

“*Ehereligion*”: The Moravian Theory and Practice of Marriage as Point of Contention in the Conflict between Ephrata and Bethlehem.

PETER VOGT

The subject of this article is the role of a particular religious interpretation of marriage in the conflict between two eighteenth century Pietist communities in Pennsylvania, the Seventh-day Baptist commune at Ephrata and the Moravian congregation at Bethlehem. It is probably no exaggeration to say that Ephrata and Bethlehem were the most prominent religious settlements in Pennsylvania during the colonial period.¹ Both places were centers of an intense and well-organized religious life in the midst of a religious landscape marked by disarray, fragmentation, and neglect. Both places stirred the curiosity of neighbors and visitors alike and attracted considerable interest within the state of Pennsylvania and beyond.

It is interesting to note that in the Old Testament the names *Ephrata* and *Bethlehem* refer to the same place.² And indeed, the similarities between their eighteenth century Pennsylvania counterparts are striking. Both communities were an outgrowth of the German Pietist movement and each emerged under the influence of a strong charismatic leadership figure, Conrad Beissel (c.1691-1768) for the Ephrata commune and Count Nikolaus Ludwig von Zinzendorf (1700-1760) for the Moravians.³ Both groups established their Pennsylvania settlements on the basis of strictly religious principles, both practiced the community of goods, and both replaced traditional family structures with a communal form of social organization. Moreover, both groups cultivated mystical forms of piety and devotion that seemed highly suspect to the sober judgment of clergymen of a more conventional orientation.⁴ Both groups developed their own style of architecture, suited to their theological convictions and organizational needs, and both cultivated a distinct musical practice.⁵

Yet there were also some significant differences. The Ephrata community was essentially restricted to its local settlement at Conestoga, whereas Bethlehem was part of a much larger network of Moravian

communities on both sides of the Atlantic. Ephrata's spiritual life was heavily indebted to the theosophical tradition of Jacob Böhme; the Moravians at Bethlehem stood much closer to the Lutheran tradition. Ephrata insisted on believer's baptism, the Moravians held on to infant baptism. And most importantly, the members of the Ephrata community practiced a celibate life-style, whereas the Bethlehem Moravians placed a strong emphasis on marriage. For the relations between Ephrata and Bethlehem it was particularly this last point, the disagreement over the significance of marriage that proved to be a poignant and divisive issue.

Given the similarities and differences between the Ephrata community and the Moravians at Bethlehem, it is not surprising that both communities experienced initially a certain measure of mutual attraction, which soon, however, turned into a bitter and fierce antagonism. The conflict came to a head during the visit of the Moravian leader Count Zinzendorf in Pennsylvania in 1742 and resulted in the publication of numerous pamphlets in which each group condemned the other one in no uncertain terms as false, perverted, and deceitful.⁶ Space does not permit to discuss the external development of this controversy, which included among other things the ill-fated attempt of a meeting between Conrad Beissel and Count Zinzendorf. Our discussion will, instead, explore the substance of the conflict, which according to the report of the *Chronicon Ephratense* was "chiefly related to justification and the married state."⁷

The juxtaposition of the theological concept of justification and the idea of marriage in this quote indicates that the quarrel between Ephrata and Bethlehem was essentially a theological conflict. Human pride and issues of rivalry and power may well have been a part of it, but ultimately the conflict derived from the clash of two incompatible interpretations of the Christian faith. One saw marriage as a hindrance to full devotion to God; the other saw marriage as a vehicle for full devotion to God. For both sides nothing less than the question of God's truth and man's eternal salvation was at stake in this conflict, so that it is quite understandable that each group would assert and defend its position with such vehemence.

Since the perspective of the Ephrata community is the subject of an article by Jeffrey Bach (which follows), this discussion will focus on the Moravian position. What did the Moravians believe about marriage? What did the Moravian practice of marriage look like? And what was it in the Moravian understanding of marriage that was so offensive and scandalous for the members of the Ephrata community? In order to answer these questions adequately, it is necessary to note the place of the Moravian view of marriage in the context of the seventeenth and eighteenth century German Pietist movement.

Marriage, to put it bluntly, was a problem for Pietists, especially for those of the more radical orientation. If Christian believers were called to a

life of purity and total devotion to God, as the Pietists believed, how could they at the same time commit themselves to the social and sexual relations of marriage? This, of course, was a question that has plagued the Christian tradition from its beginning. It is related to a deep sense of ambivalence with regard to human sexuality, running from the Apostle Paul to the early church fathers to the Middle Ages to the Reformers and still being felt today.⁸

According to the patristic and medieval tradition, the passions of the flesh, especially sexual desire and pleasure, must be regarded as something sinful, as a severe hindrance on the believer's path to God. The remedy consists in the mortification of the flesh through various forms of ascetic practices, including celibacy. At the same time, the patristic and medieval tradition also recognized the positive meaning of marriage: It was instituted by God at the time of creation, it serves the purpose of procreation, and it keeps the sinful impulses of sexual passion under control. In the words of St. Paul's first Epistle to the Corinthians, "it is better to marry than to burn with desire" (1 Cor. 7:9). Moreover, the human marriage between husband and wife forms an image and a reflection of the eschatological marriage between Christ, the bridegroom, and his bride, the church. This thought is expressed in numerous passages in the New Testament, most strikingly in the Epistle to the Ephesians, which describes the fact that husband and wife become one flesh as a "profound mystery" referring to Christ and the church (Eph. 5: 31-32).⁹

This biblical understanding of Christ as heavenly bridegroom of the church and also of the soul of the individual believer had an enormous, albeit ambiguous influence on the Christian view of marriage. It served, on the one hand, as a theological justification for the practice of marriage. Yet it also rendered relative the status and meaning of earthly marriage by subordinating it to the ultimate goal of the heavenly marriage with Christ. It was thus conceivable for individual believers to renounce marital relations on earth precisely for the sake of their spiritual commitment to the heavenly marriage with Christ. If Christ is your true bridegroom, how could you possibly be married to someone else?

I have outlined these developments in the patristic and medieval tradition at some length, because here we see precisely the issues that had to be dealt with during the Protestant Reformation and in the Pietist movement. The Reformation response to the medieval heritage was to emphasize the goodness of marriage for the sake of procreation and to reject the idea that celibacy was a spiritually superior path. Luther's decision to marry was the clearest sign in this regard. Yet, the Reformers retained the negative attitude toward human sexuality, and marriage was, accordingly, considered to be "a refuge from the sins of lust and fornication."¹⁰ As a result, the ambivalence toward marriage and sexuality was carried on, and

the problem of marriage resurfaced again at the end of the seventeenth century with the advent of the Pietist movement.

Pietism as a historical and theological phenomenon is not easily defined. For our purpose it may be sufficient to say that it was a renewal movement aiming at the realization of “true Christianity” through personal conversion and the practice of piety.¹¹ Pietists sought to lead a holy and God-pleasing life, with every thought and deed conforming to the will of God. It is easy to see that this attitude would raise some serious questions about marriage. Did marriage really conform to the God’s will? And if so, what should be done about the evidently sinful aspect of sexual activity within marriage? These were serious concerns, which created for many Pietists a deep-seated sense of uneasiness about the conventional “worldly” practice of marriage. We might even be justified in speaking about a “crisis” of the concept of marriage in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century Pietist movement, which confronted the Pietists with the task to redefine the meaning and the practice of marriage in terms of their own spiritual and social ideals.¹²

The various Pietist groups responded to the problem of marriage with a number of different approaches, ranging from the espousal of celibacy to the deliberate integration of marital relationships into the larger framework of a community’s religious practice.¹³ The Ephrata community followed the first path, the Moravians the second. Both communities based their approaches on the idea of a heavenly marriage with Christ. But while at Ephrata the practice of marriage was regarded as unfaithfulness to the heavenly spouse, at Bethlehem the practice of marriage was considered to be a liturgical and quasi-sacramental celebration of the believers’ union with Christ. The Moravians called this distinctive religious interpretation of marriage *Ehereligion*, marriage religion.¹⁴ Two issues are of particular interest for our discussion: what specific theological ideas are contained in the concept of *Ehereligion*, and how these ideas shaped actual Moravian marital practices in Bethlehem.

The Moravian concept of *Ehereligion*, as articulated in the writings and sermons of Zinzendorf, combines various beliefs and ideas, which might be outlined in five points.¹⁵ The first and central idea for Zinzendorf is the familiar theme of the mystical marriage between Christ, as the heavenly bridegroom, and the church or the human soul, as bride. Like other Pietists of his time, the Moravians speak about Jesus as the *Seelenbräutigam*, the bridegroom of souls, or simply as *Mann*, husband. In addition, Zinzendorf believes that all human souls are female: “All Souls are Sisters, the Mystery he (the Saviour) knows, he has created all the Souls; the Soul is his Wife, he has created no animos, but only animas, She-Souls, which are his Bride, She-Candidates to rest in his Arms, and in the eternal Bed-Chamber.”¹⁶ Zinzendorf cites Isaiah 54:5, “your maker is your husband,” in order to

show that the mystical marriage is part of Christ's plan of creation.¹⁷ We are created, Zinzendorf says, "in order to sleep in His arms."¹⁸ In this way, the mystical marriage between Christ and his bride has a central place in the economy of salvation; it represents, so-to-speak, the culmination of what it means to be saved. The whole purpose and point of the Christian religion, and especially of the Moravian Church, is found in the great mystery of the marriage of souls.¹⁹

The second idea, closely related to the first, is the interpretation of the earthly marriage between husband and wife as an image of the heavenly marriage between Christ and the Church.²⁰ Human beings were created male and female in order to reflect the reality of Christ's relationship to humanity. "Because the Creator of all things [i.e., Christ] has chosen and created the human soul for his eternal marriage, therefore he has deduced an analogy of it immediately after the creation, and commanded that there should be a man and a woman, the man to represent his own person and the woman to represent the person of the church."²¹ The difference of the sexes, the fact that human beings exist as men and women, belongs for Zinzendorf to the created order and does not represent a result of the fall from paradise, as some of the more radical Pietists believe.²² Accordingly, the institution of marriage cannot be looked upon as being inherently evil or sinful, although Zinzendorf agrees that the human fall has tainted earthly marriage with sin and rendered the sphere of human sexuality shameful and dishonorable.

The third idea is that through Christ's incarnation the human sexual organs have been restored to their original dignity. According to Zinzendorf, the biblical account of Jesus' birth (Luke 2:7, Gal. 4:4) and his circumcision (Luke 2:21) demonstrate that Jesus was fully human and that his humanity also included the physical and sexual aspects. In making the condition of human sexuality his own, Jesus has removed the shame associated with the sexual organs. Thus Zinzendorf affirms: "I consider the Parts for distinguishing both Sexes in Christians, as the most honourable of the whole Body, my Lord and God having partly inhabited them and partly worn them himself."²³

With regard to the male genitals, he argues that the circumcision of Jesus has removed all blemish: "What was chastised by Circumcision, in the Time of the Law, is restored again to its first Essence and flourishing State; 'tis made again equal to the most noble and respectable Parts of the Body, yea 'tis, on Account of its Dignity and Distinction, become superior to all the rest; especially as the Lamb [i.e., Christ] would choose to endure in that Part his first Wound, his first Pain [i.e., the circumcision on the eighth day, cf. Luke 2:27]."²⁴

Similarly, the female genitals are made worthy because Mary has carried Jesus in her womb and given birth to him: "[Women] also have

blessed Bodies, in one of which the Husband of Souls has lain, in which he was formed, by which he was born, whom God has begot, and a woman suckled.”²⁵ Moreover, Zinzendorf draws a parallel between the vagina and side-wound of Jesus. While the brothers can relate to the “holy covenant member” of Christ, “the sisters have the clear image of the holy Side of Jesus, which was opened to him at the cross, and from where he gave birth to our Souls.”²⁶ In this way, both the male and the female sexual organs are sanctified by the incarnation of Christ.

The fourth idea is the distinction between “necessary feeling” and “sinful lust” which serves to resolve the question of how chastity may be preserved in marriage. As pointed out above, Zinzendorf believes that neither the institution of human marriage nor the reality of human sexuality, are objectionable, if they are considered in relation to Christ. Yet, at the same time there is no question in Zinzendorf’s mind that Christians are called to a life of spiritual virginity and that lust, especially erotic pleasure, violates the chastity of the soul.²⁷ How, then, can Christians commit themselves in good conscience to the intimacies of marriage?²⁸

The solution to this dilemma, according to Zinzendorf, is found in the fact that the sin of sexual depravity does not lie in any particular physical activity as such but derives from a person’s innermost passions and desires, from an attitude of unchaste sensuality. Neither the practice of outward celibacy, nor the gratification of sexual desire within the reputable bonds of marriage will cut to the root of such sin. Rather, human beings must receive a clean heart from Christ; they must be restored to their original purity and innocence by his grace. When this is the case they will be able to deal in a chaste manner with whatever is God-given and natural.²⁹

In the specific case of marital cohabitation, Zinzendorf affirms that there is a difference between what he calls the “necessary feeling” associated with natural activity and the “sinful lust” deriving from impure intentions. The “necessary feeling” represents a basic and natural expression of the body: “the union of a husband with his wife causes no other sensations than a hundred other of the most innocent *motuum vitalium* [movements of life].”³⁰ It is an un-reflected and inevitable primary sensation, not unlike the pain that one feels instinctively after bumping one’s foot. Lust, on the other hand, arises as a result of a active mental reflection on one’s primary sensations. This step, according to Zinzendorf, involves a conscious choice: “No man can evade the primary sensation of a matter, but he can well avoid the second thought and all the subsequent ones.”³¹ Thus, the practice of sexual union between husband and wife, if it is carried out in the spirit of innocence and single-minded simplicity, does not compromise the ideal of chastity.

The fifth idea, finally, refers to the ultimate theological basis and purpose of marriage, namely, to be a provisional liturgical representation on

earth of the heavenly marriage between Christ and the church in eternity. Here, Zinzendorf draws the logical conclusion from the biblical admonition that Christians should do whatever they do in the name of Christ and to the honor of God (Col. 3:17).³² For the members of the Moravian community, marriage, including sexual union between husband and wife, must be understood as a liturgical practice, as a form of worship.³³ Zinzendorf explains: “I do not understand the Conjunction of Sexes any otherwise, than in *Sensu oeconomico & ministeriali*, by Office, by Command of God, according to the Liturgy of a Sanctuary on Purpose appointed for it, called the Conjugal Bed, where two persons, of whom one represents for a time the Husband of all Souls, keep a daily Worship; and where among other Office-Duties and Church-Graces it comes to pass, that Children respectively are begot in the Name of Jesus, and conceived in the Name of the Church.”³⁴ In other words, the marital relations between husband and wife, especially their sexual union, form a sacred and liturgical practice in celebration, preparation, and anticipation of the eschatological wedding between Christ and the church.³⁵ Both husband and wife are performing a particular representational office, the husband serving as a substitute for Christ, the wife as a substitute for the church.

Zinzendorf calls this understanding of marriage sometimes *Prokurator-Trauing*, “procurator-marriage,” because of the husband’s particular role as a proxy for Christ.³⁶ The husband, Zinzendorf says, is “a Procurator and Vicar of Jesus Christ, in the most proper Sense, a Vice-Christ, as it were, and what he doth, whilst he conjugally embraces, towards the Existence of the Child, is to be looked upon as an Office of a Vice-God, and his Wife ought to regard him as acting in the Name of the Creator.”³⁷ The role of the wife, in turn, is to enjoy the friendliness, love, and care that her husband shows her in the name of Christ.³⁸

Given these understandings, it is not surprising that Zinzendorf considers the act by which children are conceived as a “majestic act” and cohabitation as a “sacramental activity” which sanctifies husband and wife and serves especially for the wife as a way to experience the presence of Christ.³⁹ Although the procreation of children is an important aspect of marriage, the practice of sexual intercourse is fully justified even if there is no chance for conception, and the marriage of childless couples is no less blessed and holy than a marriage with children.⁴⁰ For Zinzendorf the symbolic meaning of marriage outweighs all other considerations. We must note, however, that precisely because of this symbolic meaning, the practice of marriage on earth does not exist in its own right. It is merely an “interim-matter,” a provisional arrangement for a limited time that will come to an end when the mystical marriage between Christ and the Church is consummated in the millennium.⁴¹

Zinzendorf articulated most of these ideas during the 1740s and 1750s,

when the communal religious organization of the Moravian congregation at Bethlehem was at its height. There can be little doubt that his views had a profound influence on the shape and character of the settlement. Thus, our discussion will conclude with a brief glance at how the concept of *Ehereligion* played itself out in the actual practice of marriage at Bethlehem.

The first important point is that marriage for the Moravians was not a romantic affair between two individuals, but a practical matter for the whole community. Husband and wife were considered partners in the fight for Christ's kingdom, hence Moravians referred to marriage sometimes as *Streiterehe*, militant marriage.⁴² Usually the elders of the community decided about who would be married to whom, often consulting the lot in order to know Christ's will, yet the individuals involved did have the right to refuse.⁴³

Secondly, it appears as if newlywed couples would sometimes be instructed in intricacies of marriage, especially the sexual aspects, by a trustworthy and experienced couple from the congregation. Not much information about this practice has been preserved, but given the religious importance of marital relations it only makes sense that the community would provide ways and means to teach their young couples the meaning and the procedures of married life.⁴⁴

Finally, Moravian marriage and family life was to a large extent defined by the so-called choir-system, the organization of Moravian communities on the basis of subdivisions according to sex, age, and marital status, for example, the choirs of single sisters, married sisters, widows, single brothers, married brothers, widowers and so on. These groups were not musical choirs, but sub-communities of people in similar life situations who would have their own specific devotional life and would often live together in particular choir-houses.⁴⁵ In Bethlehem during the time of the communal economy (until 1762) this practice was carried to the extreme, so that even the married couples did not live together, but within their respective choir groups. Yet a particular time and place for private togetherness was apparently set aside for each couple on a weekly basis.⁴⁶

It should be evident from our discussion that *Ehereligion*, the Moravians' religious interpretation of marriage, played a central role in their theology and thus had a considerable influence on the structure and identity of their communities. In the case of Bethlehem, the ideal of marriage as a quasi-sacramental practice was one of the distinguishing marks of the community and was consequently met with various degrees of suspicion by other Pennsylvania German Pietists who stood closer to the ascetic tradition. In fact, from the perspective of the Ephrata community the concept of *Ehereligion* was nothing less than a scandal and had every potential to bring both parties into a serious and far-reaching conflict. For

modern observers this conflict offers a fascinating window into the world of eighteenth century Pennsylvania-German Pietists and their diverse interpretations of marriage and human sexuality. Each of the two positions, the affirmation of marriage at Bethlehem and the rejection of marriage at Ephrata, represented at its time for many followers an attractive theological vision. Today each continues to be of interest as an example of how a close-knit religious group dealt with the problem of marriage within its communal bounds.

ENDNOTES

¹ There is abundant literature on both communities. For Bethlehem see Craig D. Atwood, “Blood, Sex and Death: Life and Liturgy in Zinzendorf’s Bethlehem” (Ph.D. Dissertation, Princeton Theological Seminary, 1995); Hellmuth Erbe, *Bethlehem, Pa.: Eine kommunistische Herrnhuter Kolonie des 18. Jahrhunderts* (Herrnhut: Winter, 1929); Gillian L. Gollin, *Moravians in Two Worlds: A Study of Changing Communities* (New York, 1967); Joseph M. Levering, *A History of Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, 1741-1892* (Bethlehem, Pa.: Times Publishing Co., 1903); and Beverly P. Smaby, *The Transformation of Moravian Bethlehem: From Communal Mission to Family Economy* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988). For Ephrata see Gordon Alderfer, *The Ephrata Commune: An Early American Counterculture* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1985), and Jeffrey A. Bach, “Voices of the Turtledove: The Mystical Language of the Ephrata Cloisters” (Ph.D. Dissertation, Duke University Divinity School, 1997).

² See Gen. 35:16 and 48:7; Ruth 4:11, Micah 5:1; cf. Lamante M. Luker, art. “Ephrathah (Place)” in *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, vol. 2, 557-58.

³ On Zinzendorf see John R. Weinlick, *Count Zinzendorf* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1956) and Arthur J. Freeman, *An Ecumenical Theology of the Heart: The Theology of Count Nicholas Ludwig von Zinzendorf* (Bethlehem, Pa.: The Moravian Church in America, 1998).

⁴ See, for example, the account of Israel Acrelius, “A History of New Sweden,” translated by William M. Reynolds, *Memoirs of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania* 11 (1876): 17-468.

⁵ See Hans T. David, “Ephrata and Bethlehem in Pennsylvania: A Comparison,” *Papers of the American Musicological Society* (1941), 97-104. For the ongoing scholarship on Moravian music see www.moravianmusic.org.

⁶ See Peter Vogt, ed., [Nikolaus Ludwig von Zinzendorf] *Authentische Relation von dem Anlass, Fortgang und Schlusse der am 1. Und 2. Januarii Anno 1741/2 in Germantown gehaltenen Versammlung...* The minutes of the “Pennsylvania Synods” of 1742, reprint of the original Benjamin Franklin imprint of 1742 together with an eighteenth century English translation from the Moravian Archivs in Bethlehem, Pa., (Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1998), 139, n. 192.

⁷ Joseph M. Hark, ed., *Chronicon Ephratense* (Lancaster, Pa.: Zahm & Co.,

1889), 146.

⁸ See Michael Bauer, art "Sexualität, II, Kirchengeschichtlich und Ethisch," in *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1977-), vol. 31, 195-214.

⁹ See also Matth. 9:15, 25:1-12, Luke 5:34, John 3:29, Rev. 18:23, 22:17; for the Old Testament see Hosea 2:18, 3:1, Jer. 3:1-3, Ezek. 18:8, Isa. 61:10, 62:5, and, of course, in allegorical interpretation, the Song of Songs.

¹⁰ See Thomas M. Safley, art. "Marriage," in *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Reformation*, vol. 3, 18-23, here 19.

¹¹ On the Pietist movement see F. Ernest Stoeffler, *German Pietism During the Eighteenth Century* (Leiden: Brill, 1973), and Johannes Wallmann, *Der Pietismus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990).

¹² Cf. Willi Temme, *Krise der Leiblichkeit: Die Sozietät der Mutter Eva (Buttlarsche Rotte) und der radikale Pietismus um 1700* (Göttingen: Vandhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998).

¹³ On the understanding of marriage in Pietism see Fritz Tanner, *Die Ehe im Pietismus* (Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1952) and Gottfried Beyreuther, *Sexualtheorien im Pietismus* (München, 1963).

¹⁴ See Erich Beyreuther, "Ehe-Religion und Eschaton," in *Studien zur Theologie Zinzendorfs: Gesammelte Aufsätze* (Neukirchen Vluyn: Erziehungsverein, 1962), 35-73; Gerhard Reichel, *Zinzendorfs Frömmigkeit im Licht der Psychoanalyse* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1911), 171-92; Hans-Christoph Hahn and Hellmut Reichel, eds., *Zinzendorf und die Herrnhuter Brüder: Quellen zur Geschichte der Brüder Unität von 1722-1760* (Hamburg: Wittig, 1977), 296-303; Craig D. Atwood, "Sleeping in the Arms of Christ: Sanctifying Sexuality in the Eighteenth Century Moravian Church," *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 8 (1997): 25-51; as well as Tanner, *Ehe im Pietismus*, 90-179, and G. Beyreuther, *Sexualtheorien*, 30-61.

¹⁵ Many of Zinzendorf's writings are available in a reprint edition: Erich Beyreuther and Gerhard Meyer, eds., *Nikolaus Ludwig von Zinzendorf: Hauptschriften in sechs Bänden*, 6 vols. (Hildesheim: Olms, 1962-63), abbreviated *HS*; idem., *Ergänzungsbände zu den Hauptschriften*, 16 vols. (Hildesheim: Olms, 1966-1978), abbreviated *EB*; and idem., *Materialien und Dokumente*, 30+ vols. (Hildesheim: Olms, 1978-), abbreviated *Materialien*. The indispensable bibliographical aide is Dietrich Meyer, ed., *Bibliographisches Handbuch zur Zinzendorf-Forschung* (Düsseldorf: Blech 1987).

¹⁶ Henry Rimius, *A Candid Narrative of the Rise and Progress of the Herrnhuters, Commonly Call'd Moravians or Unitas Fratrum, with a Short Account of Their Doctrines* (London, 1753), 59, quoting in English translation from Zinzendorf, *Zeyster Reden* (1747, reprint in *HS* 3), 208.

¹⁷ See Zinzendorf, *Gemeinreden* (1748-49, reprint in *HS* 4), vol. 1, 123-24.

¹⁸ Ibid, 107.

¹⁹ See ibid, 106, and *Zeyster Reden* (*HS* 3), 207.

²⁰ See Zinzendorf, *Büdingische Sammlung* (1742-1745, reprint in *EB* 7-9), vol 1, 54, and August Gottlieb Spangenberg, ed., *Schluß-Schrift* (1752, reprint in *EB* 3), 136.

²¹ Zinzendorf, *Haupt-Schlüssel zum Herrnhutischen Ehe-Sakrament* (1755, reprint in *Materialien*, Reihe 2, vol. 24.2), 103.

- ²² Cf. Spangenberg, *Schluß-Schrift* (EB 3), 598-99.
- ²³ Rimius, *A Candid Narrative*, 57, = Zinzendorf, *Naturelle Reflexiones* (1746-1748, reprint in EB 4), 111.
- ²⁴ Ibid, 56-57, = *Zeyster Reden* (HS 3), 7.
- ²⁵ Ibid, 58, = *Zeyster Reden* (HS 3), 209-10.
- ²⁶ Sermon May 14, 1748, quoted in Hans-Walter Erbe, *Herrnhag: Eine religiöse Kommunität im 18. Jahrhundert*, (Hamburg: Wittig, 1988), 102, n.14.
- ²⁷ See Spangenberg, *Schluß-Schrift* (EB 3), 650-54, and Zinzendorf, *Büdingische Sammlung*, vol. 1 (EB 7), 328-29.
- ²⁸ This was Zinzendorf's own question at the time of his marriage in 1722, see G. Reichel, *Zinzendorfs Frömmigkeit im Licht der Psychoanalyse*, 175-76.
- ²⁹ See Zinzendorf, *34 Homiliae über die Wunden-Litaney* (1747, reprint in HS 3), 87-88.
- ³⁰ Zinzendorf, *Büdingische Sammlung*, vol. 1 (EB 7), 329.
- ³¹ Spangenberg, *Schluß-Schrift* (EB 3), 605; see also 159 and 367-68.
- ³² See E. Beyreuther, “Ehe-Religion und Eschaton,” 52.
- ³³ On the distinction between the practice of marriage within the Moravian community and the conventional practice of marriage see Spangenberg, *Schluß-Schrift* (EB 3), 603-04.
- ³⁴ Rimius, *A Candid Narrative*, 57, = Zinzendorf, *Naturelle Reflexiones* (EB 4), 111.
- ³⁵ The idea of *Ehereligion* pertained to the whole range of marital relations, not just sexual intercourse, cf. Spangenberg, *Schluß-Schrift* (EB 3), 609.
- ³⁶ See *Herrnhuter Gesangbuch* (1735-1748, reprint in *Materialien*, Reihe 4, vol. 3), p. 1755, no. 1843, 24, and Zinzendorf, *34 Homiliae* (HS 3), 84.
- ³⁷ Rimius, *A Candid Narrative*, 62, quoting from Albinus Sincerus, *Ungezwungene Heimleuchtung der bißherigen Dr. Baumgartischen unerwarteten und unbegreiflichen Beschuldigungen gegen einige Glieder und Schrifften der evangelisch. Kirche Mährischer Unität* (Frankfurt / Leipzig, 1747), 134. Cf. Zinzendorf, *Zeyster Reden* (HS 3), 207 and 209-11, and Spangenberg, *Schluß-Schrift* (EB 3), 608.
- ³⁸ Cf. Spangenberg, *Schluß-Schrift* (EB 3), 158; and Zinzendorf *Gemeinreden* (HS 4), vol. 1, 122-37.
- ³⁹ Cf. Spangenberg, *Schluß-Schrift* (EB 3), 304, 368, and 606-607, Zinzendorf, *Zeyster Reden* (HS 3), 211, and Hahn / Reichel, *Quellen*, 298 and 303.
- ⁴⁰ See Spangenberg, *Schluß-Schrift* (EB 3), 609, Zinzendorf, *Gemeinreden* (HS 4), vol. 1, 124-25 and 135-36, and *Zeyster Reden* (HS 3), 207.
- ⁴¹ Zinzendorf, *Haupt-Schlüssel zum Ehe-Sakrament* (*Materialien*, Reihe 2, vol. 24.2), 151 and 172, and *34 Homiliae* (HS 3), 83.
- ⁴² See Zinzendorf, *Büdingische Sammlung*, vol. 2 (EB 8), 256, and Hahn / Reichel, *Quellen*, 298.
- ⁴³ On the use of the lot see see Hahn / Reichel, *Quellen*, 246-49.
- ⁴⁴ See Zinzendorf, *Kurze, zuverlässige Nachricht* (1757, reprint in EB 6), 53-54; *Naturelle Reflexiones* (EB 4), Beylage 128; and Spangenberg, *Schluß-Schrift* (EB 3), 369-70 and 433. See also Craig D. Atwood, “Zinzendorf's 1749 Reprimand to the Brüdergemeine,” *Transactions of the Moravian Historical Society* 29 (1969): 59-84,

here 77, and G. Beyreuther, *Sexualtheorien*, 51-58.

⁴⁵ On the choir system see Erbe, *Bethlehem*, 35-47, and Hahn / Reichel, *Quellen*, 250-58. Bethlehem was organized as a regular Moravian congregation in 1742, but differed from other congregations by a higher level of communal organization, including a communal economy, which lasted until 1762.

⁴⁶ See Erbe, *Bethlehem*, 39, n. 173.