? How does a Roman Catholic describe her church? Does a Lutheran give us a brief biography of Martin Luther when asked to explain his church affiliation? Does a Lutheran or a Catholic really care when a scholar uncovers an embarrassing fact from their history?

In this article I will argue that history has played a defining role from the beginning of the renewed Moravian Church. Moravians have consciously used history to create and construct a common identity. They have cultivated their Moravian identity by pursuing a culture of remembrance.

In the first part of the article I will look at how Moravians used history, how they

perceived history, and how they changed their historical narrative to adjust to new situations.

In the second part, I will discuss what role history plays in the current Moravian Church. As we have already seen, history is still important to Moravians today, but there are also many misconceptions regarding Moravian history. I will argue that history can still be a vital element of our identity.

Part I: History and Moravian Identity

We are who we say we are. By the stories we tell and the background information we provide about ourselves, we determine our identity. Groups define themselves, to an important degree, through history: By remembering, sharing stories, and following rituals they construct a common identity. The emerging nation states of the 19th century used history in developing a national identity through educating citizens, erecting monuments, creating national museums, and celebrating defining moments from their history.

Let us consider the early years of Herrnhut; but first, let us forget what we know. Forget about how Herrnhut later developed into the center of a worldwide religious movement. Forget about how the founding of Herrnhut is interpreted as the renewal of the long lost church of the Unity of Brethren. These are parts of the historical narrative the Herrnhuters created for themselves.

With these elements removed, what do we see? We see the estate of a Saxon nobleman, Count Zinzendorf, who held a position at the

court in Dresden. The pious count wanted to use his estate for the extension of the Kingdom of God. He called a new minister to Berthelsdorf; he married a pious wife; and he allowed religious refugees, such as the Schwenckfelders from Silesia and Protestants from Moravia and Bohemia, to live on his lands.

The initial center of all this activity was the newly renovated manor house in Berthelsdorf. Zinzendorf and his wife spent much of their time in Dresden, where they met with like-minded people in their home. Zinzendorf believed the true church of Christ did not exist as an institution, but was made up of true believers, independent of their religious affiliation. Zinzendorf invited others to join him in his effort to extend the Kingdom of God. The Berthelsdorf estate, including Herrnhut, became a gathering place for pious people from all over central Europe.

What was the identity or self-concept of the inhabitants of Herrnhut in those early years? Elsewhere I have argued that they first tried to model their community on the ideal of the early Christian church.¹ When they discovered that the organization of their community was similar to the ideals of the Unity of Brethren, the Herrnhuters added another historical identity.

About two-thirds of Herrnhut's initial inhabitants came from Moravia and Bohemia. At least some of them had a notion of the Protestant heritage of their ancestors, but precisely how much they knew about the Unity of Brethren still needs to be investigated. I think it likely that Zinzendorf encouraged them to

learn about their past. Zinzendorf himself read a history of the Unity, written by Comenius, while he was traveling in Silesia during the spring of 1727. When Zinzendorf reported on his findings upon his return to Herrnhut on August 4, it was an eye-opening experience for many Herrnhuters, who saw many similarities between what had been accomplished in Herrnhut and what they learned about their own past.² Some refer to this as the "miracle of Herrnhut," although at least one skeptic called it Zinzendorf's "pious fraud."³

I personally don't believe in miracles, nor do I believe it was a fraud. There is a simple explanation: For both the Herrnhuters and the Unity of Brethren, the ideal of early Christianity served as a model. Therefore it is not surprising the Herrnhut Moravians discovered similarities with the history of the Unity of Brethren. I cannot go into more detail at this point, but the whole question of continuity and discontinuity between the Unity of Brethren and the Moravian Church would serve as a fascinating topic for another Moses lecture.

Important in this context is the fact that the Herrnhuters discovered an identity by looking at their own history. In the summer of 1727 the Herrnhuters found strength in their faith and in their newfound identity. It is no coincidence that the famous revival of August 13, the spiritual birthday of the Moravian Church, took place the very next week!

From then on the Herrnhuters believed God had renewed the ancient Unity of Brethren within their midst. The religious

community that formed on the estate of Count Zinzendorf had found an identity. Let us call this the “Moravian identity.” I would like to argue that this Moravian identity initially served external purposes and was used to obtain formal recognition from churches and governments. As the “renewed Moravian Church,” the Herrnhuters could work within the legal framework of an old and recognized church and refute accusations of separatism.

Internally, however, something more was required. As more people joined the Moravian Church and new communities were founded throughout the world, the church found it crucial to create an identity for its members. History was part of this process, along with traditions such as the liturgical rituals, the typical Moravian language, the Moravian dress and the choir ribbons, as well as the physical architectural design of the Moravian communities. By the 1740s all these elements contributed to establishing an identity for the ever-expanding Moravian movement. Here we wish to focus on the role of history.

An overview of festivals and holidays during 1743 lists 42 festivals to be observed within the Moravian Church throughout the year.⁴ Ten were related to events in the Moravians’ recent past. These included occasions still celebrated today, such as August 13, 1727 (the spiritual birthday of the Moravian Church), and November 13 (Elder’s Festival); but they also included events such as the January 17 “miracle festival, when Br. Israel was rescued on the rock” of the coast of Tortola in the Virgin Islands.⁵ The great number of historical

festivals is an indication of how the Moravians incorporated events of their own recent past into the church’s narrative. Sharing stories was a community experience. Those who heard the stories could relate to the events along with those who had actually experienced them. Thus these stories became a part of the collective Moravian consciousness.

Moravians were creative in the way they organized the celebration of historical events. Let us consider an example of how an experience by Count Zinzendorf was made part of the common Moravian narrative. During 1742 Zinzendorf stayed in Pennsylvania. He undertook several journeys from Bethlehem, visiting American Indians and settlers throughout the area. On one of his journeys Zinzendorf and his group pitched their tents in an area called “Wyomik”—probably near present-day Wyoming, Pennsylvania, in Luzerne County. This area was then deep in American Indian territory. Unknowingly, Zinzendorf had pitched his tent over a snake’s nest, and while he went about his usual business of writing letters and keeping his diary, the snakes came out of their hole and crawled around in Zinzendorf’s tent. However, they left the count alone and did not harm him.

This incident immediately became a favorite story, widely told among the Moravians. The message Zinzendorf and the Moravians imposed on the story was of course connected to the snakes. According to biblical imagery the snake is a symbol of evil. So when the snakes in Wyoming, far away from what Europeans

considered civilized territory, did not harm Zinzendorf, it meant that the kingdom of evil was succumbing to the kingdom of God. The story called to mind the “new heaven and new earth” of Isaiah 65, where “the wolf and the lamb shall feed together...and dust shall be the serpent’s food.” It also evoked texts in the gospels saying that a disciple of Jesus shall not be harmed by snakes (Luke 10:19; Mark 16:18). The story of the snakes in Wyoming became proof of the victory of God over the power of evil. They proved, too, that Zinzendorf was a true disciple who was on a mission from God as he travelled through the wilderness.

The story of Zinzendorf and the snakes was memorialized in various ways. In the Moravian hymnbook of the 1740s there are five hymns that refer to Wyoming!⁶ In 1747 the snake story was even the center of a public birthday celebration for Count Zinzendorf: During a lovefeast in Marienborn a painting depicting the story was revealed, and the events from five years earlier were recounted once more. Another painting of the Wyoming incident is known to have existed in London, where the main staircase of Lindsey House was a splendid display of various paintings representing the history and worldwide connections of the Moravian Church.⁷ One of those paintings depicted Zinzendorf and Anna Nitschmann inside a tent at Wyoming. Martin Mack, one of Zinzendorf’s travel companions, wrote a colorful account of the incident more than twenty years later.⁸ And in the nineteenth century *The Moravian* published an article entitled “Count Zinzendorf and the Rattle-Snake.”⁹ Through hymns, paintings, celebrations,

telling and retelling, the event passed into the collective memory of the Moravians. The story confirmed and strengthened Zinzendorf’s position as the Moravians’ undisputed leader as it became part of the common narrative of the young movement.

At the Moravian history conference held at Moravian College in 2006, Gisela Mettetele pointed out that church history for eighteenth-century Moravians was not a history of institutions and dogmas, but rather a history of lived faith by the children of God throughout the world.¹⁰ For them their collective history was comprised of the individual stories of numerous witnesses to faith, found in reports submitted by various congregations and in the memoirs of those who had died. By means of the *Gemeinnachrichten* or the “Congregational Accounts” these testimonies were shared with Moravians all over the world. The collective memory of the Moravians was truly global.

German historian Matthias Pohligh argues that, in addition to dogma and theology, memory constitutes the identity of a religious group.¹¹ Pohligh studied the role of history among German Lutherans during the period following Luther’s death in 1546 through the first centennial celebration of the Reformation in 1617. His findings show intriguing parallels with the Moravians and how they formed their identity 150 years later. Pohligh found that church history played an important role in defining Lutheranism in the decades after Luther’s death. It also helped establish boundaries by condemning deviations from

true teachings. Another interesting parallel is how 17th-century Lutherans upheld the idea that the Reformation did not institute a new religion, but restored an old one. Moravians, too, claimed that theirs was not a new church, but an ancient church renewed.

Zinzendorf died in 1760. A few months later the Herrnhut elders considered placing a memorial plaque for him in the Herrnhut *Saal*.¹² This monument was never realized, but the deliberations indicate that Moravians felt that an important phase in the life of their church had come to an end and a new period was about to begin. Moravians began to reflect upon and write about their history, producing a history of their mission enterprises, a biography of Count Zinzendorf, and a history of the Moravian Church.

Following Zinzendorf's death Moravians began to reinvent themselves. No longer the radical Pietists of earlier years, they became the "quiet in the land" (Ps. 35:20). Most of their theological ideas were toned down; theologically not much separated Moravians from the Lutherans anymore. History now played an even more important role in Moravian identity. When dogma and theology no longer defined Moravian confessional identity, Moravians had to rely on their distinctive liturgical forms, their traditions, and, foremost, on their history.

Moravians began to develop an elaborate culture of remembrance. At each funeral a biography of the deceased was read to the congregation, taking the listener back through time. As part of the Easter morning sunrise

service members who had died during the past year were remembered. Each Moravian cemetery or "God's Acre" exhibited hundreds of monuments for deceased brothers and sisters, forming a continuous connection from the present to the past. Even the congregational settlements were living testimonies to the past, where Moravians could not escape their history. Moravians continued to live in what French historian Pierre Nora termed *lieux de mémoire* or "sites of memory," history-laden places such as Herrnhut, Zeist, and Bethlehem (to name but a few).¹³ This culture of memorialization was nourished by annual celebrations of historical events: August 13, November 13, the choir festivals, and the church anniversaries. And when the younger generation's enthusiasm for the church seemed to fade, a solution was found in the publication of historical books for the young.¹⁴

Although Moravians continued to employ the narrative of their past to define their confessional identity, the narrative did not remain the same, but continued to develop over time. In his eight-volume biography of Zinzendorf, Spangenberg consciously presented an image of the count not as he had actually been, but as Spangenberg wanted him to be;¹⁵ or rather, to use Spangenberg's own words: "nothing but truth, but not the entire truth."¹⁶

So when we say that history shapes our identity, this can also work in the other direction: Our desired identity can shape our history. We create the narrative that fits our self-concept.

An excellent example of this process is the American Moravian Church in the early years of its independence as a province. Freedom from any supervision by the worldwide Unity, as realized in 1857, was interpreted as freedom from the oversight of the German Moravian Church. In a time when America's self-confidence as a nation was growing, American Moravians tried to find their own identity. The narrative from their past was too closely interwoven with the German Moravian Church.

A speech by Edmund de Schweinitz is very enlightening in this context. In 1867 de Schweinitz addressed the American synod, which was meeting at Lititz, Pennsylvania. The title of his address was "The Historic Character of the American Moravian Church." De Schweinitz was worried about the American Moravian Church after the sweeping changes of recent years. The opening up of the congregational settlements to non-Moravians in the 1840s and the provincial independence of the 1850s had not resulted in a substantial increase in church membership: "We are in imminent danger of disintegration, of drifting in the wake of other Christian denominations, and of finally perishing amidst the absorbing strength of their under-current."¹⁷ Since Moravians did not differ theologically from other mainline denominations de Schweinitz feared the Moravians were lacking a distinctive identity ("character"). However, de Schweinitz claimed that an identity could be found in history. The history de Schweinitz wanted Moravians to concentrate on was not the German Moravian history of Herrnhut of the eighteenth century,

but rather the Bohemian history of earlier years: "We pass by the associations that blossom around the Hutberg of Saxony, not in the spirit of disdain, but with sincere veneration, and go back beyond the times of Christian David and Zinzendorf and Spangenberg, to the days of those Bohemian fathers who were gathered, four centuries ago, as we are met now, to deliberate on Zion's peace and Zion's prosperity."¹⁸ Like earlier generations, de Schweinitz proposed to use history in defining the identity of the church; but de Schweinitz differed from earlier generations in which aspects of Moravian history he deemed useful:

From these fathers we derive that historic character which we may lawfully assume in the future. It is in harmony with our present position in the United States, and it is just what we require in order to render that position strong and practically available in our labors for Christ....

It will promote unity among us, preserve us from disintegration, keep off from our altars strange fire, create a common tendency, a harmonious aim, and, by the blessing of our fathers' God, crown our work with abounding success.¹⁹

History can shape our identity, and concurrently, our desired identity can shape our history. History is part of the Moravian confessional identity. This is especially important for a church that does not have a distinctive dogmatic identity.

Customs and traditions are also part of a common history. A group observing traditions

believes it is linked to the past, when earlier generations observed the same (or similar) traditions. Moravians had a wide array of traditions that were observed by fellow Moravians around the world. Observing traditional customs is a practical way of engaging in historical discourse. They could be old traditions such as the reading of the Daily Texts, the distribution of lighted candles during the Christmas Eve service, or the use of particular hymns and choir anthems. New traditions also developed: A prime example is the Advent star that began to advance throughout the Moravian world in the early twentieth century.

Hedwig Richter has pointed out in the *Journal of Moravian History* how traditions were invented during times of crisis. Following World War II, when the Cold War was at its height, the 1957 general synod of the Moravian Church introduced the Unity Prayer Watch. It followed the example of the 18th-century hourly intercession and was intended to be observed by Moravians around the world.²⁰

Such invented traditions serve to create and to strengthen a common bond for Moravians worldwide. By drawing on the past, the prayer watch appealed to the collective memory of the Moravians. The founders of the Unity Prayer Watch took a part of the usable past and made it useful for the future.

Part II: Moravian History Today

History can be useful, but it can also be problematic. Not all Moravians are as “history-minded” as I would wish them to be. On the other hand, sometimes a preoccupation with history is an obstacle to facing the challenges

of the day and moving forward. History can also keep us captive and suffocate us; there are many misconceptions about the meaning of Moravian history.

As part of my previous position as Unity archivist in Herrnhut, I was responsible for publishing a new calendar every year. The calendar included a selection of images from the archives: beautiful, decorative portraits, views, and maps from the 18th and 19th centuries. More than once I was criticized for using images from the past: Would it not be better to compile a calendar depicting, for example, current missionary work of the church? My response: I had no objection to calendars with contemporary images. Such endeavors, however, were not part of the mission of the Unity Archives. The mission of the archives is to preserve the historical heritage of the church and to make it useful for the present. Just as the church has a mission board, a seminary, and a publication agency, the church also has an archives responsible for preserving the records of the church. The work of the archives is not more important than that of the other agencies, but it is certainly not less relevant.

Skeptics sometimes fear that Moravian historians want to return to the theology and ways of the past. Dealing with Moravian history, however, does not mean the current Moravian Church should imitate previous generations. It is crucial to understand that the faith of our ancestors was fundamentally different from the faith of our contemporaries. The study of history cannot present us with examples meant to be copied in our own time.

Nevertheless, the study of history can teach us other things. It can explain where we came from and how we have developed over time. It can also reveal characteristics of the Moravian Church that still are relevant today: the emphasis on ecumenical ideas, the importance of song, the strong connections throughout the Unity—to name but a few. By providing a better understanding of the past, the study of history can help us understand who we are today.

I believe we need to study the Moravian past in its entirety. Some people are uncomfortable with the 18th-century Moravians' focus on the symbols of the passion of Christ. What later generations have dismissed as “repulsive blood and wounds theology” was, however, the heart of the Moravian experience during the 18th century. We cannot expect to develop a full understanding of our past if we study only the parts that appeal to us today.

We must also take care not to reduce Moravian history to nostalgia. That is what we risk if we limit our past to a collection of beautiful but peculiar customs, such as beeswax candles and lovefeast buns, *Haubes* and sugar cake. Nostalgia to me is the wearing of historical costumes, outrage about revisions to a Christmas Eve ode, or heated arguments about the correct way to make lovefeast coffee. Nostalgia can indeed strengthen the identity and the bond of a group, but not necessarily in a sound and productive manner. The group can become inward-looking and cease to be inviting to outsiders.

I do believe history can play a crucial role in the Moravian Church of today. Much has changed since the eighteenth and early nineteenth century, when the Moravian world was characterized by a strong unity and uniformity. As Peter Vogt points out in the *Journal of Moravian History*, Moravians of those earlier years exhibited a common identity because of a unity in organization and leadership and a unity of worship and faith.²¹ Today much of this unity is shattered. The Moravian Church is organized in autonomous and very different provinces. Unity of worship is a thing of the past, and there are great theological differences as well. It is as if diversity in worship and faith has become the new unifying factor: We are all different, with a different understanding of our faith, but we still are one.

What is the source of this unity? I would argue: To a large extent it is our common history. A common Moravian history will continue to serve as a unifying factor within the church, but the narrative will change and develop as we integrate the histories of the “missionized,” indigenous people into the larger picture.

In order to make good use of our history, we need to approach that history from several perspectives. This idea draws on the assertion by German church historian Albrecht Beutel, following the terminology of Friedrich Nietzsche, that there are three approaches to church history: monumental, antiquarian, and critical.²²

Monumental church history provides the reader with examples, models, teachers, and comforting narratives. History that serves

to create a common identity is monumental church history, according to Beutel. For Beutel this is a limited use of church history, because it serves only to confirm one's own theological and denominational standpoint.

Antiquarian church history focuses on details, and by doing so, it loses sight of the greater context. Details become so important that the larger picture is lost. Like other Moravian historians, I can plead guilty to this accusation, having once published an article with the title "The Eighth Notes in Gregor's Hosanna!"²³ At the Moravian History Conference of 2006, Jon Sensbach pointed out that one reason Moravian history is rarely acknowledged by general historians lies in the fact that Moravian historians are too preoccupied with the details of their own history.²⁴ I understand the importance of the bigger picture, and I agree with the call for contextualization. I also believe, however, that if we do not understand the details, we risk misrepresenting the greater picture.

Both an exclusively monumental approach and an exclusively antiquarian approach have their shortcomings. But Beutel agrees that both the monumental element and the antiquarian element are essential to the study of church history as long as a third element is observed: a critical approach. A critical approach to church history ensures insight into the limitations of one's own theological position; it provides historical knowledge and insight; and it liberates us, Beutel argues, to Christian agency (i.e. what we are commissioned to do).

History has a place in our church today. First of all, we have inherited testimonies from the past, and we must care for them. We possess a great number of historical buildings, records, and objects, and it is our cultural obligation to preserve them. We should also use this situation to our own advantage; our rich history can be made usable and productive.

Various church congregations of different denominations have learned, in their planning, that in order to fix current problems they must find a way into the future. Increasingly, congregations are turning to a method of organizational development that teaches the incorporation of past experiences into a vision for tomorrow. This method of "appreciative inquiry" is a tool for renewal and change. Appreciative inquiry aims at evaluating an organization's performance and increasing its effectiveness. It allows people to explore the stories of the past and to use the best and most valuable narratives to construct a hopeful image of the future.²⁵ Appreciative inquiry seeks a "usable past" that can be employed for defining a positive self-identity.

To me this sounds like something our Moravian ancestors understood well. Mark Lau Branson writes about appreciative inquiry on the website of the Alban Institute, a resource center for congregations facing the challenges of a changing society: "We tell and re-tell our own church's story and our personal spiritual autobiographies." Is this not something Moravians from the past were competent at doing? Branson also encourages people to look

at the history of their context: the stories of their neighbors and the local history of their city. This will result in “a congregation’s discourse about identity (who are we) and about agency (what we are to do).”

By studying and discussing our history, Moravians can gain a better understanding of the church today. This understanding will provide us with tools to move into the future—so long as it is based on something more than an idealized, simplified narrative of the past. We cannot perpetuate oversimplified tales about days gone by, or wallow in nostalgia. We need a historical narrative, grounded in serious research. We need the critical, scholarly element of church history that complements the monumental and antiquarian approaches. In our reflection on the past we need to continue asking critical questions, engage in dialogue with scholars, contextualize the Moravian experience and return to primary sources.

In the few years that I have lived in Bethlehem, I have seen how Moravian College increasingly uses Moravian heritage as part of its identity. For many years Moravian College has organized conferences on Moravian music, and it is now also co-sponsoring the conference on Moravian history and culture. Moravian College also offers an undergraduate course on Moravian history. Moravian history is becoming part of the identity of the college in an academic, non-denominational way.

It should go without saying that Moravian history is essential for the education of future Moravian pastors at Moravian Theological

Seminary. By reflecting on the past, by discussing the experiences of former generations, by critically analyzing the development of the church through the ages, and by asking questions to which no definite answers exist, we can train pastors who are capable of successfully leading our church into the coming years.

Long ago, Moravians used their historical narrative to construct a common identity. A focus on history has become a substantial part of the Moravian identity, but it does not stand in the way of facing today’s challenges. Critical reflection on Moravian history can be helpful in understanding who the Moravians were in the past and who we are today.

When we are firmly based in our past, we can face the future with confidence.

Endnotes

¹ Paul Peucker, “The Ideal of Primitive Christianity as a Source of Moravian Liturgical Practice,” *Journal of Moravian History*, no. 6 (2009): 7–29.

² Selections from the Herrnhut diary of 1727 are published in *Zinzendorf und die Herrnhuter Brüder: Quellen zur Geschichte der Brüder-Unität von 1722 bis 1760*, ed. Hans-Christoph Hahn and Hellmut Reichel (Hamburg: Friedrich Witte Verlag, 1977), 95–108.

³ Enrico Molnár, “The Pious Fraud of Count Zinzendorf,” *Illiff Review* **11** (1954): 29–38.

⁴ “Charnier, bestehend aus etwa 400 Stücken, daraus der Gemeinde ihre Kette von innen und aussen zusammenhängt” (1743), R.2.A.7.8., Unity Archives.

⁵ Interestingly, there were no festivals related to the ancient Unity.

- ⁶ No. 1853, 1857, 1902, 2201, and 2205.
- ⁷ Vernon Nelson, "Lindsey House Chelsea, Its Grand Staircase and Upper Saal," *Moravian History Magazine*, no. 30 (March 2008).
- ⁸ See William Cornelius Reichel, *Memorials of the Moravian Church* (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co., 1870), 105–106.
- ⁹ *The Moravian* (1861): 324.
- ¹⁰ Gisela Mettke, "Erudition vs. Experience: Gender, Communal Narration and the Shaping of Eighteenth-Century Moravian Religious Thought," in *Self, Community, World: Moravian Education in a Transatlantic World*, ed. Heikki Lempa and Paul Peucker (Bethlehem: Lehigh University Press, 2010), 193.
- ¹¹ Matthias Pohlig, *Zwischen Gelehrsamkeit und konfessioneller Identitätsstiftung: Lutherische Kirchen- und Universalgeschichtsschreibung 1546–1617* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007).
- ¹² "Bey der Gelegenheit wurde gefragt: ob wir ein Monument für den seligen Papa auf dem Saale errichten sollen? * ja. Das beste wird vermuthlich ein Monument von Messing mit einer lateinischen Inscription seyn." (It was discussed if we should erect a monument for late Papa in the church. [answer of the Lot:] Yes. It will probably be a monument made of brass with a Latin inscription). Minutes of the *Enge Konferenz*, Apr. 26, 1763, R.6.A.b.47.c, p. 145, Unity Archives, Herrnhut.
- ¹³ Pierre Nora, *Les lieux de mémoire* (Paris, 1984–1992).
- ¹⁴ [Jeremias Rislér], *Erzählungen aus der alten und neuen Geschichte der Brüderkirche. Der Jugend in den Brüdergemeinen gewidmet*, 2 vols. (Barby: Conrad Schilling, 1803–1805).
- ¹⁵ Gerhard Meyer, introduction to August Gottlieb Spangenberg, *Leben des Herrn Nicolaus Ludwig Grafen und Herrn von Zinzendorf und Pottendorf*, Nicolaus Ludwig von Zinzendorf. Materialien und Dokumente, Reihe 2 (Hildesheim and New York: Olms, 1971), vi.
- ¹⁶ Minutes of the meeting of the *Enge Konferenz*, Jan. 2, 1763, R.6.A.b.47.c, p. 1, Unity Archives.
- ¹⁷ Edmund de Schweinitz, *The Historic Character of the American Moravian Church* (Bethlehem: Moravian Publication Office, 1867), 11.
- ¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 12. The Hutberg refers to the hill near Herrnhut where the cemetery of the Herrnhut congregation is located and where many of the leaders of the early years are buried.
- ¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 13.
- ²⁰ Hedwig Richter, "De-Nazification, Socialism and Solidarity: Re-Establishing International Relations in the Moravian Church after 1945," *Journal of Moravian History*, no. 3 (2007): 7–29.
- ²¹ Peter Vogt, "Everywhere at Home: The Eighteenth-Century Moravian Movement as a Transatlantic Religious Community," *Journal of Moravian History*, no. 1 (2006): 7–29.
- ²² Albrecht Beutel, "Vom Nutzen und Nachteil der Kirchengeschichte. Begriff und Funktion einer theologischen Kerndisziplin," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* **94** (1997): 84–110.
- ²³ Paul Peucker, "Die Achtel im Hosianna," *Herrnhuter Bote* (Feb. 1997): 16–17.
- ²⁴ Jon Sensbach, "Searching for Moravians in the Atlantic World," in *Self, Community, World: Moravian Education in a Transatlantic World*, ed. Heikki Lempa and Paul Peucker (Bethlehem: Lehigh University Press, 2010), 35–53.
- ²⁵ Mark Lau Branson, "Ten Assumptions of Appreciative Inquiry," www.alban.org.