

Ephrata and Moravian Relations: The View from Ephrata

JEFFREY BACH

The main controversy between the Ephrata community and the Moravians arose over different conclusions drawn about marriage and sexual relations and concerning spiritual rebirth and justification (as Ephrata's own chronicle noted in 1786). Undoubtedly the personality conflicts of two strong, charismatic leaders like Conrad Beissel and Count Zinzendorf exacerbated the tensions. Both groups' quest for new members among the German speaking population of Pennsylvania further compounded the rivalry. This article addresses primarily the question of marriage and sex from the Ephrata perspective and secondarily Ephrata's different view of salvation and rebirth. The thesis of this article is that partly shared theological vocabulary concerning sexual desire and spiritual rebirth led to both mutual interest, and ultimately mutual rejection, as the two groups discovered they interpreted that vocabulary very differently.

Ephrata's conflict with the Moravians came to a head during the seven religious conferences that Count Zinzendorf called in 1742 in effort to bring unity to the Christian groups among the Pennsylvania Germans. Already the second of the 1742 conferences noted that the question of marriage and sexuality seemed to be the most divisive between Ephrata and the Moravians. Ultimately this proved to be true. However, the minutes of this second conference recorded the Ephrata representatives' satisfaction during the discussion that the Moravians were indeed not making marriage mandatory ("a carnal necessity"- *von einer fleischlichen Noth*). The Moravians simply recorded that they found the Ephrata brethren free from "the suspicion of the doctrine of devils."¹

At the third conference, held at Oley February 10-12, 1742 (O.S.), the differences over marriage exploded. The minutes from this conference show some restraint. But the polemical anti-Moravian treatises written from Ephrata

the following year make the conflict somewhat clearer, even through the biases of the openly hostile writers.

The third conference began with the Ephrata delegation submitting two treatises, one to clarify Ephrata's position on marriage, the other on baptism. The authors, according to Johannes Hildebrand, were, in addition to himself, Ludwig Blum, the music master, Friedrich Foltz (sic), Jacob Keller and the venerable old Heinrich Kalcklöser.² All of these men were householders, meaning they were or had been married, and had not entered the celibate male Brotherhood of Zion.

According to Hildebrand, the handwritten documents explained Ephrata's views of the difference between the state of marriage (*Ehstand*) and that of singleness (*ledigen Stand*). Similar contrasts appear in Ephrata's *Mistisches und Kirchliches Zeuchniß der Brüderschaft in Zion* (1743), which contains a section on "The Two Kinds of Estates in the Church" (*Von den zweyerley Ständen in der Kirche*). This work, which includes additional anti-Moravian tracts paginated and bound with it, reflects some of the views on marriage that these four men would have presented at Oley.

The passage contrasts the solitary state [or estate] (*einsamen Stand*) with the householder state [or estate] (*Hausstand*).³ At Ephrata these phrases were synonymous with celibacy and the state of the married people, or householders, respectively. This passage is by Ephrata standards very restrained in its discussion of celibacy and the marriage. This would be quite understandable if four householder men had primarily contributed to its content.

The passage acknowledges "two main estates, the household estate [*Haus=Stand*] and the estate of the solitaries [*Stand der Einsamen*]."⁴ The estates of the church prepare one to attain the teaching [doctrine] of Jesus Christ. With this much, stated in this manner, the Moravians could agree, since they also had single women and single men living as groups, and even married couples living separately in choirs.

Concerning the single state, the *Mistisches Zeuchniß* declares that it is "of great importance," because it is "not strangled by the yoke of this world" and because Jesus "can come near to such a one with His holy doctrine." The passage also warns against seeking worldly means to make up for that which is lacking (i.e. a wife) when one is in the single state. The passage gives none of the Ephrata view of the sexual nature of sin and the superiority of celibacy. This suggests that householders, rather than Conrad Beissel or members of the Brotherhood of Zion, contributed to this passage. Even the conference minutes report that Israel Eckerlin, head of the Brotherhood of Zion, met with

Zinzendorf at Tulpehocken during two days after the conference closed, and remarked that the manuscript from the Ephrata delegation was “too modest” [*zu bescheiden*].⁵

Concerning the marital state, the *Mistisches Zeuchnüß* quotes I Corinthians 7:21, exhorting single or married people to continue on in the state in which they were called to Christ. Ephrata acknowledged a “permitted, limited marriage,” and that it would be “an unthoughtful act, simply to reject such an estate,” because some people “simply are not capable of a higher estate.” The passage goes so far as to say that there is no prohibition against marriage,⁶ a suspicion that was frequently rumored against Ephrata.⁷ Again, the Moravians could have found agreeable aspects in such statements. Expressed in this wording, these statements seem to allow the importance of marriage alongside celibacy.

The same document, however, states that marriage was “introduced as an ordinance of discipline over fallen people.” Surely more shocking, however, was the assertion that “in the Church, this estate [of marriage] may be broken and dissolved,” and that in fact “it will be necessary for pious married people, if they want faithfully to progress in their calling, that this estate must be dissolved.”⁸ This would have scandalized Moravians, given that Zinzendorf saw lifelong human marriage as a reflection and sign of Christ’s faithful commitment to the Church. To suggest that a human marriage should be dissolved would have deeply troubled Zinzendorf.

This final point probably reflects some of the teaching in Conrad Beissel’s early treatise now lost, *Die Ehe, Das Zuchthaus fleischlicher Menschen*. Yet this passage in the *Mistisches Zeuchnüß* was far more restrained than Conrad Beissel’s views on celibacy. In a theosophical epistle printed in 1745, Beissel wrote to a woman concerning his understanding of sexuality. In the Genesis account in which God created humans in the image of God, male and female, Beissel wrote that this was “not divided but in one person” [nicht gezweyt, sondern in einer Person]. God created them male and female in one person [Er schuff sie ein Männlein und ein Fräulein].⁹ Beissel derived his position from Jacob Boehme’s image of God as possessing both female and male aspects in a balanced androgyny. Johann Georg Gichtel popularized this view among Radical Pietists on the continent.¹⁰ Hence, the Ephrata view of Adam being created fully in the divine image of God meant that, like their view of God, Adam possessed both female and male characteristics in perfectly balanced androgyny, free of sexual desire. This female dimension of God Boehme had personified as a heavenly female, the divine Sophia. Beissel adopted this vocabulary, following Boehme’s and Gichtel’s lead to indicate that Sophia was

intended to be Adam's spouse originally.

In contrast to the Moravian, and general Christian view, that God created Eve and instituted marriage in paradise, Gichtel sexualized the teaching of Boehme to portray Eve's creation as the result of Adam's sin. Adam desired a sexually differentiated mate as the animals had, and thus lost his divine androgyny and Sophia. Beissel drew on Gichtel in writing to his correspondent that with the creation of Eve, "the impure members of propagation, which did not pertain to the image of God, had to be revealed." Because of "the animal imagination of Adam to multiply himself according to the animal manner, they [i.e. the members of propagation] were attached and are therefore a disgrace to God and people." Therefore Beissel believed circumcision to be a sign of God's disgust for reproductive organs. In God's covenant with Abraham, "everything that was masculine had to be circumcised on this organ, to show that before God's holy eyes it [the organ] was a disgust." From this reproductive deterioration, Beissel concluded that, "the mixing of both genders [*Geschlechter*] is a disgust before God and people." Jesus Christ, the savior, was therefore born not of a sexual "mixing, but from a most pure virgin."¹¹

In Beissel's view, Adam was created originally without genitalia. Organs of sexual reproduction were added only after the fall into sin and creation of Eve. Whereas Zinzendorf found a positive value for reproduction in the human creation in the belief that Jesus Christ was fully human, Conrad Beissel taught that reproductive organs were no part of God's image or original creation. While Zinzendorf found in the circumcision of Jesus a sign of God's favor for gender distinctiveness in creation, Beissel saw it as a sign to assuage God's disgust for sexual procreation.

At the third conference, the Moravians in deference offered comments on the opening day that stressed not "the sacramental blessing of holy marriage," rather gave an exhortation "to all the children of God against all plagues of pleasure."¹² The term "*lust-seuche*," which I have translated as "plagues of pleasure" [rather than merely "lustful desires," as appeared in the first English translation], would have won instant approval from the Ephrata listeners. The term is common in Johann Georg Gichtel's writings as the flaw of married life. Small wonder that the Ephrata delegation added their "Amen." They would have interpreted the exhortation to avoid the plague of pleasure as instruction to avoid marriage and procreation.¹³ For their part, the Moravians surely meant merely to observe in marriage the kind of moderation that allowed for the natural responses that led to procreation, while avoiding the lustful speculation on desire that could, according to Zinzendorf, distort the marriage relationship. Hence, both sides could think they had found agreement in words that merely

reinforced their opposite opinions. Each side understandably thought later that the other was intentionally deceiving them.

Johannes Hildebrand wrote his own report of how the discussion of marriage at the third conference had ended in angry conflict. In his *Schriftmässiges Zeuchnüß von dem himmlischen und Jungfräulichen Gebährungs=Werck*, Hildebrand emphasized the restraint of the Ephrata brethren. He stated that the submitted manuscript intended initially to “show that we do not reject marriage outright.”¹⁴ However, according to Hildebrand’s *Gebährungs=Werck*, Zinzendorf declared that the Moravian practice of marriage was “much higher” than the views of marriage at Ephrata. Zinzendorf was accurate, since the Ephrata celibates deprecated marriage as only an intermediate step before celibacy. Zinzendorf reportedly said that, “If I were sleeping with my wife at just the time when I should die, I could say to the Savior, ‘I am coming from this work.’” By this he apparently meant he would have been about the Savior’s work at that moment. This would be fully congruent with Zinzendorf’s concept of *Ehereligion*. However, Zinzendorf’s statement would have scandalized the Ephrata brethren, just as their view that marriage should eventually be dissolved in favor of celibacy offended Zinzendorf. Ironically, the conflict from the conferences unfolded at exactly the time Israel Eckerlin was preparing married couples to separate and enter a new monastic house, Hebron (today’s sister house, Saron). It was designed specially for these former spouses to live in celibate orders of women and men.

According to Hildebrand, the Ephrata representatives publicly denounced Zinzendorf’s view on the spot as “error and heresy,” which it would have been to them. Furthermore, Hildebrand reported that they continued this debate privately (which may be the private audience at the end of the second day noted in the minutes). Zinzendorf allegedly broke off angrily, saying, “I want to have nothing to do with you.” When the Ephrata members attempted to report this to the gathered conference body, supposedly Zinzendorf silenced them, saying “I cannot bear to listen to this,” and wanted to leave the room.¹⁵ Clearly by the time the Ephrata members left the third conference, both sides realized how widely opposed were their views on marriage and celibacy, even with the possibility that Hildebrand exaggerated some aspects of the encounter.¹⁶

The second disagreement that ruptured relations between the Moravians and Ephrata at the third conference related to baptism. The four Ephrata householders had submitted a second treatise on this topic. The deeper conflict was not so much the debate over dunking versus pouring in baptism,¹⁷ but more over both sides’ concepts of salvation and rebirth. This disagreement

hinged on a shared core of the faith of both groups, namely the side wound of Jesus on the cross and its meaning.

Article 10 of the Minutes stresses that salvation consists of “conversion, the remission of sins” and congregations consist of “sinners who afterwards unite themselves to the honour and praise of the sufferings of Jesus.”¹⁸ Zinzendorf understood this through the Lutheran lens of forensic justification by faith alone, imputing the merit of Christ’s righteousness to sinners. Article 14 of the minutes of the third conference notes that “Brother Lewis [Ludwig] (as is known to everybody) confesses himself to be a servant of God from the Lutheran religion,” and has “inculcated the fundamental principles of this religion.”¹⁹ The side wound of Jesus and its blood signified Jesus’ redemptive suffering, which could arouse only the gratitude and devotion of the forgiven.

For the Ephrata brethren, the suffering of Jesus was equally uniquely redemptive through God’s grace, a point the Moravians, including Zinzendorf, consistently misunderstood. Conrad Beissel had been just as clear as Zinzendorf that no sinner could do any work to earn God’s favor. In fact, Beissel declared that any efforts to do pleasing works for God (what Beissel called the “first conversion”) must be condemned to death.²⁰ At this point, the death of Jesus on the cross became first a redemptive gift, and secondly a participate model by which the converted would follow Jesus in a life of renunciation. Especially for Ephrata, this so-called “second conversion,” or “mystic death”, marked the beginning of spiritual rebirth. Beissel wrote in another letter before 1745, “The cross of Jesus remains hidden until all righteousness is fulfilled under the law, until we are condemned to death as an evil-doer.” This mystic death “is much more painful than the death one suffers for sins,” for in this condemnation, one must “believe, trust God” alone. At last the sinner can grasp the redemptive sacrifice of Jesus Christ.²¹

For the Ephrata community, the side wound of Jesus represented the paramount gift of God’s grace, but with an interpretation different from the Moravian view. Conrad Beissel wrote, in the same letter on sexuality mentioned earlier, “We all receive our first mother again and are gathered in the open side of Jesus, and become again one unified person in Him.” By this Beissel meant that through spiritual rebirth, made available through Christ’s redemptive death, signified by his side wound, the gender aspects divided by Adam’s sin are at last reunited. “Our first mother” is the divine Sophia, who is the female divine aspect assisting in spiritual rebirth to unify with Christ both female and male aspects of believers. Thus “Adam’s wound is healed in the sleep of death of Jesus, and Adam and Eve are helped again.”²² By this Beissel alluded to the original sleep of Adam when God created Eve, which was seen

negatively at Ephrata as the sleep of sin, now reversed through Christ's redemptive death, a kind of sleep to heal sinners.

Johannes Hildebrand called attention to this same teaching, particularly in his *Gebährungs=Werck*. Mentioning Conrad Beissel's sermon on the topic of the "true" meaning of Christ's wound opened by a spear, Hildebrand wrote that he received a divine inspiration about Christ's side wound even as Beissel expounded on the topic. Like Beissel, Hildebrand saw the side wound of Jesus as a womb for spiritual rebirth. "Here in this side of Jesus Christ opened with the spear . . . is the heavenly virginal matrix opened again." This made it possible that "a spiritual, virginal person could be born again from the heart of Jesus Christ burning in love." Christ's "birthing work" from the side is spiritual, contrasting with the fleshly work of conception and birth from genitalia that are located on the lower part of the body, "where all impurity of the body makes its exit."²³ Beissel and Hildebrand differed from Zinzendorf in that they saw the divine Sophia as a co-laborer in this work of grace.

The other main departure from the Moravians regarding the side wound was that for Ephrata, the side wound of Jesus' suffering became the ethical paradigm for discipleship. As Hildebrand stressed, salvation led to sanctification evidenced in a life of mortification. This ultimately tied into the views of conversion, which both communities held. According to Hildebrand, the side wound is a "lovely comfort of all true disciples of Jesus Christ in his real footsteps of suffering and dying! Who give themselves free-willingly as pure, patient lambs to daily slaughter unto the complete mortifying of their old, animal nature." Without this "real way of suffering and dying" it is "impossible to come to God."²⁴ Therefore the suffering of Christ culminating in his wounded side, presented to the Ephrata brethren both the work of God's grace through rebirth, and the model of how to live their lives through ascetic self-renunciation. For Ephrata, the center of God's work was "healing" the divided genders that resulted from Adam's sin, and reuniting the genders in celibate androgyny.

The Moravians saw the cross of Jesus as a redemptive gift whose merit was graciously accredited to sinners, who would gaze upon Christ's work of salvation. Through devout imagination, believers might seek to enter into the scene of Christ's suffering. The Protestant emphasis on Christ's work usually meant that believers could do nothing. To the Ephrata brethren this sounded like grace was powerless to transform human conduct, "as if one could please God without sanctification."²⁵ For Ephrata, Christ's side wound invited mystical participation in his suffering through a life of self-renunciation. This sounded to the Moravians like believers working to earn God's favor, and not

trusting sufficiently the gift-like quality of redemptive death. Thus the central image for salvation, which both groups shared (Christ's suffering on the cross, epitomized in his wounded side) meant very different things to each.

This bore implications for their understandings of conversion, ultimately reconnecting to their conflict over marriage versus celibacy. Hildebrand stated the Ephrata saw rebirth as Christ's spiritual work that ended a believer's sexual desire. New Christians could come only through conversion, not through the infant baptism of children born to Christian parents. The polemical tract, *Unpartheyisches Bedencken* (probably by Hildebrand) noted that spiritual rebirth stands in stark contrast to birth from the flesh.²⁶ In contrast, the Moravian system of matching unmarried men and unmarried women, and of encouraging married couples to live separately in communal houses, yet come together for procreation,²⁷ seemed to be a total violation of spiritual rebirth as Ephrata understood it. Any allowance for the fleshly work of procreation to be a means for the church to grow could have no connection to rebirth. This was the "carnal conversion" (*fleischliche Bekehrung*) against which Hildebrand railed. Thus again, while both communities stressed the importance of conversion, its results led in two opposite directions. For the Moravians, it led to communal living that allowed for procreation without excessive lust among married couples, while child rearing was shared in the community. For Ephrata, conversion led ultimately to a dissolution or avoidance of the marriage bond and communal living in celibate orders of women and men. While Ephrata allowed families of married people with their children at Ephrata, the community clearly prioritized the celibate life.

The diverging interpretations of shared imagery led to harsh mutual condemnations. By the seventh conference, the Moravians could only say they hoped that the Lamb would "soon crush this Satan underfoot," referring to Ephrata.²⁸ The spate of polemical treatises from Ephrata the following year claimed that the Moravians were no church at all and had no trace of awakening among them.²⁹ In a letter to Hildebrand in 1742/3, Moravian further condemned the Ephrata people as "instruments of the devil" and "misbirths in the eyes of God."³⁰ Hildebrand responded in kind in another treatise on rebirth and sanctification.³¹

The Moravians claimed that Ephrata had spun an unbiblical web of speculation. The Moravians were partly correct, in that the Boehmist and Gichtelian building blocks of Beissel's theology included some speculations extraneous to canonical scripture, albeit with efforts at Ephrata to harmonize them with scripture. The Ephrata people claimed to be falsely accused, and they were partially right. The Moravians' charges that Beissel was creating

“works righteousness” simply did not take seriously Beissel’s insistence that the Law condemned all efforts at good works and conversion proceeded from Christ’s unique work of grace. The condemnations from both sides rested partly on misunderstandings of concepts and images central and beloved to both. Their shared devotion to the side wound of Jesus actually divided them because of the strikingly different conclusions they drew from it.

Conclusion

Both Ephrata and the Moravians grew out of the Protestant renewal movement in Germany known as Pietism. To the critical questions about marriage that surfaced around the turn to the eighteenth century, both communities made different answers yet found alternatives to social conventions of their time. Both groups were led by charismatic individuals, and at times competed in the same pool of German population for converts. Although Ephrata and the Moravians shared some important common convictions, especially in rebirth as the fruit of Christ’s suffering, they interpreted differently those seeming commonalities. After the conferences of 1742, the two communities were further apart, but better defined. Christian pluralism remained characteristic of Pennsylvania’s German settlers.

ENDNOTES

¹ Peter Vogt, ed., *Authentische Relation Von dem Anlass, Fortgang und Schlusse der am 1sten und 2ten Januarii Anno 1741/2 in Germantown gehaltenen Versammlung einiger Arbeiter dere meisten Christlichen Religionen un d vieler vor sich selbst Gott-dienenden Christen-Menschen in Pennsylvania*, in Nikolaus Ludwig von Zinzendorf Materialien und Dokumente, Series 2, Nikolaus Ludwig von Zinzendorf Leben und Werk in Quellen und Darstellungen, ed. Erich Beyreuther and Matthias Meyer, vol. 30 (Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1998), 31. The text has parallel German and English text.

² Johannes Hildebrand, *Schriftmässiges Zeuchnüß von dem Himmlischen und Jungfräulichen Gebährungs=Werck* ([Germantown: Christoph Saur, 1743]), 14. Kalcklöser had long been associated with the Dunkers, but left Germantown for Ephrata following the death in 1735 of Alexander Mack, Sr., the organizer of the Dunkers.

³ Peter Vogt, ed., *Relation*, 43. [Johannes Hildebrand and others], *Mistisches und Kirchliches Zeuchnüß der Brüderschaft in Zion* (Germantown: C. Saur, 1743), 13-17. Hildebrand would seem to be a major contributor, if not primary author, of this work, based on several passages that strongly resemble his work, *Schriftmässiges Zeuchnüß von dem Himmlischen und Jungfräulichen Gebährungs=Werck*. The *Mistisches und*

Kirchliches Zeuchniß was printed by Saur, whose wife was still at Ephrata in 1743.

⁴ [Hildebrand and others], *Mistisches und Kirchliches Zeuchniß*, 14.

⁵ Peter Vogt, ed., *Relation*, 50. The conference minutes report that Israel Eckerlin, head of the Brotherhood of Zion, met with Zinzendorf at Tulpehocken during two days after the conference closed. Upon hearing what had been submitted to the conference, Eckerlin reportedly called the position “too modest” [*zu bescheiden*]. Probably he meant that it was too easy on marriage.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 16.

⁷ Some hint of this rumor may lie behind conclusion no. 15 in the minutes of the third conference in the parenthetical comment that the conference body saw no sign for a “general introduction” of celibacy into Christian congregations. Peter Vogt, ed., *Relation*, 54.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 14, 16.

⁹ Irenici Theodicāi, *Des Zionitischen Stiffts I. Theil* (Ephrata: Drucks und Verlags der Bruderschaft, 1745), 193. Irenici Theodicāi is a hellenization for Beissel’s spiritual name, Friedsam Gottrecht. No doubt Peter Miller provided this, since he was probably the only member at Ephrata with capability in Greek.

¹⁰ See Jacob Boehme, *De Tribus Principiis, oder, Beschreibung der drey Principien Göttlichen Wesens*, in Jacob Boehme, *Sämtliche Schriften*, vol. 2, ed. Will-Erich Peuckert and August Faust, facs. Repr. of 1730 ed. (Stuttgart: Frommanns Verlag, 1955), 100-150. See also, for example, Johann Georg Gichtel, *Theosophia Practica*, 3rd improved ed. (Leyden, 1722), vol. 5, p. 3640.

¹¹ Irenici Theodicāi, *Zionitischen Stiffts*, 194. “der unreinen Glieder zur Fortpflanzung welche nicht zum Bilde Gottes gehören, mußte offenbar werden.” “. . . [wegen] der Imagination Adams sich nach der thierischen Art zu vermehren, wurden sie ihm angehangt und sind also eine Schande an Gott und Menschen.” “mußte alles was männlich war an diesem Glied beschnitten werden, um zu erweisen daß vor Gottes heiligen Augen es ein Eckel sei. Dahero die Vermischung zwischen beyderly Geschlecht vor Gott und Menschen ein Eckel ist.” “Christus wolte nicht durch solche Vermischung geboren werden; sondern von der allerreinsten Jungfrau.”

¹² *Ibid.*, 43. “Des sacramentlichen Segens der heiligen Ehe,” . . . “Predigt an die Gottes-Kinder wider all lust-seuche.” I have translated this from the German, because the original English translation does not pick up some of the subtleties here.

¹³ *Ibid.*.

¹⁴ Hildebrand, *Gebährungs=Werck*, 14.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 14-5.

¹⁶ Peter Vogt, ed., *Relation*, 48, 125 n. 49. The choice by lot of Gottfried Haberecht as one of three ecumenical trustees of the conference representing Ephrata was a moot point by this time. Besides, Haberecht was the “safest” of potential Ephrata trustess, since he had earlier belonged to the Moravians and was in the process of returning to them during the conferences. He would have been suspect to most of the

Ephrata community.

¹⁷ Zinzendorf's decision to baptizing three Native American converts using the Moravian mode of pouring water three times in the names of the Trinity occurred after the Ephrata delegation left the third conference. Apparently some Dunkers (Church of the Brethren) were present. Both the Dunkers and Ephrata practiced baptism in a threefold immersion in the names of the Trinity. Zinzendorf's action would have been offensive to both the Dunkers and Ephrata, signaling to them that the conferences were not fully respectful of different views on baptism. See *Relation*, 47-8.

¹⁸ Peter Vogt, ed., *Relation*, 52.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 53. This article explicitly affirms Zinzendorf's Lutheran identity.

²⁰ Irenici Theodicäi, *Zionitischen Stiffts*, 124-5. The same concept appears in one of the anti-Moravian polemics from Ephrata. See [Johannes Hildebrand], *Unpartheyisches Bedencken Ueber das Bekehrungs=Werk der Herrenhutischen Gemeine In Pennsylvanien* ([Germantown: Christoph Saur, 1743]), 31. Here the author writes that in conversion, one must sign over (verschreiben) one's self to death.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 62, 72-3.

²² *Ibid.*, 195.

²³ Hildebrand, *Gebährungs=Werck*, 8. "Allhier in dieser mit dem Sperr eröffneten Seite Jesus Christ, . . . ist die himmlische Jungfräuliche Matrix wieder eröffnet." "Und ward ein Weg gemacht, daß eine geistliche Jungfräuliche Menschheit wieder konte ausgebohren werden." "darum der erste Adam sein Gebährungs=Werck nicht mehr in der Seite hat, sondern in dem untersten Theil seiner Menschheit, allwo alle Unreinigkeit ihren Ausgang nimmt."

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 7. ". . . liebereicher Trost aller wahren Nachfolger Jesu Christi in seinen Realen Leidens und Sterbens Fußstapffen! Die sich als reine geduldige Lämmer zum täglichen Schlachtopfer freywillig hingeben bis zum völligen mortificiren ihres alten thierischen Menschen." ". . . ohne den Realen Leidens= und Sterbens=Weg ihrer Oberhaupts Jesu Christi. . . ohne welchen ohnmöglich ist zu Gott zu kommen."

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 5. The second quotation is from [Hildebrand], *Unpartheyisches Bedencken*, 31. Hildebrand had stressed what he considered the inadequacy in Zinzendorf's theology for rejecting the role of repentance in conversion. While Zinzendorf thought the Ephrata people were making a work out of repentance, they in turn thought he was denying all the scriptures that call for repentance, reducing conversion to cheap grace.

²⁶ [Hildebrand], *Unpartheyisches Bedencken*, 30.

²⁷ [Israel Eckerlin?], *Ein kurtzer Bericht, von den Ursachen, warum die Gemeinschaft in Ephrata sich mit dem Graffen Zinzendorff und seinen Leuten eingelassen . . .* ([Germantown: Christoph Saur, 1743]), 4.

²⁸ Peter Vogt, ed., *Relation*, 115-16.

²⁹ [Hildebrand], *Unpartheyisches Bedencken*, 33.

³⁰ Fridrich Harmann and others, *Ein Schreiben der Herrnhutischen Gemeine aus*

ihrer Conferenz an Mstr. Johann Hildebrand in Ephrata ([Philadelphia, 1742/3).

³¹ Johannes Hildebrand, *Wohlgegrüdetes Bedencken der Christlichen Gemeine in und bey Ephrata von dem Weg der heiligung* (Germantown: Christoph Saur, 1747). An earlier edition was reportedly published in 1743.