

Durham E-Theses

*The history and development of the Moravian church,
especially in the North of England, centred on the
settlement at Fulneck, in the West Riding of
Yorkshire.*

Gordon C. Birch

How to cite:

Birch, Gordon C. (1966) The history and development of the Moravian church, especially in the North of England, centred on the settlement at Fulneck, in the West Riding of Yorkshire. Masters thesis, Durham University.

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a <https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/9715/> is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

The Rev. Gordon C. Birch B.A.

A Dissertation on

The History and Development of the Moravian
Church, especially in the North of
England,
centred on the Settlement at
Fulneck, in the West Riding of Yorkshire.

Submitted for the Degree

of

Master of Arts

in the

University of Durham.

March 1966.

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.
No quotation from it should be published without
his prior written consent and information derived
from it should be acknowledged.

FOREWORD.

I have tried to account for the coming of the Moravian Church to the North of England, and its subsequent establishment and development, especially in Yorkshire, centred on the Settlement at Fulneck, in the West Riding. It has been necessary to give some background by way of the origins and earlier growth of the Moravian Church, or "Unitas Fratrum" in Europe and its coming to this country, in order to make the existence of the Yorkshire Moravians intelligible.

The vast story of Moravian activity in Germany and America and the wider field of missionary work has not been followed and is only referred to in so far as it has a bearing on the Yorkshire development. I have tried to indicate that the Moravians came of a long tradition and that the pioneer spirit, at times almost heroic, of faith and tenacity evident in the Yorkshire Settlement, was characteristic of their inheritance. Similarly, with regard to the British Province, very little has been said of the work in other parts of the United Kingdom, except by way of background to the work in Yorkshire. It should be remembered that the Moravians are a Church with an inter-Continental organisation of which the British Province is but a part, and that, within the British Province, the Yorkshire work was one line of development among many. The main centres in which work grew along lines rather similar to those in the West Riding were: London, Bedford, Bristol, Derbyshire, Northern Ireland, and Lancashire, with some significant work in South-West Wales (Haverfordwest) and South-West Scotland (Ayr).

The main sources of information for the earlier parts of this account are standard printed histories, such as "A History of the Moravian Church during the 18th, and 19th. Centuries," an American publication written by J. Taylor Hamilton at the end of the 19th. Century, "A History of the Moravian Church," by J.E. Hutton, published in London by the Moravian Publications Office in 1909, and "The Beginnings of the Brethren's Church in England," a treatise presented by Gerhard Wauer for his Ph.D. degree at Leipzig in 1901.

The sources for the later part are nearly all manuscript accounts, diaries, registers, minute books, and letters, together with some printed accounts, which were printed under private contract rather than for general publication. These are all available for inspection in the archives of the Moravian Church at Fulneck but because of their nature, lack of page numbering and adequate cataloguing, it has been impracticable to give effectively detailed footnotes. A number of local histories have been used also and are referred to in the footnotes, and a complete list of the manuscripts used is appended hereto. The Minister and Church Committee granted free and ready access to all their records at Fulneck and I gratefully acknowledge their most willing assistance.

SOURCES.

Manuscripts in the archives at Fulneck:

For the very early period material is scanty. There are fragments of the Helpers' Conference at Lamb's Hill in the years 1743, 1744, 1745, 1746, 1748, 1749, and some early letters, including the letters and reports of Wm. Holland, July 1744, and some letters of Metcalfe 1745-1747. Then, from a reasonably early date the various records are available in more profusion and completeness.

The Fulneck Diaries 1748 - 1959.

Minutes of the Fulneck Elders' Conference 1750 - 1912.

Minutes of the Yorkshire Elders' Conference 1814 - 1903.

Minutes of the Yorkshire Ministers' Conference 1795 - 1822.

Minutes of the Yorkshire District Conference 1869 - 1902.

Results of various Provincial Synods of the British Province.

The "Foundation Stone Document."

Catalogues of members 1755 - 1855.

"Some brief Historical Account concerning the Beginnings and

Progress of the Work of the Lord in the Brethren's

Congregation at Fulneck, compiled in the years 1785-86."

(This is a manuscript chronicle in the handwriting of

John Müller, Single Brethren's Labourer, 1783 - 1788).

Printed sources:

J. T. Hamilton. A History of the Moravian Church in the 18th.

and 19th. Centuries. Times Publishing Co. Bethlehem Pa.

1900 $\frac{1}{2}$

- G. A. Wauer. The Beginnings of the Brethren's Church in England.
Leipzig 1900. (Translated by J. Elliott and published at
Baildon, Yorkshire. 1901.)
- J. E. Hutton. A History of the Moravian Church. Moravian ~~Publications~~
Publication Office. London. 1909.
- S. Raynor. The History of Pudsey. Longmans, Green and Co. 1887.
- A. C. Price. Leeds and its Neighbourhood. Clarendon Press,
Oxford. 1909.
- F. S. Popham. (Ed). A History of Christianity in Yorkshire.
Religious Education Press. 1954.
- The Centenary Book of Bradford. 1847-1947. Produced by the
Yorkshire Observer for Bradford City Council, 1947.
- R. B. M. Hutton. Fulneck School 1753-1953. Privately printed by
Fulneck School Bicentenary Committee. 1953.
- Results of the General Synod of 1899 (Herrnhut).
- The Catechism of the Moravian Church (American Province).
- The Moravian Hymn Book (1912).
- The Moravian Tune Book (1887).
- The Moravian Liturgy (1960).
- The Church Book of the Moravian Church in the British
Province. (1891).
- The Brotherly Agreement and Declaration concerning the Rules
and Orders of the Brethren's Congregation at Pudsey,
Gomersal, Mirfield and Wyke. (Privately printed 1777).
- An Account of the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren. (Herrnhut
1818). Translated from the German and privately published
in Bradford, 1822.

Periodical Accounts relating to the Missions established by
the Protestant Church of the Unitas Fratrum. Quarterly,
London, 1790 - 1900.

John Wesley's Journal.

Amos Comenius. Ratio Disciplinae. Amsterdam. 1660. Translated
by Bishop Seiffert. Moravian Publications Office. London.
1866.

Carter and Weeks (Editors). The Protestant Dictionary. The
Harrison Trust. London. 1933. Article on the Moravian
Church by J. E. Hutton.

SYNOPSIS.

Part 1. Origins.

1. The Bohemian Brethren. How they came into existence at Kunwald, 1457; growth and influence; "destruction" 1620.
2. The Hidden Seed. Dispersion of the Brethren; Bishop Comenius and the securing of the Episcopal succession; persistence of the Church of the Brethren "underground."
3. Herrnhut.
 - i. Beginnings. How refugees came to Berthelsdorf and established Herrnhut, 1722.
 - ii. Baptism of the Spirit. How the Church of the Brethren was resuscitated at Herrnhut.
 - iii. Transfer of the Episcopate. How the resuscitated Brethren of Herrnhut became a distinct Church, with the Episcopal Orders secured from Comenius, 1727.

Part II. Great Britain.

1. Beginnings of the Moravian Church in England. First visit of Moravians, 1728; James Hutton; connections of the Moravians with the Wesleys; establishment of a Congregation of the Moravian Church in London, 1742; work begun in Yorkshire.
2. Progress in Great Britain. John Cennick; establishment of Moravians in the West of England and in Ireland; opposition to Moravians in England - recognition by Act of Parliament 1749; further opposition in tracts and books; Moravians' defence and progress in spite of opposition.

Part III. Yorkshire and the North : Fulneck.

1. The Building Period. 1742 -1755. The Rev. B. Ingham; formation of the Yorkshire Congregation in London 1742; Lamb's Hill → Fulneck foundation, 1746; features of the Settlement life; "settlement" of the five Yorkshire Congregations, 1755; dangers inherent in the system.
2. Activity. 1755 - 1825. Congregational and missionary activities; development of Fulneck; refusal to proselytise; reconciliation with Wesley; educational activity; reaction in congregational life.
3. Decline and Recovery. 1825 - 1855; 1855 - 1899; 1900 - . Thirty years inactivity; congregational decline - causes; signs of recovery, and progress; Home rule - separation of Provinces; Moravians in England; Yorkshire Moravians today.

Appendices:

1. Lists of Officials.
 - i. Holders of office, Yorkshire Congregation, 1742.
 - ii. Vorstehers at Lamb's Hill (Fulneck).
 - iii. Ministers and Assistants at Fulneck.
 - iv. Directors of the Schools at Fulneck.
 - v. Ministers in other Yorkshire Congregations 1755 - 1855.
 - vi. Various lists of Labourers, Co-Labourers, Wardens etc.
2. Chronological Summary.
3. List of Moravian Churches in the British Province 1965.
4. Doctrine in the Moravian Church.
5. Moravian Liturgy and Worship.
6. Footnote References.
7. Maps I. and II.

PART 1

ORIGINS.

1. The Bohemian Brethren
2. The Hidden Seed
3. Herrnhut.
 - i. Beginnings
 - ii. Baptism of the Spirit
 - iii. Transfer of the Episcopate

1. The Bohemian Brethren

John Wycliffe's followers, the Lollards, were speedily suppressed in England by Act of Parliament (1401) and survived in only a few villages, but he had a greater influence in Bohemia. There the ground had been prepared by teachers such as Milic of Kremsic (1363-74), Thomas of Stitny (1370-1401) and Matthew of Janow (1381-1393). and Wycliffe's teaching contributed so much, indirectly, to the establishment of the Ancient Church of the Brethren that the first chapter of Dr. J.T. Müller's "Geschichte der Bohmischen Brüder" published in 1922, is entitled "Bohemian Wycliffism and the Hussites". (1).

For a period of about fifty years there existed a close connection, both personal and literary, between England and Bohemia. Two years prior to Wycliffe's death Richard II of England married Princess Ann of Bohemia (1382) and many Bohemians came to the English Court. Some students from Prague University visited Oxford in 1390, and after studying Wycliffe's doctrines, took back copies of some of his works when they returned to Prague. This, with similar activity by students from Bohemia on later visits in 1406 and 1407 to Kimmerton in Worcestershire and Braybrook in Northamptonshire, resulted in Wycliffe's doctrines becoming the subject of widespread discussion in Bohemia.

LOLLARD
INFLUENCE
IN
BOHEMIA.

The influence of some English Lollards was even more significant. Whilst Wycliffe's followers were being burnt to death or induced to recant in England, John Hus was preaching some of his teachings at the Bethlehem Chapel in Prague (2) and certain English Lollards did their utmost to help him. Sir John Oldcastle wrote to one of his friends and Richard Wyche wrote to Hus himself who read the letter from his pulpit. Other Lollards fled from England and lived together in St. Valentine's College, in Prague.

The most influential of all the English Lollards was Peter Payne, Principal of St. Edmund Hall, Oxford, who went to Dresden in 1411 where he tried to stir up the Waldenses. Shortly afterwards he settled down in Prague and there not only popularized the doctrines of Wycliffe by publishing them in the form of pithy extracts but also created a great sensation by refusing to take the oath when he tried to obtain a post in the University.

In the course of time all this agitation led to the establishment of the Moravian Church. The martyrdom of John Hus, on July 6th 1415, gave rise to the terrible Hussite Wars, during which no reform party in Bohemia accepted Wycliffe's doctrines completely and the people were divided into factions. The Utraquists were content with the Cup for the Laity and remained Catholic in all other respects and eventually, by the

Compactata of Basle in 1433 were recognised by the Pope as the National Church of Bohemia. The Taborites, regarded themselves as God's angels, commissioned to destroy the wicked by the sword, and they were defeated in 1434 at the Battle of Lipan. The Picards, the Amosites, and the Chiliasts added to the confusion. (3)

FOUNDING
OF THE
BRETHREN.
1457.

Against this background a tailor named Gregory, later to be known as Gregory the Patriarch, was deeply influenced by two powerful teachers of the day. At the Thein Church in Prague, the Archbishop-elect, John Rockycana denounced the vices of the clergy, and at a little village called Chelčic lived a writer known as Peter of Chelcic, and both these prophets stirred the soul of Gregory. Through his attendance at the Thein Church, Gregory became convinced that in order to become a true Christian he must leave the Utraquist Church. Reading the works of Peter of Chelčic to whom John Rockycana had recommended him, he also became convinced that he must take the New Testament as his guide. Obtaining the special permission of King George Podiebrad he retired with some friends to the small village of Kunwald, in south-east Bohemia, about 1457 or '58, and there established an independent Brotherhood. (4) This Brotherhood placed themselves under the care of an Utraquist priest, Michael Bradacius, chosen not because he was an episcopally ordained priest, but because he was a good Christian in character.

From the very beginning they asserted their adherence to two principles taught by Peter of Chelčic. One, in conformity with Wycliffe's teaching, was that Holy Scripture alone was the true Christian standard. In contrast, however, to Wycliffe, he taught that neither the State nor the Church had any right to make war, and the first object of the settlers at Kunwald was to be true to the Law of Christ in every department of life. Others soon came to join the Brotherhood at Kunwald, some from Vitanowitz, the headquarters of the followers of Peter of Chelčic, some from Klattau and other villages, and some from the University at Prague.

A bold and decisive step was then taken at a Synod in Lhota in 1467 (5) when Gregory and his Brethren decided to obtain their own Episcopal Orders, and applied to the Waldenses for this purpose. First a Waldensian Elder consecrated Michael Bradacius a bishop; next Michael consecrated Matthias a bishop (6); then Michael resigned his priestly office which he had received from the Church of Rome. Matthias, the new bishop, then ordained Michael, Thomas and Elias as the first three ministers of the Church. Acting on the belief that all Sacraments administered by a Catholic priest were invalid, all the members of the Synod were then re-baptized. Moravian Episcopal Orders thus had their origin and so the Brethren broke away entirely from the Church of Rome

THE
BRETHREN
OBTAIN
THEIR OWN
EPISCOPACY.

which they held to be morally corrupt. So they asserted that a true Episcopal Succession depended, not on a mechanical descent from the Apostles, as the Catholics claimed, but on a moral and spiritual conformity with Apostolic principles. Gregory maintained that in the days of the Apostles, the terms Bishop and Presbyter were identical, that the Waldensian Elder possessed the necessary spiritual qualities and therefore he was qualified to consecrate Michael a bishop.

During the next century and a half the Brethren spread rapidly in Bohemia and strong branches were also formed in Moravia and Poland, the international character of the Church manifesting itself at so early a stage. Sometimes they called themselves Jednota Bratrská (the Church of the Brethren) (7), sometimes Brethren of the Law of Christ, sometimes Waldensian Brethren, and sometimes simply Brethren. In official documents they usually referred to themselves as either Unitas Fratrum or Fratres. In doctrine they were broadly evangelical but they laid the chief stress on discipline and personal piety. At the head of the Church was an Inner Council, elected by the Synod and next came the Bishops, also elected by the Synod. The Synod consisted of all the Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons.

INFLUENCE
OF THE
BRETHREN'S
CHURCH.

This Synod authorised publications for the moral welfare of the people and, for this purpose, in 1501 they published the first Hymn Book of Christendom, containing 84 hymns. Other editions followed and the last had 743 hymns, making the Brethren the pioneers of congregational singing. They also published Catechisms, some of which, translated into German, attracted the attention of Luther and were also used by the Protestants of Switzerland. Their most important publication, however, was the Kralitz Bible (1579-92). This was the whole of the Bible in Bohemian and was the first translation of the Bible from the original Hebrew and Greek into the common language of the people. It is the version which is still issued by the British and Foreign Bible Society today.

The Brethren tried to uplift the people by means of literature and also education. Bishop Luke of Prague wrote 150 treatises and John Blahoslav wrote a *Historia Fratrum*, a treatise on music, and a Bohemian grammar, amongst other works. Between 1505 and 1510, out of sixty works in Czech, fifty were published by the Brethren. They had a school for the sons of the nobility at Eibenschütz in Moravia and in nearly every parish they had free schools for the poorer children, where the Bible and the Catechism were in daily use, good conduct was taught from a "Book of Morals", and

practical lessons were given in trade and commerce.

In their doctrinal outlook the Brethren became gradually more definitely Evangelical. So long as Gregory, the Patriarch, lived they adhered mainly to the ethical teaching of Peter of Chelčic, but under Luke of Prague and John Augusta they came into personal touch with Luther, Calvin and Bucer. Finally in 1609 they formed a definite alliance with the Utraquist Lutheran National Church (8). At that time nine-tenths of the people in Bohemia were Protestants and about half of these Protestants were Brethren. In discipline they were as strict and pietistic as ever but in doctrine they were Protestants and accepted the Bohemian National Confession.

"DESTRUCTION"
OF THE
BRETHREN'S
CHURCH.
1620.

It was then, at the height of its power, that the Church of the Brethren was destroyed by force. The Bohemian Protestants were routed at the battle of the White Mountain in 1620 and during the next six years something like thirty six thousand families left Bohemia and Moravia. (9) All the Brethren's Churches were seized and converted into Catholic Chapels and Kralitz Bibles and Hymn Books were burned in their thousands. Official word was sent to the Pope that the Church of the Brethren was no more. So, by the power of the sword, the Moravian Church was stamped out of existence; but the Jednota Bratrská did not entirely die.

2. The Hidden Seed.

The power of the alliance of the House of Austria with the Jesuits was sufficient to suppress all organic ecclesiastical life in Bohemia and Moravia, other than Roman Catholic, and their rigorously tyrannical religious policy was confirmed by the Peace of Westphalia. They could not, however, deprive the Evangelicals of the sad right of emigration and a significant body of emigrants proceeded at intervals from Bohemia to Silesia and Lusatia. By 1650 these exiles were so numerous in Dresden as to be given for their use the Johannes-Kirche. Others settled at Wesgau near Barby, others at Zittau, Charselz on the Spree, and Gebhardorf, near Messersdorf, during the 17th Century. In the first decades of the 18th Century several Bohemian families lived at Gerlachsheim and Gross Hennersdorf. Five hundred persons deprived of their homes at this latter place left for Berlin in 1732, (10) Of the many confessions managing to keep attachment to their traditional faith by emigration from successful suppression during that illiberal age the Jednota Bratraska or Unitas Fratrum was surely one.

BRETHREN
CONTINUE
IN SECRET
AT HOME.

It is also difficult to believe that a movement of such quality and sturdiness as that of the Bohemian Brethren could altogether vanish in their own land within a century of the inception of the Country's Reformation. The lack of sure records proves nothing. It is one thing for the rulers and hierarchy to crush organic

congregational life and suppress a prohibited cultus amongst the nobility, but quite another thing to extinguish the embers of a cherished faith amongst those in a humble walk of life, especially if these latter are intelligent and in possession of books. The stories of the perpetuation of faithfulness in secret down the generations that have come through the care of a Pastor like Augustus Schulze and Bohemian refugees like Zacharias and Tobias Hirschel and John Bittman, and Moravian refugees like David Nitschmann, Frederick Neisser and Christian David, showing that families and individuals cherished and preserved the doctrines and usages of the Brethren in Bohemia, cannot be exceptional. These families and individuals must have had counterparts elsewhere which failed to be chronicled.

Thus, though the Church of the Brethren was outwardly destroyed in 1620, it was not killed but driven underground at home and abroad and continued to live, like the hidden seed, later to grow and flourish in the light of day.

Amongst the 36,000 who fled after the battle of the White Mountain was their sole surviving Bishop. John Amos Comenius, the leading educationist of the time in Europe. His wanderings took him to Poland and Holland and he was invited to England to help reorganise Education. (11) Much sympathy for the Bohemian martyrs had been aroused in England during the Commonwealth when

BISHOP
COMENIUS
SECURES
CONTINUATION
OF BRETHREN'S
ORDERS.

Cromwell had offered them a home in Ireland, and for some time afterwards collections were made on behalf of the Unitas Fratrum in many Anglican churches. Believing the days of the Unitas to be numbered, Comenius drew up a remarkable document in which he said:-

"As in such cases it is customary to make a Will, we hereby bequeath to our enemies the things of which they can disposses us, but to you our friends (of the Church of England) we bequeath our dear Mother, the Church of the Brethren. It may be God's will to revive her in our country or elsewhere. You ought to love her even in her death, because in her life she has given you an example of Faith and Patience for more than two centuries".(12)

He secured the episcopal succession¹ apart from the Polish branch in which it still continued, by having his son-in-law, Peter Jablonsky, consecrated bishop by Bishop Bythner at Milenezyn in Poland. Peter Jablonsky consecrated his son, Daniel Ernest Jablonsky, who eventually in 1735 consecrated David Nitschmann, the first bishop of the renewed Church of the Brethren. Comenius also published a Catechism for the benefit of certain Brethren who still kept faith in Moravia and during the century 1622-1722, there existed, both in Bohemia and Moravia a "Hidden Seed", who held their meetings in secret and handed on their traditions from

father to son.

EVIDENCE
OF THE
HIDDEN
SEED.

In April 1756 at a "Moravian Synod" held at Herrnhut, preparatory to a General Synod of the Church, a committee of nine was appointed to draw up lists of all Brethren and Sisters of Moravian and Bohemian extraction, secure accounts of their experiences when fleeing from their homeland, and record their labours on behalf of the resuscitated Unity. (13) So sources became available used by Friedrich Ludwig Külbing in writing the "Memorial Days" and his "Bischöfliche Ordination".

From a passage in the Jüngerhaus Diarium of May 1, 1756, and a passage in Plitt's manuscript History, and Neisser's manuscript "Fasciculus", it would seem that in 1756, 1014 members were living who had been born in Moravia or were of Moravian parentage, and 629 members who were born in Bohemia or were of Bohemian parentage. (14) These latter resided chiefly in Berlin and Rixdorf. Plitt's and Niesser's manuscripts show that 313 Moravians and Bohemians had already passed away. This would give a total of nearly 2,000 members of Bohemian and Moravian birth in the resuscitated Church up to 1756.

It is also known that the Synods of the Polish Branch of the Brethren's Unity met as such at Lissa until 1699 and that in 1710 the Brethren and the Reformed met at Warsaw in a Union Synod and continued

as such in the future. It is known too that Bishop Jablonski called fequent Synods to strengthen the things that remained, and used his position as court preacher in Berlin to aid the Brethren in Poland, Russia and Hungary. No doubt the Polish Synods before the 18th Century tried to keep in touch with their Brethren who secretly held to the faith in Moravia and Bohemia and encouraged them.

Certainly in Poland and Polish Prussia at least fifteen parishes still remained in 1715 despite the repeated disasters that had happened at Lissa, the central point of their activity. These were an element of sufficient importance to be granted representations at the Union Synod at Danzig in 1718 and to maintain their episcopate. So too, up to the same time, in Bohemia, around Landskron, Leitomischl, Hermanitz, and Rothwasser, and in Moravia around Zerawic, Fulneck, Zauchtenthal, Kunwald, and Sehlen, the irrepressible adherents of the Unitas Fratrum dared the stake and dungeon to serve God according to conscience and after their fathers' traditons.

The Diary of the congregation in Berlin and Rixdorf for May 1754 reads:-

"On May 18 Brother Hirschel began to draw up an account of our Bohemian Congregation. Several things of importance appear from it -

1. That the most of our members originate from around Leitomischl and Lititz where were formerly the chief seats of the Bohemian Brethren.
2. That their awakening took place about the year 1720 and was therefore contemporaneous with the awakening in Moravia.
3. That they maintained the knowledge of the Saviour and intelligence concerning the Brethren's Unity throughout the entire seventeenth century by the traditions of their forefathers which they passed on to their descendants.
4. That their first connection with the Moravian Brethren at Herrnhut was through the visits of Christian David and Christopher Demuth in 1726 and especially through that of Melchiar Nitschmann in 1728." (15)

Names which are recorded as unforgettable in Bohemia are those of Jacob Pechatschek and his son John, John Schallman, and Wenzel Kleych. (16) Also still burning in their memories was the revival at Hermanitz and its neighbourhood 1720-22 which was followed by such cruel persecution that the track of the confessors who had endured the knout could be followed from the castle homeward by the blood that dripped from them!

In Moravia there was the Kutschera family of Zerawic, and the Schneiders of Zauchenthal. (17) Old Martin Schneider was a contemporary of Comenius and had frequently held services, including the Lord's Supper, in his house, when a clergyman came secretly from the Brethren's parish of Skalic in Hungary. His grandson, Samuel Schneider often preached himself and, on his death bed in 1710, after refusing an offer of the viaticum firmly but respectfully, witnessing to assured salvation, won from the Romish priest the confession - "Let my soul strive after a death such as that of this righteous man". In close fellowship with the Schneiders were the families of Kunz, Beyer, Stach, Zeisberger and Tannebergen, of Zauchenthal, and the families of Jaeschke and Neisser of Söhlen and Seitendorf, the family of Grasmann of Senftleben, and the family of Nitschmann of Kunwald.

Thomas Piesch, born at Birlitz in Silesia, 1702, and later active in England, states in his memoir that his father took evangelical books from Birlitz to Moravia where he was arrested and persecuted for doing so. (18) Rosina Kisselowa (nee Hirschel) of Lippstadt in Bohemia related that she often heard of the so called Waldenses (a misnomer often applied to the Bohemian Brethren) holding Services and celebrating the Lord's Supper in the surrounding villages. (19)

Paul Wattman, born in Bohemia June 28th, 1705 said his ancestors had maintained the faith and usages of the Brethren uninterruptedly in secret and implanted the truth in him in childhood. He died in Berlin 1755. (20) Tobias Kutschera was born in Moravia in 1671, his parents both being descendents from members of the old Unity. His mother was the grand-daughter of a presbyter of the Church and his paternal grandfather pastor at Zerawic where the Synod of 1616 assembled. Moreover, in the days of Tobias a meeting house of the Brethren still stood and as late as 1680 services of the Brethren were still held openly. In his father's house the Brethren later held worship three times every Sunday but the persecution became more severe and public meetings were stopped. (21) David Nitschmann of Zauchtenthal, born 1676 (uncle of the Bishop Nitschmann) recorded that his father John held Services in his house every Sunday when they had more people than they could seat. (22) They sang hymns from the old Brethren's Hymn Book and read such sermons as they had on hand. A new priest called Schlimman came to the parish and dealt with them severely but they maintained their services with great secrecy. That must have been before 1692 for the old parents died about then. George Pakota was born at Steinern Sedlitz near Leitomischl in 1699 and he told that his parents were loyal adherents of the Brethren's Church.

His father had often told him, as a child, of the evangelical preachers formerly in Bohemia, sighing over the tale of their suppression. Later his father had read to him from the New Testament and from a book by John Hus. (23)

These and many others had remained in the lands of oppression. Though they had often contemplated emigration, they had stayed partly deluded by the elusive expectation of better times, partly fearing the dangers of detected and arrested flight, partly from a natural love of a beautiful fatherland, and partly shrinking from the surrender of all property and the loss of a certain means of earning a livelihood involved in secret emigration. And through it all, reading the Scriptures, sermons and other evangelical literature, keeping family worship and carefully training their children in the traditional way, they kept alive the faith and usages of the Brethren.

3. Herrnhut (a) Beginnings

AUTHORS
OF THE
RESUSCITATION
OF THE
BRETHREN'S
CHURCH.

Two men drawn from the extremes of society were destined to make the resuscitation of the Unitas Fratrum possible and fulfil the predictions of Comenius; Nicholas Ludwig von Zinzendorf, a noble even more in character than in hereditary rank, and a certain shepherd and carpenter, Christian David. It was the latter who first came into touch with the remnant of the Ancient Brethren.

CHRISTIAN
DAVID

Christian David was born of Roman Catholic parents at Senfleben not far from Neutitschein and the Kuhländl, memorable as the scene of the first scholastic labours of Comenius. (24) As a youth he showed himself a person of deep and burning devotion. He was apprenticed to a family at Holeschau which was secretly evangelical and there he was taught to discard his faith in the pictures of saints and in pilgrimages; also he was greatly impressed by the fidelity of certain Protestants who endured imprisonment for their Faith. In 1710 he came into possession of a Bible, a book of which he had heard but which he had never read, and as a result of his reading he determined to seek fellowship with some body of evangelical believers. So he set out on his travels through Hungary, Austria, Bohemia, Silesia, Saxony and Brandenburg.

The Lutheran pastors in some places refused to receive him into their Church for fear of Catholic persecutors. In other places, shocked by the loose morals of the Church members, he desired no fellowship with them. Eventually he joined the army of Frederick of Brandenburg thinking to have more leisure to serve Christ as a soldier, than working at his trade. He was received into the Lutheran Church by Pastor Schmidt in Berlin before the army left the city. His expectations of a soldier's life were sadly dispelled and after taking part in the siege and capture of Stralsund in December 1715 he was glad to obtain his discharge from the army. Eventually in 1717 he came into contact with Melchior Schaeffer, a pastor at Gorlitz, together with John Andrew Rothe and John Christopher Schwedler. It was during his fellowship with these men that David felt at long last he had found the assurance of salvation he had been seeking, and also felt the inner call to evangelistic work amongst his fellow countrymen, many of whom he knew were as little satisfied with the superstitions of Rome as he himself had been.

Thus he made his first visit to his fatherland in 1717, and on his fourth visit in 1719, at Sehlen near Neutitschein he got to know the five Neisser brothers. (25) Their grandfather, George Jaeschke,

whose family had belonged to the Unity since the 15th Century, had been a godly patriarch amongst the remnant of the Brethren, and had prophesied on his death bed that the Brethren's Unity, so long cherished in secret, would be restored. As a result of meeting Christian David they began to think seriously of emigrating and on his third visit to them they told him they were anxious to find refuge in a Protestant country. He promised to do what he could to help them, and directed them to Pastors Steinmetz, Muthmann and Sassadius, of Teschen, across the Silesian border.(26) On his return to Görlitz he made the Niessers' desire for emigration known to Schaeffer and other friends, but it was some time before their hope could be realised.

COUNT
VON
ZINZENDORF.

In the Spring of 1722 a young Saxon nobleman and government official, Count Nicholas Louis von Zinzendorf talking with his future parish minister, Rothe, heard about Christian David and his efforts to find asylum for a few Moravians.(27) He was interested and sent for David who told him of his visits to Moravia. The Count promised to find a place where the Niessers could worship God in peace and meanwhile offered to receive them temporarily on his estate. David immediately went to Moravia arriving at Sehlen on Whit-Monday, 25th May, 1722 and Augustine and Jacob Niesser resolved to

emigrate at once, while the others preferred to wait until they received news of the successful issue of their brothers' venture. At 10.0 p.m. on the following Wednesday night these two, with their wives and children - a son of 6 years, a daughter of 3 years and twins of 12 weeks - together with Michael Jaeschke and Martha Niesser, set out from Sehlen to follow Christian David into a new land. (28) They travelled all night along the byways, crossed the Silesian frontier, and followed the Oder to Nieder-Wiese, where they were welcomed by Pastor Schwedler. From there they crossed into Saxony and were hospitably received at Leube by the Von Schwienitz family and there met their future pastor, Rothe. At Görlitz the families stayed with pastor Schaeffer while David and the two Niessers visited Gross Hennersdorf to interview Lady Gersdorf, Zinzendorf's grandmother, for the Count was away in Dresden. She received them rather coolly but was persuaded by the family tutor, Marche, to send them to the Count's new estate at Berthelsdorf under the care of Zinzendorf's steward Heitz, who was engaged there building a new home for the Count and his bride. (29) Thus the first representatives of the Church reached the ground where its resuscitation was to take effect.

When the refugees were first placed under the care

of Heitz he intended to lodge them in a leasehold farm held by his employer, but while the men were fetching their families from Görlitz he had further consultations with the Baroness and decided to settle the newcomers in some place by themselves rather than in the existing village. He chose a spot on the highway from Löbau to Zittau where it skirted the southern slopes of the Hutberg, and where he deduced, from the early morning mists, that water would be available. (30) It was a wild marshy stretch of land with tangled forests, bushes and briars on all sides, and the highway was so poor that wagons sometimes sank axle deep in mud. Augustine Neisser's wife exclaimed in dismay at her first sight of the place, "Where shall we find bread in this wilderness?" but Christian David's recitation of the third verse of the 84th Psalm as he plunged his axe into the first tree to be felled, was typical of the spirit able to transform the wilderness into the garden of the Lord. (31)

By the time the Count had come to his new mansion built by Heitz, the Niessers were not the only expatriated strangers and the place had obtained a name. Writing to the Count in July 1722 Heitz had named the spot Herrnhut, expressing the prayer that, at the foot of the Hutberg a city might rise which should not only be "Unter des Herrn Hut" (Under the Lord's watch care) but also "Auf des Herrn Hut" (On the watch for the Lord)

News sent home by the refugees encouraged their brothers and, with the added stimulus of the harsh treatment meted to them in lieu of the fugitives Augustine and Jacob, who were out of reach, by the Austrian Authorities, they decided to emigrate too. When Hans Quitt and Frederick Riedel arrived at Herrnhut just after Easter 1723 they announced that the rest of the Niesser family might shortly be expected.

THE FIVE
YOUNG MEN
OF
ZAUCHTENTHAL.

In December 1723 Christian David went to Moravia taking a letter to Christian Jaeschke from his relatives at Herrnhut encouraging him to join them and he arrived with his wife and five children the following month. Meanwhile Christian David was busy at Zauchtenthal and Kunwald. There a spiritual revival had met with repressive measures by the clergy and magistrates and, for some of the most determined, emigration became the final resource. With the refugees so far it had been simply a question of personal liberty and conscience, and nothing definite in the way of resuscitating the ancient Unity had been contemplated. Now, however, five young men of Zauchtenthal definitely resolved to bring about the resuscitation of the Unitas Fratrum, should it please God to use them for that purpose.(33) They were David Nitschmann, a weaver, known later as the Syndic, and to become eventually a most useful agent of the Moravian Church as a negotiator with various

governments; David Nitschmann, a carpenter, to whom Bishop Jablonski later transmitted the episcopate and was associated with the commencement of missions amongst the heathen; Melchior Zeisberger, who became a pioneer worker in America; John Töltzschig, later to become a leader of the establishment of the Moravian Church in Northern England and Ireland; and David Nitschmann, the Martyr, later an elder of the congregation at Herrnhut and destined to a martyr's death in the prison at Olmütz on April 15th, 1729.

On the 1st May 1724, Töltzschig's father, the village burgess, called these five before him and forbade them to hold religious services, advising them to behave as became their lively youth, frequenting the taverns and enjoying the dances and festivals. He threatened that if they attempted emigration they would be severely dealt with. Their response was decisive action and at 10.0 p.m. on May 2nd they slipped out of Zauchtenthal and, when fairly outside the village, knelt and commended it and their relatives to God. Then they sang again the hymn which the Bohemian-Moravian Brethren had sung when going into Exile:-

"Selig ist Der Tag, da ich muss scheiden,
Mein liebes Vaterland muss meiden
Und mich begeben in das Elend". (34)

Their intention was to go to Lissa, the old Polish centre of their fathers' Church and there work for its

renewal. When they were on the road, where it forked at Jaegersdorf, they decided to go aside and visit Christian David, before they proceeded to Lissa. Thus they arrived at Berthelsdorf on the 12th May.

It happened that Zinzendorf and some of his Pietistic friends had launched a venture in the autumn of 1723 to provide a college for the education of young noblemen. A site had been selected for this purpose close to the humble homes of the settlers at Herrnhut and on the very day of the arrival of the five Zauchtenthal refugees the corner stone of this college was to be laid. As they listened to the address by Count Zinzendorf and the prayer of Baron de Watteville they felt that Providence had brought them there to cast in their lot with Herrnhut and not proceed to Lissa. (35)

(b) Baptism of the Spirit

GROWTH
AT
HERRNHUT

During the next few years the Count and his associates De Watteville, Rothe and Schaefer were occupied by their own projects and the movement from Moravia to Herrnhut grew in force. By May 1725 there were ninety refugees at Herrnhut, (36) many of whom had thrilling stories of escape from persecution and imprisonment to tell.

Not all who came to Herrnhut from Moravia were allowed to stay as a matter of course, however. On his arrival, each was brought before a justice and had to give a reason for his presence, and if he were moved by anything other than a desire to serve Christ freely he was given a letter of commendation to his former feudal lord, dismissed with the advice to return and provided with money, usually furnished by Zindendorf, for the journey. (37)

The fervour of the religious life at Herrnhut coupled with the spreading fame of Rothe's preaching at Berthelsdorf began to attract others from the vicinity and other parts of Germany. Thus in 1725 Frederick Kühnel, a linen weaver from the neighbouring village of Oberoderwitz built himself a house near the Moravians. Another industry was introduced by the brothers Martin and Leonard Dober who were potters. (38) The diversified occupations and the reputation for thoroughness which Herrnhut acquired began to give

promise of prosperity to the settlement.

RELATIONSHIP
BETWEEN
SETTLERS AT
HERRNHUT
AND THE
LOCAL CHURCH.

Amongst the settlers some were practically Lutherans, others Calvinists and a number of the Moravians, led by the five young men who desired the resuscitation of the Unitas Fratrum, urged the adoption of the Brethren's principles and practices at Herrnhut. The standing of the settlers in relation to the parish of Berthelsdorf was undefined and tension arose between members of the parish "ecclesiola" and the people of Herrnhut who resisted all efforts to bring them into its membership. No rules and regulations for the inner life of Herrnhut had as yet been formulated. Thus the welfare of the new settlement began to be threatened by sectarianism and separation and the trouble was intensified towards the end of 1726 by the arrival of a company of Schwenkfelder from Silesia.(39) These were descendants of the followers of Caspar Schwenkfeld, a Silesian nobleman, contemporary with Luther, who had in the main embraced the evangelical faith but disagreed with the reformers regarding the Lord's Supper, holding views peculiar to himself.

The separatist tendencies of Herrnhut were a great worry to Zinzendorf and early in 1727 he obtained indefinite leave of absence from his official duties in order to devote himself to the people on his estate.(40) On the 21st April he made his home at Herrnhut and left

his business matters wholly in the hands of his wife and De Watteville. The problem forced upon him was that of acceding to the Moravians' desire to preserve the disciplinary features of their ancient church and at the same time to maintain the connection with the parish organisation. He did not then contemplate a resuscitation of the Unitas Fratrum pure and simple, nor, if he had so desired, would the laws of the State have allowed it. The peculiar relation of Herrnhut to the State Church for some time yet to come, coupled with Zinzendorf's efforts to have it a Moravian congregation and yet part of the State Church, gave a peculiar tendency to the development of the Unitas Fratrum for many decades. His endeavours as an individual were complicated too by his relation to Herrnhut in civil matters, for he had not only given the Moravians a refuge, he had become their feudal lord.

REGULATION
OF LIFE
AT
HERRNHUT.

In consultation with Rothe, the parish minister, Christian David, Marche, his legal adviser, and the leading Moravians, he proceeded with the drawing up of statutes to regulate the life of Herrnhut. On the 12th May, forty-two statutes relating to Christian conduct and demeanour, together with certain prohibitions and injunctions setting forth their relations to Zinzendorf as their feudal lord, were publicly accepted by the people of Herrnhut. (41) Twelve elders were chosen to have spiritual supervision, four of whom were singled out

by lot as chief elders, namely, Christian David, George Nitschmann, Melchior Nitschmann and Christopher Hoffmann. Nightwatchmen, inspectors of public works, watchers by the sick, almoners of the poor, and other similar officials were appointed. "Bunden" (bands or classes) were instituted, which were small associations of those who had a spiritual affinity to one another, to promote personal growth in grace and spiritual fellowship. (42)

Zinzendorf had come into possession of a copy of Comenius' "Ratio Disciplinae", with which he was previously not familiar, and now reading it was amazed at the substantial agreement between the principles of the Unitas Fratrum set forth in it and the statutes fixed at Herrnhut on May 12th 1727. This, in itself, was a token of the purity of the tradition preserved by the Moravian' forefathers of the Hidden Seed. It was at this time that Zinzendorf first began to think seriously that the resuscitation of the Unity might be providentially intended through the colony of Moravians at Herrnhut. (43)

THE
BAPTISM
OF THE
SPIRIT.

On Wednesday, August 13th there was a remarkable realisation of the presence of the Lord and a Baptism of His Spirit in connection with a celebration of the Holy Communion held at Berthelsdorf.

It was at the invitation of the pastor, Rothe, that the special celebration was about to take place

and he gave a short address on the Holy Communion that morning at Herrnhut. Later the service began in the Parish Church at Berthelsdorf with the hymn:-

"Entbeinde mich, mein Gott" ("Deliver me, my God, from all that's now enchaining"). Then Roche confirmed two Moravian candidates and gave an earnest address. During the next hymn - "Hier legt mein Sinn sich vor Dir nieder" ("My soul before Thee, prostrate lies") - the congregation knelt and Zinzendorf offered a moving public confession and prayers, finally asking a blessing on two absent elders - Christian David and Melchior Nitschmann, who were visiting exiles in Hungary. Pastor Süß. of Hennersdorf, pronounced the absolution and administered the elements, and all who partook were filled with a peace and joy as they had not experienced before. The remarkable thing was that, on the same day and at the same time, Christian David and Melchior Nitschmann at Sablat in Hungary felt an overpowering impulse to pray for their brethren at Herrnhut and, on their return, immediately asked what had happened at that time. (44)

(c) The Transfer of the Episcopate

PROCESS OF
INDEPENDENCE
FOR HERRNHUT.

For some years Herrnhut remained an integral part of the parish of Berthelsdorf, gradually developing communal, liturgical and doctrinal features of its own which were practically complete by 1732. The absolute separation did not take place until 1756 and a legally binding agreement regarding the separation was concluded in 1758 between Zinzendorf and the ecclesiastical authorities of the older community. (45) The renewal of the Unitas Fratrum, as such, could thus only take place after a formative period of transition.

The gradual separation of Herrnhut from the parish of Berthelsdorf was accompanied by the birthpangs of both inner friction and antagonism from without.

ATTEMPTS TO
INTEGRATE
THE BRETHREN
AS PART OF
THE LUTHERAN
CHURCH.

During the summer of 1728, whilst Zinzendorf was absent at Jena, Pastor Rothe and other Lutheran Ministers in the neighbourhood persuaded Christian David and some of the elders to give up the name and regulations of the Brethren's Church and amalgamate completely with the State Church, with the aim of increasing their true catholicity and avoiding persecution for themselves and evangelical believers in Austria, whom the Roman Catholics identified with them. (46)

Christian David and Andrew Beyer were sent to Jena to tell Zinzendorf of the proposal. He and the Moravians with him and a large group of students under the leadership of Spangenberg, vigorously opposed it and

on Zinzendorf's return to Herrnhut the scheme fell through. However, at the beginning of 1731, Zinzendorf himself proposed the very course which he had previously opposed. The subject was laid before the Church Council on January 7th and met with strenuous opposition from the Moravians. Finally it was agreed to refer the matter to the decision of the lot. Two tickets were prepared, one bearing the text "Brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught" (II Thess. II. 15) and the other bearing the words "To them that are without law, as without law" (I. Cor. IX. 21). Then Zinzendorf's son, Christian Renatus, was called in and drew a ticket. It was the former, and Zinzendorf's implicit faith in the lot led him to yield at once, becoming more persuaded than ever that God had some special purpose for Herrnhut.

ATTACKS
ON
COUNT
ZINZENDORF.

The opposition from outside was becoming serious. This was due partly to the continued immigration from Moravia, and partly to the dissatisfaction of the local clergy and the leading Pietists at Hallé. Formal accusations were laid before the Saxon Court both by Zinzendorf's personal enemies, on the ground that he was a dangerous man, and by the Austrian Government, alleging that he was enticing its subjects to remove to his estates. He, therefore, asked for a judicial investigation and the Prefect of Görlitz, by royal commission, thoroughly examined the affairs of Herrnhut

from Jan. 19th - 22nd 1732. (47) The report was most favourable but the Government took no action until August 1733. Meanwhile, in March, Zinzendorf asked permission to resign his office in service of the State and this was granted. The further reception of refugees from Bohemia and Moravia was prohibited and the Count's enemies tried to have him imprisoned in the fortress of Königstein. They failed in this but it was clear they would achieve his banishment, and he anticipated this by carrying into full effect the transfer of his estates - especially those acquired since their marriage - to his wife. (48) In November 1732 an order came from the Saxon Court directing him to alienate his property - but it came too late. If his estates had then passed into hostile or unsympathetic hands, the Moravians at Herrnhut would surely have been dispersed.

ORDINATION
OF
ZINZENDORF.

In his student days Zinzendorf had a personal desire and inner call to enter the Christian Ministry and this was deepened by his experiences in connection with Herrnhut. In spite of serious opposition, not only from enemies, but from within his own family, for such a step to be taken by a nobleman was considered excessive eccentricity, he publicly entered the Ministry at Tübingen on the fourth Sunday in Advent 1734. (49) He had hoped eventually to restore the ruined Protestant cloister of St. George in the Black Forest and there

establish a theological seminary to train ministers to supply the needs of people belonging to other Churches without proselytising, and also by the commencement of missionary workⁱⁿ remote places amongst backward races. Had Zindendorf's plans materialised, the organic resuscitation of the Unitas Fratrum would probably never have taken place, since Lutheran orders would have been imposed on Herrnhut and its affiliations. However, his plans for the cloister of St. George were refused by Duke Charles Augustus and his Cabinet. (50)

BRETHREN AT
HERRNHUT
FEEL THE NEED
OF THEIR OWN
EPISCOPAL
ORDERS.

The return of Leonard Dober from St. Thomas with a converted negro boy pressed home the need of the missionaries for an ordination which would qualify them in the sight of other Christians, and in the opinion of governors and courts of justice, to administer the sacraments and perform other ministerial functions. The Moravians thought about the episcopate of their fathers and, after receiving an affirmative answer to their customary resource for guidance to the use of the lot, one of their elders, David Nitschmann, the carpenter, was chosen, also by lot, as the one who should receive consecration. (51)

CONSECRATION
OF BISHOP
DAVID
NITSCHMANN.

The episcopate of the Unitas Fratrum at that time was represented by Daniel Ernest Jablonsky, the grandson of Comenius and court preacher at Berlin, and Christian Sitkovius at Thorn, Superintendent of the

United Reformed and Brethren's congregations in Poland. The aged Sitkovius signified his written approval, and Jablonsky consecrated David Nitschmann a Bishop of the Unitas Fratrum in Berlin on March 13th, 1735, and issued the following certificate setting out his conception of the purpose of the consecration:-

"In the name of the Blessed Triune God, to Whom be honour and glory for ever and ever. Amen!

"Inasmuch as it seemed good to the eternal and wonderful God, to permit His faithful confessors, the Bohemian - Moravian Brethren, to fall into such evil circumstances, that many of them were forced to forsake their native land and to seek other places, where they could serve their God with freedom of conscience, and confess His truth; therefore, it has come to pass that some of them are scattered in the northern portions of Europe, and others even in America, both on the Continent and the Islands there; but this all-wise God put it into the hearts of the noble-born Count of the Empire, Sir Louis Nicholas, Count of Zinzendorf and Pottendorf, to receive as a father such Bohemian - Moravian Brethren in their dispersion, and to care for their bodily and spiritual welfare, especially also for the maintenance of their venerable ancient Christian Church statutes and discipline; in accordance with all this with the knowledge and approval of the congregation

he also piously resolved to have the Rev. Mr. David Nitschmann, who was one of the first of the Moravian witnesses in America, who had ventured all things in trust in God, and to whom the Lord had given the first fruits of the heathen, in accordance with the ancient Moravian rites ordained a Senior and Superintendent of this and all future Colonies, in all congregations and for all their ministers.

"Therefore, I, the undersigned, in accordance with this properly presented request, as Elder, Senior and Episcopus of the Bohemian-Moravian Brethren in Great Poland, with the knowledge and consent of my colleague in Great Poland, Sir Senior Christian Sitkovius, did ordain the afore-mentioned Mr. David Nitschmann, on March 13th, 1735, in the name of God, according to our Christian customs, with imposition of hands and prayer, a Senior of the afore-mentioned congregations, and endowed him with full authority to perform the visitations called for by his office, to ordain the pastors and church servants of those congregations, and to take upon himself all those functions which belong to a Senior and Antistes of the Church. May the dear Saviour, to Whose service he has devoted himself, abide with him most sensibly, endow him with courage and strength, accompany his apostolic office with rich blessing to the glory of God, and to the salvation of many souls; in order that he may bear much fruit in

God's vineyard, and that his reward may be great in eternity.

"I myself have written the above, signed it, sealed it with the seal of our Church. So given at Berlin, June 14th, 1737.

Seal. Daniel Ernest Jablonsky
Royal Elder Court Chaplain, Consistory
and Church Councillor - as Elder Senior
and Antistes of the Bohemian-Moravian
Brethren in Great Poland. Manu propria. (52)

In Zinzendorf's judgement the episcopate which had so been transferred was intended merely for foreign missions and was not to separate Herrnhut from the Lutheran Church or to become an independent organisation. Yet these things necessarily resulted. The first ordination by Nitschmann was of John George Waiblinger, not a missionary, but minister elect of the settlement at Pilgerruh in Schleswig, on July 29th 1735. (53)

Zinzendorf's entry into the Ministry alienated many influential people and his enemies, regarding him as a dangerous man, had him banished from Saxony on March 20th, 1736. Instead of returning to Herrnhut from Holland which he was visiting when the decree of banishment was issued, he left the supervision of its affairs to his wife and he eventually leased property in Wetteravia from the Count Ysenburg. (54) At Ronneburg, a ruined medieval castle populated by Jewish and gypsy families, he began his new evangelistic work, against the advice of Christian David. There he inaugurated an

ZINZENDORF
BANISHED:
FORMATION
OF THE
JUNGERHAUS.

institution which long influenced the Brethren's Church - the Pilgergemeine or Pilgerhaus, (the Congregation of Pilgrims). (55) This body stood at the head of affairs during his banishment. It was a body of men and women whose mission was to proclaim the Saviour in all the world and who, therefore, moved from place to place according to the needs of the cause. After the Count's return from banishment the Pilgergemeine became known as the 'Jüngerhaus' and in 1747 the Diarium der Hütten, later known as the Diarium des Jungerhauses, was begun. (56) It provided a complete account of the doings of Zinzendorf and his coadjutors from day to day, and it contained verbatim reports of all the discourses he delivered and copies of all reports received from every mission in Christian or heathen lands. No part of it was printed but the whole was written and manuscript copies sent to all parts of the world wherever the Brethren were established. To do this the Schreiber-Collegium - a body of copyists devoting almost all their time to transcribing the diary and letters - was formed.

After a short stay at Ronneburg he toured Livonia and on the return journey he visited Frederick William I of Prussia at his hunting lodge in Wusterhausen. The King was impressed by Zinzendorf and concluded that his only fault was that he wished to be pious although

a nobleman. He advised Zinzendorf to be consecrated as a Bishop of the Brethren's Church and the Count gave this serious consideration and consulted further with Bishop Jablonsky.

FIRST SYNOD
OF THE
RENEWED
BRETHREN'S
CHURCH AT
MARIENBORN.

On his return to Wetteravia the first Synod of the Renewed Unitas was held in the castle of Marienborn, another estate leased from the Counts Ysenburg. This Synod met from Dec. 9th 1736 and one of its chief discussions was on the importance of the episcopate as giving the Brethren's Church a distinct and independent position. At the close of the Synod Zinzendorf went to Holland, then to England to consult with the Trustees of the Colony of Georgia regarding a Moravian Settlement at Savannah, to do evangelistic work among the Germans in London, and to confer with Archbishop Potter at Canterbury with respect to the Moravian episcopate. The Archbishop received him in a most friendly way and repeatedly acknowledged the validity of Moravian Orders and urged Zinzendorf to accept consecration at the hands of Jablonsky.(57)

CONSECRATION
OF
ZINZENDORF
AS A BISHOP
OF THE
BRETHREN'S
CHURCH.

Thus on May 20th 1737 Zinzendorf was consecrated in Berlin by Jablonsky and Nitschmann in the presence of several members of the old Bohemian congregation and with the consent of Sitkovius. Letters of congratulation were received from the King of Prussia, Sitkovius and Archbishop Potter. This consecration

was an important step in the direction of independence, which was almost forced on Zinzendorf eventually, so that the Moravians might not be driven from Herrnhut but might have an acknowledged standing as members of a recognised Church.

PART II.

GREAT BRITAIN

1. Beginnings of the Moravian Church
in England
2. Progress in Great Britain.

1. Beginnings of the Moravian Church in England

FIRST CONTACT OF THE RENEWED BRETHREN'S CHURCH WITH ENGLAND.

Early in the summer of 1728, Zinzendorf had sent three men, Wenceslaus Neisser, John Töltschig and David Nitschmann, the Syndic, to England, to form a connection with the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge. He had been in correspondence with a lady of the English Court, Countess Lippe-Schaumberg, and was counting on her support to obtain introductions to officials of Oxford University. They left Herrnhut on June 7th and travelled via Jena, obtaining there from Dr. Buddhaeus, a letter of recommendation to Ziegenhagen, the Court Preacher. (1) They reached London after enduring great privation on the journey but failed in their errand, largely through the hostility of Zeigenhagen whose mind had been prejudiced against them by Hellenian opponents. Thus the first contact of the renewed Moravian Church with Britain was most unpromising.

JAMES HUTTON AND THE WESLEYS.

A few yards to the west of Temple Bar there was a London bookseller's shop known as "The Bible and Sun". This bookseller, James Hutton, in time became the first English member of the Brethren's Church (2) and he was the connecting link between the Moravians and the Methodists, playing quite a vital part in the Evangelical Revival.

James Hutton was born on September 14th, 1715,

the son of a High Church clergyman, a non-juror who had been compelled to resign his living and kept a boarding house in College Street, Westminster, for boys attending the Westminster School. James was educated at that school where one of his teachers was Samuel Wesley, the elder brother of John and Charles. Brought up as a son of the Church of England, with a deep concern for her services and doctrine, and with no knowledge of Herrnhut or Zinzendorf, he merely longed for a revival of spiritual life within his Church.

One of the Religious Societies then meeting in London met at the house of Hutton's father, but James felt that it was a group of slumbering souls who fancied themselves more holy than other people. Being apprenticed to a bookseller he thought he might do some good business by visiting old schoolmates at Oxford and it was on such a visit that he was introduced to John and Charles Wesley. (3) These two, with others, had formed a group who attended the Holy Communion at St. Mary's every Sunday, met on Sunday evening to read classics and the Greek New Testament, regularly visited the poor and the prison, and observed regular fasts. They had become known variously as the Holy Club, the Reforming Club, the Sacramentarians, the Bible Moths, the Enthusiasts, and the Methodists.

CONTACTS
WITH THE
BRETHREN.

James Hutton was deeply stirred by his contact with these men. He was still living with his father at College Street and next door to his old teacher, Samuel Wesley, and he asked John and Charles Wesley to call on him next time they were in London. About that time John Wesley received an invitation from the Governor of Georgia to go to his Colony as a missionary and he and his brother Charles, who was appointed as the Governor's secretary, came to London in 1735 and spent two days at Hutton's house before sailing to Georgia. Hutton was caught in their enthusiasm and would have sailed with them had he not been bound apprentice. As it was, he went to Gravesend with them to see them off and spent some time aboard the ship which was to take them. This provided him with his first contact with the Moravian Brethren, for the passengers on the "Simmonds" included not only the Governor, General Oglethorpe, but Bishop David Nitschmann and twenty three other Moravians bound for missionary work in the American Colonies.

The following year saw Hutton's apprenticeship completed and he set up for himself as a bookseller at the "Bible and Sun". He founded a new Religious Society with weekly meetings in his own back parlour which was to become the centre of the Evangelical Revival. John Wesley began his famous Journal as he sailed for Georgia and he sent copies to Hutton who

read them out at his weekly meetings. In his story Wesley told with admiration of his contact with the Moravians, how they had impressed him with their quiet and courageous faith in storms at sea and how he had been personally helped and inspired by the advice and company of the Moravian scholar-missionary, Spangenberg. (4) As he read these reports at the "Bible and Sun" Hutton began to take a deeper interest in the Church of the Brethren.

HUTTON'S
SOCIETY AT
ALDERSGATE
STREET.

Not only had Hutton met with the Wesleys at Oxford, he had also made the acquaintance of Benjamin Ingham and George Whitefield. He was the first to welcome Whitefield to London, found him openings in the Churches there, supplied him with money for the poor, and published his sermons. Now he founded another Society in Aldersgate Street and was soon to meet Zinzendorf. (5)

In 1737 the Count came to London for about six weeks, first to talk with Archbishop Potter about Moravian Episcopal Orders, and secondly to consult with the Board of Trustees for Georgia. He had several talks with the Board's secretary. The Secretary was Charles Wesley, who was then lodging at old John Hutton's house in College Street. (6) It was he who introduced James Hutton to Zinzendorf, thus forging the next link in the chain.

PETER
BOEHLER.

On January 27th, 1738 another Moravian arrived

in London, who was to have an incalculable effect on the rising Revival. Peter Boehler had just been ordained by Zinzendorf and was on his way to missionary work in South Carolina. He arrived in London five days before John Wesley landed from his visit to America. On February 7th the two men met at the house of a Dutch merchant named Weinantz.(7) Wesley found lodgings for Boehler, introduced him to James Hutton, and then set out with him to Oxford where they had conversations which deeply influenced Wesley.

There is little doubt that John Wesley was a real and practising Christian when he embarked on his mission to Georgia but he had returned bankrupt of much of his original ardour. He lacked the one thing that Boehler seemed to possess - what St. Paul called "peace with God", and what the Methodists call "assurance". Boehler did more than any to lead him through his troubled doubts to the calm waters of rest.(8) Boehler had to leave for South Carolina and he wrote a farewell letter to Wesley from Southampton in which he charged him - "Beware of the sin of unbelief and if you have not conquered it yet, see that you do conquer it this very day, through the blood of Jesus Christ".

That evening, May 24th, 1738 John Wesley went to Hutton's Society Meeting in Aldersgate Street. Someone

was reading Luther's preface to the Epistle to the Romans, and Wesley wrote afterwards - "About a quarter to nine, while he was describing the change which God works in the heart through faith in Christ, I felt my heart strangely warmed. I felt I did trust in Christ, Christ alone, for salvation; and an assurance was given me that He had taken away my sins, even mine, and saved me from the law of sin and death".(9) From that moment John Wesley was a changed man. Peter Boehler had similarly deeply influenced John Wesley's brother, Charles, during his brief stay in England.

But Boehler's influence was not only on the Wesleys. He had quickly learned English from Charles Wesley and had given addresses to the people who gathered at James Hutton's house. Rapidly he changed the whole character of the Society. In particular it changed from being a rather free-and-easy gathering of a group of High Churchmen, to a society of Evangelicals with very definite regulations and for some two years was nothing less than the headquarters of the growing Evangelical Revival.

The Rules of the Society were the joint work of John Wesley and Peter Boehler, drawn up on May 1st, 1738 just before the latter sailed for America. By these rules the members of the Society were, almost unconsciously, introducing a new principle into English

Church life, that of democratic government. The Society was a self-governing body in which all members, clerical and lay, stood on equal footing. They met weekly to confess their faults one to another and pray for each other. They divided their Society into "bands" with a leader at the head of each, and it was ruled that "everyone without distinction, submit to the determination of his Brethren".(10)

THE
FETTER LANE
SOCIETY.

The Society increased and soon the meeting room at Hutton's house was too small, therefore, he hired a large Baptist Hall known as the Great Meeting House, in Fetter Lane. From then on the Society became known as the Fetter Lane Society and for some months all was well. Hutton and the Wesleys became still more impressed with the Moravians as many called in on the Society as they passed on their way to America, and the fervour of the Society reached its height at a Watch-Night Service at Fetter Lane on December 31st, 1738. John Wesley writes "About three in the morning as we were continuing in short prayer, the power of God came mightily upon us, insomuch that many cried out for exceeding joy, and many fell to the ground".(11)

JOHN
WESLEY
PARTS FROM
THE BRETHREN.

This happy state was not to continue however. John Wesley soon found serious faults in the Brethren. He had visited Marienborn and Herrnhut in August 1738

and was displeased because the Brethren had excluded him, as a "homo perturbatus" (a restless man). from their Holy Communion, although they had admitted his companion Benjamin Ingham. (12) Now he found increasing difficulty in fitting in with the complete democracy of Fetter Lane, for his nature was rather that of a commander than a member of the crew. Because the members of the Society came from such varied stations in life and free discussion was the rule, scholars, tradesmen and artisans, all standing on the same footing, discussed theology with the eagerness of novices and the confidence of experts. This was a sphere quite foreign to Wesley who had been brought up in the realm of authority. He grew increasingly impatient and disgusted with the discussions and his alienation was made complete in his clash with Philip Henry Molther (13) who arrived en route for America on 18th October, 1739. The Fetter Lane Society was no longer a calm and peaceful place and the wranglings came to a head at a meeting on July 16th, 1740 when Wesley determined to clear the air. He charged the Moravians with antinomianism, they regarded him as perverting the doctrine of salvation through grace without merit, and the dispute went on until eleven o'clock. On Sunday evening, 20th July 1740 Wesley attended the meeting again and delivered an ultimatum

saying "I find you more and more confirmed in the error of your ways. Nothing now remains but that I should give you up to God. You that are of the same opinion follow me". Eighteen supporters answered his call and Wesley departed never to return to Fetter Lane. (14) Zinzendorf tried to heal the breach and met Wesley in Gray's Inn Gardens, 3rd September, 1741 but the result of this meeting was to drive Wesley further than ever from the Brethren. (15)

STEPS IN
THE ESTABLISH-
MENT OF
THE FIRST
ENGLISH
CONGREGATION
OF THE
BRETHREN'S
CHURCH.

After John Wesley had left the Fetter Lane Society, James Hutton came to the forefront, and he was chiefly responsible for the Society becoming more and more Moravian in character. He maintained correspondence with Zinzendorf, introduced Moravian literature to English readers by publishing a collection of Moravian hymns, a Moravian Manual of Doctrine and a volume of Zinzendorf's sermons. He asked for Moravian teachers, and Molther, who had done so much harm, left and the sober and scholarly Spangenberg arrived. Immediately things were lifted to a higher level, quarelling ceased, and the members began to apply themselves to spreading the Gospel. They established the "Society for the Furtherance of the Gospel", with the object of supporting foreign missions, under the direction of a committee of four, one of whom was James Hutton. (16)

The next step was to licence the Chapel in Fetter Lane, for as long as the members met without a licence they could be accused of breaking the Conventicle Act. The licence was taken in September, 1741 and they took on themselves the title "Moravian Brethren, formerly of the Anglican Communion". William Holland asked, for most of the members were loyal to the Church of England but desired closer connection with the Church of the Brethren, "Can a man join the Moravian Church and yet remain a member of the Anglican Church?" and the answer was given, "Yes, for they are sister Churches".

So, without wishing to become Dissenters, some members applied to Spangenberg to establish a Congregation of the Moravian Church in England. At first he hesitated and the matter was put to the Lot which sanctioned the move. Thus, on 10th November, 1742 the London Congregation was established, consisting of seventy two members of the Fetter Lane Society, most of them Anglicans who considered themselves Anglicans still. But they were now Brethren in the fullest sense and about half of them took office in the new Congregation which was modelled on the pattern of Herrnhut. It was divided into Choirs with an Elder at the head of each. There were also two Congregations: Elders, two Wardens, two Admonitors, two Censors, five Servants and eight Sick-Waiters.(17) This Church in Fetter Lane was the headquarters of Moravian work

in Britain for some years and meanwhile a new campaign had begun in Yorkshire.

2. Progress in Great Britain

JOHN
CENNICK.

A strange factor in the establishment of new congregations in the renewal and growth of the Brethren's Church is the part played so often in preparing the way by one who did not originally belong to that Church himself. At Herrnhut the pathmaker was the Lutheran Christian David; at Fetter Lane it was James Hutton, the son of an Anglican clergyman; in Yorkshire, as we shall see, it was the Anglican clergyman, Benjamin Ingham, who never actually joined the Moravian Church at all; and in the South West of England, Wales and Ireland, it was another Anglican, John Cennick.

John Cennick, said to be descended from one of the Brethren who fled from Bohemia to England in the middle of the 17th Century, was born in 1718 at Reading. (18)

In his youth he seems to have been unaware of his descent from the Unitas Fratrum. He was baptised and brought up as an Anglican at St. Lawrence's Church where he experienced the assurance of salvation, or conversion, before he met Moravians or Methodists.

A few months after this experience he was at a private card party in Reading and when asked to take a hand he refused. His refusal was regarded as priggish and someone in the company remarked that there was just such another stupid religious fellow at Oxford called Kinchin. Charles Kinchin was one of Wesley's friends

and a fellow member of the Holy Club. As soon as possible Cennick went to Oxford to seek out Kinchin and was introduced by him to the Wesleys. He went to London and there met James Hutton and George Whitefield and was thus drawn into the main stream of the Evangelical Revival at the time when Wesley and Whitefield first began their open air preaching.

In 1739 John Wesley opened a Charity school for miners' children at Kingswood, near Bristol, and he appointed Cennick as head warden. (19) Cennick soon joined the ranks of the preachers and for some eighteen months was one of Wesley's first lay assistant preachers, using the same sensational style as Wesley and meeting with the same sensational results. At the services listeners often behaved like maniacs and Wesley, far from being shocked, regarded this as a sign of the working of the Holy Spirit convicting people of their sin. At first Cennick felt the same but before long his common-sense prevailed and he differed from Wesley on this and also on other matters such as the doctrines of predestination and Christian perfection. The result was that Wesley dismissed him from his service.

CENNICK
IN THE
WEST
COUNTRY.

Now Cennick joined forces with Howell Harris and then with Whitefield. From 1740-45 he engaged in preaching through Gloucestershire and Wiltshire and in spite of much violent and humiliating opposition, from

his headquarters at Tytherton, near Chippenham, he established Societies at Bath, Brinkworth, Foxham, Malmesbury, and in many other villages. (20)

THE
BRETHREN'S
CHURCH
ASKED TO
HELP.

Before long he felt he had too many flöcks under his care and he decided to hand them into the care of the Moravians whom he had met and for whom he developed an increasing admiration. Eventually a meeting of his stewards at Tytherton on 18th December 1745 made a petition to the Brethren, and in answer to this request workers were sent down to begin their work in the West of England. (21)

The Brethren's policy was never one of proselytisation and instead of forming a number of new and independent congregations they followed their typical pattern of centralisation which everywhere ultimately prevented the extension of their Church. They centred their work at Tytherton and it was many years before the other Western congregations received recognised status. This did not happen at Bristol until 1755, at Kingswood until 1757, at Bath until 1765, Malmesbury 1770, and Devonport 1771. Many Societies had to wait so long that, their patience exhausted, they simply died of exhaustion and neglect.

CENNICK
JOINS THE
BRETHREN
AND WORKS
IN
IRELAND.

Leaving his Societies in the West to the care of the Brethren, Cennick toured Germany and spent three months at Herrnhag where he was received into the Brethren's Church as a member.

Returning to Britain as a Moravian he embarked on his great campaign in Ireland, beginning at Dublin, and proceeded to found religious Societies in the Counties Antrim, Down, Derry, Armagh, Tyrone, Cavan, Monaghan, and Donegal. In spite of some fierce opposition his work was accompanied by phenomenal success and was supported by Dr. Rider, Bishop of Down and Connor. At the close of his work Cennick had built ten chapels and established some two hundred and twenty religious societies. The Brethren were particularly thick on the ground around Lough Neagh where they were divided into Four districts. In the north-east there were four societies with chapels at Ballymena, Gloonen, and Grogan, with a growing cause at Doagh. In the north-west there was a society at Lisnamara, later established as a congregation at Gracefield. In the south-west three chapels were being built ~~at~~ in Co. Armagh, and in the south-east there were several societies with chapels built or being built at Ballinderry, Glenavy, and Kilwarlin. (22)

Little remains in Ulster today to indicate the power of the Brethren in those days, and the cause of the decline would seem to be threefold. The first was financial, for the Moravian Church was at that time passing through a financial crisis so that, when money would have been most useful to support the hold the movement was achieving on the affections of desperately

poor Irish folk, none was available. The second was the questionable system of management, for centralization was pursued in Ireland as it had been in Wiltshire and Yorkshire. As, in Yorkshire, the congregation were dependent on Fulneck, so in Ulster a settlement was built at Gracehill, near Ballymena, upon which the other congregations were made to depend. The third cause was Cennick's early death. At the height of his powers he broke down in body and mind, worn out with his labours and the victim of mental depression. On his way to London he was taken seriously ill and arrived at Fetter Lane in a state of high fever and exhaustion. There, in a room which is now the Chapel Vestry, he lay delirious for a week and died at the age of thirty-six. (23)

Now he is perhaps chiefly remembered in English Churches as the author of the well known grace before meals' "Be present at our table, Lord" and some hymns such as "Children of the Heavenly King" and "Ere I sleep for every favour". Perhaps he did more than other English Brethren to extend the Moravian cause in the United Kingdom, yet, strangely, he was never promoted to any position of special responsibility, never having the sole charge of a congregation nor being superintendent of the work in Ireland.

Meanwhile, in England, the Brethren had been bitterly opposed. This opposition was often due to prejudice

REASONS
FOR
OPPOSITION
TO THE
BRETHREN'S
CHURCH:

and misunderstanding and they tried to counter it first by an appeal to Parliament and other authorities and then, more successfully, by answering their critics both in print and also by the quality of their own spiritual life.

There were several reasons for the opposition which developed against them.

1.
NATURAL
SUSPICION
OF
FOREIGNERS

The first was that the leading Brethren were Germans. The English then had a German King for whom they had little love and the general feeling was that any foreigner was almost bound to be a conspirator or traitor. If a man's name were John Smith he was accepted as a loyal citizen, but if his name should be Gussenbauer or Ockershausen, he was probably another Guy Fawkes plotting against the State! So the Brethren were accused of treachery. Gussenbauer at Pudsey was arrested, tried at Wakefield, and committed to prison in York Castle. In Essex, at Broadoaks, where the Brethren had opened a school, they were accused of being agents of the Young Pretender!

2.
WRITINGS
OF GILBERT
TENNENT.

A book published in America by a certain Gilbert Tennent, entitled "Some account of the Principles of the Moravians", was the source of the second cause of trouble. In 1743 it was published in England, with a preface by an English editor in which extravagant and strange accusations were levelled at the Brethren, resulting in the spreading of the alarming rumours

that the Moravians were really Papists in disguise!(24)
In fairness to those who attacked them it must be remembered that, in common with other Evangelical revivalists, they were running counter to the current mood of the Age of Reason and presenting an acceptance of authority completely foreign to that which had general acceptance. A religious source of authority independent of Reason or the State was bound to create opposition and misunderstanding. Accusations of being "Papists in disguise", whilst clearly being far from literally true, may well have had more justification that is at first evident, and was, to some extent at least, brought upon themselves.

3.
STRANGE
TERMS
USED BY
BRETHREN.

A third source of misunderstanding was the religious language employed by the Brethren. They talked of Jesus as "the Man of Smart", and referred to their own condition as "Sinnership" and "Sinnerlikeness". Such terms seemed absurd to the orthodox Churchman who, failing to know what it meant and not finding it in the Bible, therefore concluded that the Brethren's doctrine was unscriptural and so unsound.

4.
SUSPICION
OF BEING
ANTINOMIAN.

Fourthly, the Brethren's doctrine of Justification by Faith alone brought against them the most serious and persistent charge of despising good works, and they were denounced as Antinomians. In this their severest critic was John Wesley with his "Letter to the Moravian

Church" published in his Journal, his "Short View of the Difference between the Moravian Brethren, lately in England, and the Rev. Mr. John and Charles Wesley", and his "A Dialogue between an Antinomian and his Friend". (25)

THE
BRETHREN'S
DEFENCE.

In the face of all these attacks the Brethren considered what measures they should take in self - defence. Accused of disloyalty to the throne, on behalf of all the English Societies connected with the Brethren's Church, James Hutton, Benjamin Ingham and William Bell, drew up an address to the King, went to see him in person on April 27th, 1744 and assured him that they were loyal subjects who hated both Popery and popish pretenders. Accused of attacking the Anglican Church, two Brethren called on Bishop Gibson of London, and assured him that this was untrue. Regarding the rest they kept silent, following the direction of the Lot, consulted at a conference in London, which decided they should not reply to Tennent or Wesley. (26)

THE
BRETHREN'S
STANDING
AS A
PROTESTANT
EPISCOPAL
CHURCH
RECOGNISED
BY ACT OF
PARLIAMENT.

The Brethren had established a flourishing Indian congregation at Shekomeko, in Dutchess County, New York and in 1744 the New York Assembly, stirred up by liquor sellers who were losing their business, passed an Act declaring that "all vagrant preachers, Moravians, and

disguised Papists" should not be allowed to preach to the Indians unless they first took the oaths of allegiance and abjuration. (27) The English Moravians felt insulted since the Act did not apply to other denominations such as Presbyterians, Independents and Quakers, but bracketed loyal Moravians with "Papists in Disguise", and they were stung to action to protect their Church in the Colonies. Helped by General Oglethorpe, Governor of Georgia and himself a Member of the House of Commons, they eventually had a new clause passed in Parliament extending the freedom already extended by previous Acts to Quakers and other foreign Protestants in Pennsylvania, to all foreign Protestants in all American Colonies, the Moravians being especially mentioned. (28)

This did not, however, greatly help the Brethren in England whose great problem was the standing they were to hold in England, where, on the one hand they were entitled to religious liberty as a foreign Protestant Church, but on the other hand were practically treated as Dissenters, being compelled to have all their buildings licensed. A further petition was made to Parliament that the Brethren in America should be exempted, not merely from the oath, but also from military service, and this resulted in the formation of a Parliamentary Committee to investigate thoroughly.

the whole history, doctrine and practice of the Brethren. This Committee satisfied itself that the Moravians were the true descendents of the Old Church of the Brethren with a genuine episcopal succession, that they had no sectarian motives and no desire to compete with the Church of England, and that wherever they went they made honest and industrious citizens. As a result of the Committee's good report, leave was granted to bring in a Bill "for encouraging the people known by the name of the Unitas Fratrum, or United Brethren, to settle in His Majesty's Colonies in America." The real purpose of the Bill, however, was to recognise the Brethren's Church as an ancient Protestant Episcopal Church, not only in the American Colonies, but also in the United Kingdom, and its provisions were to be in force wherever the British flag might fly.

The first reading of the Bill was on March 28th, 1749 and had a smooth passage. (29) Some possible opposition was expected in the House of Lords where it was feared some Bishops might raise an objection because the Brethren were described as an "Episcopal Church". However, the English Bishops had met at Lambeth and after discussion resolved not to oppose, and Bishop Maddox of Worcester spoke on behalf of the other Bishops. He said "Our Moravian Brethren are an ancient Episcopal

Church. Of all Protestants, they come nearest to the Established Church of this Kingdom in their doctrine and constitution. And though the enemy has persecuted them from several quarters, the soundness of their faith and the purity of their morals have defended them from any imputation of Popery and immorality". (30) Eventually the Bill was carried without division on May 12th, 1749. (31)

HEADQUARTERS
OF THE
CHURCH OF
THE BRETHREN
MOVED TO
LONDON.

Shortly after the passing of the Act of Parliament, Count Zinzendorf moved the headquarters of the Brethren's Church from Germany to London and acquired a considerable property in Chelsea where he began the arrangements for a Moravian Settlement in full working order. (32) Then he published a folio-volume entitled "Acta Fratrum Unitatis in Anglia", on the advice of Wilson, Bishop of Sodor and Man. It contained the main evidence examined by the Parliamentary Committee; an article setting out the Brethren's doctrinal beliefs, called "The Whole System of the Twenty-one Doctrinal Articles of the Confession of Augsburg"; an article on "The Brethren's Method of Preaching the Gospel, according to the Synod of Bern, 1532"; some extracts from the minutes of German Synods showing what the Brethren meant by such phrases as "Sinnership" and "Blood and Wounds Theology"; and Zinzendorf's treatise, "The Rationale of the Brethren's Liturgies". The volume ended with the Brethren's

"Church Liturgy", revised by Sherlock, Bishop of London. (33) It was an honest manifesto of the Brethren's principles, a declaration that they had nothing to hide, and a challenge to their enemies to do their worst. This they proceeded to do!

VARIOUS
WRITERS
ATTACK THE
BRETHREN'S
CHURCH:

1. JOHN
WESLEY

John Wesley, still regarding the Moravians as wicked Antinomians, obtained a copy of the "Acta Fratrum" and, in 1750, published a summary of its contents with comments of his own, entitled "Contents of a Folio History" and signed "A Lover of the Light". It was a fierce attack on the Brethren, accusing them of deceiving the Government and obtaining their privileges under false pretences, of a hypocritical pretence in their professed reluctance to steal sheep from other Churches, and lastly, earnestly besought all Methodists who had joined the Church of the Brethren to quit their diabolical delusions, to flee from the borders of Sodom, and leave these Brethren, who loved darkness and rejected the Holy Scriptures!

(34)

2. GEORGE
BADDELEY

A milder attack followed from George Baddeley, the Curate at Melbourne in Derbyshire, who was disturbed that so many of his parishioners had ceased to attend the Parish Church. He appealed to them in a pamphlet called "A Kind and Friendly Letter to the People called Moravians at Melbourne, in Derbyshire".

(35)

It was, in fact, kind and friendly, but revealed a mistaken impression which the writer had of the Brethren's teaching which it reported inaccurately.

3. GREGORY
OLDKNOW

The fantastic nature of some of the attacks made against the Brethren is nowhere better illustrated than in a pamphlet published in 1751 by Gregory Oldknow of Spondon, near Derby, entitled "Serious Objections to the Pernicious Doctrines of the Moravians and Methodists". He described the Moravians as cannibals and German pickpockets and said that their chief object at their "love-feasts" was to squeeze money from the poor. (36) At some of their Services they played the bass viol, and at others they did not, which plainly showed that they were unsteady in their minds and therefore a danger to Church and State.

4. JOHN ROCHE

In Dublin, also in 1751, another writer, John Roche, published a treatise subscribed to by a number of prominent Churchmen, entitled "Moravian Heresy" in which the Moravians were denounced as Antinomians. When he wrote both Cennick and Wesley had been preaching in Dublin and originally he intended to expose both Moravians and Methodists but he said that "the Moravians being the more dangerous, subtle and powerful sect, and I fear will be the more obstinate, I shall treat of them first". (37)

5. GEORGE
WHITEFIELD

The Moravian Brethren underwent a financial crisis

at this time which was due entirely to their foolish mismanagement of their investments and rather rash expenditure on expensive building schemes. Thus when some £67,000, invested with a Portugese Jew named Gomez Serra, was lost, the English Brethren found themselves in 1752 with liabilities amounting to about £100,000. Relying on the Brethren to repay their debt as soon as possible Zinzendorf pledged himself for the whole sum at a meeting of creditors who accepted the offer. (38) It was at this point that George Whitefield interfered and nearly sank the Moravian ship. He accused them of several unusual religious practices but most seriously he accused both Zinzendorf and the Brethren of robbery and fraud, which undermined the confidence of their creditors. To prove his point about their ruthless exploitation of simple believers he quoted the case of one Thomas Rhodes as one of the victims. He said that they had first persuaded this man to sell a valuable estate, seized part of his money to pay their debts and at length drained him so dry that he had to sell them his watch, bureau, horse and saddle, to fly to France, and to leave his aged mother to die of starvation in England. At first the story was believed and creditors in panic began to press for their money. The Church of the Brethren was on the brink of ruin. However, those very people the Brethren were supposed to have robbed came to their

defence and repudiated Whitefields's charges. They formed a committee and drew up a statement - "The Representation of the Committee of the English Congregations in Union with the Moravian Church" (1754) declaring that Whitefield's charges were untrue. Thomas Rhodes wrote a letter to his own lawyer declaring that he had sold his estate of his own free will, that the Brethren had paid a good price, and that he and his mother were living in perfect comfort. With Whitefield's fiction so exploded the Brethren's credit was restored. (39)

6. HENRY RIMIUS.

In 1753 another writer in London Henry Rimius, issued "A Candid Narrative of the Rise and Progress of the Herrnhuters". This was to be followed by a series of writings from Rimius attacking the Moravians - "A Solemn Call on Count Zinzendorf" (1754), "Supplement to the Candid Narrative" (1755), "A Second Solemn Call on Mr. Zinzendorf" (1757) and (undated) "Animadversions on Sundry Flagrant Untruths advanced by Mr. Zinzendorf". (40) His books were malicious, indecent, and unfair, painting a progressively more disgusting picture of the Brethren. If some of his accusations had sound basis in the foolish excesses of the fanatics of Herrnhag (a settlement which Zinzendorf had wound up) it was dishonest of Rimius to father their sins on the English Brethren against whom he had no evidence at all.

7. ANDREW
FREY.

Also in 1753, one Andrew Frey issued an eye-witness story, "The True and Authentic Account of Andrew Frey". (41) He claimed to have spent some four years among the Brethren in Germany and had settled at Marienborn when the fanaticism there was in full blood. Disgusted with the gluttony, drunkenness and self indulgence he found amongst them he had finally concluded that they were the wickedest sect that had ever been and turned his back on them for good. The picture he drew of Marienborn and Herrnhag in their worst days was substantailly true, for when the settlement at Herrnhag was abandoned some of the Single Brethren went to Pennsylvania where they confessed to Spangenberg that Frey's description was no exaggeration.

8. BISHOP
LAVINGTON.

Bishop Lavington of Exeter struck at the Brethren with a book in 1754, "The Moravians Compared and Detected". (42) He described the Brethren as "immoral characters fitted to enter a herd of swine", and explained his purpose, in his preface, as the suppression of the Brethren's Church in England. It was a scurrilous attack and quite unworthy of its episcopal author, framed in extravagant and offensive language.

The finishing touch in these written attacks came from John Wesley, in 1755, when he published a pamphlet "Queries to Count Zinzendorf" (43) in which he claimed that he wanted to be quite fair to the

Brethren and give them a chance of clearing themselves, and so set out the case against them in a nutshell.

THE
BRETHREN
ANSWER
THEIR
ATTACKERS.

Attacked in this way from many sides the Brethren set themselves to self-defence. Zinzendorf, James Hutton, Frederick Neisser and others, who remained anonymous, issued a series of pamphlets. The chief of these were:-

(a) IN
WRITINGS,

AND

(b) BY
QUALITY OF
LIFE AND
CHARACTER.

1. Peremptorischen Bedencken, or The Ordinary of the Brethren's Churches;
Short and Peremptory Remarks on the Way and Manner wherein he has been hitherto treated in Controversies. (1753)
(Zindendorf).
2. A Modest Plea for the Church of the Brethren.
(1754) (Anonymous)
3. The Plain Case of the Representatives of the Unitas Fratrum (1754) (Anonymous)
4. A Letter from a Minister of the Moravian Branch of the Unitas Fratrum to the Author of the "Moravians Compared and Detected" (1755)
(probably by Fred. Neisser)
5. An Exposition, or True State of the Matters objected in England to the People known by the name of unitas Fratrum (1755) (Zinzendorf).
6. Additions, by James Hutton.
7. An Essay towards giving some Just Ideas of the Personal Character of Count Zinzendorf (1755)
(James Hutton).
8. A Short Answer to Mr. Rimius's Long Uncandid

Narrative (1753). (Anonymous). (44)

Generally, these pamphlets pointed out that the accusations of Rimius and Frey were "out of court" on two grounds. Firstly, they accused the whole of the Brethren's Church of sins committed by only a few fanatics at Marienborn and Herrnhag, and secondly, that fanaticism had practically ceased before the English Act of Parliament was passed. The critics had to go to these centres of fanaticism and abuse for the material of their accusations because it was lacking in the English Brethren, whose good character was well known to their neighbours and was its own defence. It was clearly unfair to blame innocent Englishmen for the past sins, long ago abandoned, of a few foreign fanatics. The apparently strange and extravagant language used by the Brethren in some of their worship and which had brought the charge of using indecent language, was explained and justified by both Zinzendorf and Hutton.

But the better part of the Brethren's defence was not the writing of these pamphlets. It was their concentration on setting their English House in order. In 1752 they published their first authorised collection of hymns with a preface which declared their purpose as first the proclamation of the Gospel and then the cultivation of personal holiness.(45) In the same year at a Synod at Lindsey House they resolved that a Book

of Statutes was needed and asked Zinzendorf to prepare one. The result - "Statutes: or the General Principles of Practical Christianity, extracted out of the New Testament" was sanctioned and adopted at the Synod on May 12th 1755. (46) It was thorough and systematic and provided a handy guide to daily conduct and so long as the Brethren ordered their daily conduct by its rules they could smile at Rimius and his supporters.

The Moravian influence in England was at its high tide and we find that just at the time when their enemies were denouncing them as immoral Antinomians, they were establishing their strongest congregations at Fulneck, Gomersal, Wyke, Mirfield, Dukinfield, Bristol and Gracehill. In all these congregations the "Statutes" were being strictly enforced.

1. The Building Period, 1742 - 1755.

THE REV.
BENJAMIN
INGHAM.

The Moravian connection with Yorkshire began when the Rev. Benjamin Ingham met Moravian missionaries in Georgia. Ingham was born at Ossett in Yorkshire in 1712. While at Oxford he joined the Wesleys and the Holy Club and was so enthusiastic in the Evangelical cause that on his return to Ossett in 1734 he held nightly religious meetings in his mother's house. He sailed with John Wesley to America in 1735 meeting the Moravians for the first time during the voyage on board the "Symmonds" and then getting to know them more thoroughly in Georgia. (1) In 1737 he returned to Yorkshire and devoted himself to preaching the Gospel to the poor working people in the area between Halifax, Leeds, Wakefield and Bingley. Though his area was rough and opposition was considerable and frequently violent, his work prospered and soon he had some fifty Societies depending upon him and many more people interested. The work grew beyond him and he badly needed help, especially since he wished to extend the sphere of his work further north in the region of Settle.

INGHAM
LOOKS TO
THE
MORAVIANS
FOR HELP.

His thoughts turned to the Moravians as the most suitable he knew for the work. He had been with Wesley to Marienborn where, though they had excluded Wesley, they had admitted Ingham to the Holy Communion. He had been a frequent visitor to Hutton's house in London and

had attended the services at Fetter Lane, and all his subsequent contact with the Moravians had deepened the regard which he had from his first meetings with them in Georgia. He wrote of them, "They are more like the Primitive Christians than any other Church now in the world, for they retain both the faith, practice and discipline delivered by the Apostles. They live together in perfect love and peace. They are the more ready to serve their neighbours than themselves. In their business they are diligent and industrious, in all their dealings strictly just and conscientious. In everything they behave themselves with great meekness, sweetness and simplicity". (2) Unlike Wesley, who changed bitterly towards them, Ingham's good opinion remained constant, although he never actually joined the Brethren as Cennick did, but remained an ordained Minister of the Church of England having no official charge.

He decided that the Moravians were the people to take on this work in the West Riding, and he particularly desired the help of one whom he had met in Georgia, John Toeltschig. So, whilst on a visit to Herrnhut in 1738 he wrote to Count Zinzendorf asking that Toeltschig be allowed to go with him to England:-

"B. Ingham sends greetings and bids grace and peace to the most Reverend Bishops, Lord Count Zinzendorf and David Nitschmann and to the other esteemed Brethren

in Christ. I shall be greatly pleased if, with your consent, my beloved brother, John Toeltschig, be permitted to stay with me in England as long as our Lord and Saviour shall so approve. I am heartily united with you all in the bonds of love. Farewell.

Herrnhut. Sept. 29th 1738" (3)

Thus John Toeltschig came to Ossett and joined Ingham in his work in Yorkshire in November, 1739 where he was eagerly welcomed by the Societies. They gave the same welcome and support to another Moravian evangelist, Peter Boehler (who had been friend and early guide of Wesley) when he came to take Toeltschig's place in 1741.

THE
"YORKSHIRE
CONGREGATION"
FORMED.

Ingham, however, desired more Moravians to come and so he called a mass meeting of his Societies and put to them the question - "Will you have the Moravians to work among you?" Their answer was unanimous and voiced in loud shouts of approval, and a letter was accordingly sent to Gottlieb Spangenberg who was then in London with a group of Moravians at Fetter Lane. He laid the letter before the Fetter Lane Society and on the 26th May 1742 a "Yorkshire Congregation" was formed containing twenty-six members from the Moravians in London. (4) With Spangenberg at their head they set out to join Ingham to commence their evangelistic work in earnest and arrived in July at Smith House, a farm

building in Lightcliffe near Halifax, where they set up their headquarters. (5)

Shouts of approval were not enough for Spangenberg who wanted much more concrete evidence of the local desire for the Moravians to work in Yorkshire. He and Ingham prepared a document which was laid before another meeting of the Societies and some twelve hundred Yorkshire folk signed the request. So Ingham's Societies were handed over to the care of the Moravian Church. The whole neighbourhood was mapped out and places arranged for preaching, prayer and Bible-reading, mostly in barns and small cottages to begin with. Leaders were appointed and stationed at central places - Gussenbaner and his wife at Pudsey; Toeltschig and Piesch at Great Horton, near Bradford; Ockershausen at Mirfield; the Browns at Holbeck, Leeds; and others were soon busy at Lightcliffe, Wyke, Halifax, Hightown, Wortley, Farnley, Cleckheaton, Great Gomersal and Baildon. Crowds gathered to listen to the Moravians, many jeered and threw stones, but many were brought into the fellowship of Christ. By the end of 1743 forty-seven preaching places had been established and a great opportunity for Church extension was ready for the Moravians to grasp.

ZINZENDORF
VISITS
YORKSHIRE
AND ENVISAGES
A 'SETTLEMENT'
AT FULNECK.

In February, 1743 Count Zinzendorf came to Yorkshire (6) and went to see Ingham at Aberford. He soon applied his own method of organisation to the

work which quite effectively prevented its extension. Here as elsewhere his method was centralization. He held that the Brethren should not form new congregations but be content with "diaspora" work, building, where it was possible, a settlement on the model of Herrnhut for the cultivation of social religious life.

At six o'clock on the morning of 4th March, 1743 the Count set off from the meeting house at New House, near Halifax, called at Smith House, and rode on to see the Gussenbauers at Pudsey to visit their child who was seriously ill. It was on this journey that he had his first sight of the site which Fulneck now occupies. (7) It was a spacious but wild and unkempt valley and hillside with a few small cottages along the hilltop. The Gussenbauers lived at one end with a splendid view across the valley. The estate was then known as Falneck and Zinzendorf saw, in his mind's eye, another Herrnhut rising on the hillside, and named the place "Lamb's Hill". A few months later Ingham heard that the Falneck estate was for sale and through his agency the Count purchased the land and cottages and preparations were made for the establishment of the Moravian Settlement in England.

FOUNDATION
OF FULNECK.

At first the Brethren called the place Lamb's Hill, Zinzendorf's first choice of designation, then Gracehall, and then, no doubt partly from the suggestion of the sound of the original name and partly in

memory of Fulneck in Moravia, the home of Comenius, they gave it the name which remains today. Gifts of money came from friends in Germany, timber from others in Norway and the work began.

The founding of Fulneck took place in a surge of zeal, the Brethren singing and praying as they marked out the sites and laid the first stones. The land for the Church was staked out in March, 1746 during a visit of Leonard Dober, a Moravian missionary pioneer, and on 21st May the foundation stone was laid. A manuscript account in the Fulneck archives tells us:-

"This solemnity began at six o'clock in the evening when the congregation assembled in the meeting room". Letters were read, including one from Lady Margaret, wife of Benjamin Ingham, and then John Toeltschig knelt down upon the cornerstone and poured out his heart unto the Lord in a very moving manner, praying that He would from the very beginning take possession of this house and place..... At ten o'clock at night the Single Brethren came to the building place and sweetly sang upon it. The following morning early at one o'clock, Brother Toeltschig being so impressed with joy and thanks on account of the transactions of the last evening that he could not sleep, went to the foundation and thanked Our Saviour for this gracious beginning. He thereupon walked round the place and

sang. Some of the Brethren and Sisters, being surprised to hear him singing so early, got up and joined him, and at four o'clock the Single Sisters did the same upon the building place. And thus almost the whole night was spent in singing and praising the goodness of the Lord to us".(8)

GROWTH
AND
EXTENSION
OF THE
WORK.

The first building to rise in 1746 was the Chapel; then the minister's house, with the rooms beneath on the east side of the Chapel in 1748.

The Chapel came in for some criticism among the earlier generations of Moravians at Fulneck for the supposition on the part of some that it had a certain superfluity of ornament which they condemned as inexpedient. But having regard to its solidity of structure and careful design later generations had cause to be grateful for a building so durable and little in need of repairs in a century or more. It was evidently the work of an architect of considerable ability but there is no certainty as to his identity. It is recorded in 1855(9) that Brother P. La Trobe said that his deceased father, who had been born in Fulneck only ten years after the completion of the Chapel, often named a Mr. Bottomley, of Halifax, as the architect. Attempts to trace more information about Mr. Bottomley have proved fruitless. The Chapel and Minister's house and other rooms were consecrated in June 1748 by Johannes de Watteville, assisted by Peter

Boehler. (10) In the same year the organ was erected by Snetzler, the most eminent organ builder in England at the time. Among the many organs he built were those in Halifax Parish Church; Chesterfield Church; St. Nicholas', Newcastle (now Newcastle Cathedral); St. Mary's Church, Lowgate, Hull; Beverley Minster; Gloucester Cathedral and Buckingham Palace. In the organ at Fulneck, in spite of a rebuild in 1850, some of Snetzler's pipework and part of his original case remain. The pulpit was not erected until 1750 and the first preacher to occupy it was Benjamin La Trobe, at that time the Single Brethren's Labourer.

It was during a visit of Count Zinzendorf and his son, Renatus, in 1749 that the foundation stones of the two choir-houses were laid, and these buildings were completed and inhabited in 1752. The Burial-ground was consecrated in 1749 by the occasion of the interment of a Sister called Grace Clark. (11)

A Chapel was begun at Gomersal in May and completed in November 1751, when it was consecrated by Johannes de Watteville. It was in this little Chapel, rather later, that Zinzendorf preached his first English sermon. At Mirfield a house was rented for use as a Chapel. It was opened on December 15th, 1751 by Benjamin La Trobe, but they were compelled to abandon this Chapel the following year when they took

other premises on lease which seem to have been obtained in perpetuity in 1765 and the premises were added to in 1801 and 1837. At Wyke preparations for a Chapel began in 1752 and it was completed on December 26th, 1753. This Chapel at Wyke was enlarged in 1775 and a Sisters' house was built there in 1783.

The Widows' House was begun at Fulneck in 1763 and further added to in 1770 and 1780. The Congregation Inn and Shop-buildings were either built or enlarged in 1771, both establishments having been set on foot some years before. The Belfry and some rooms under it were added to Fulneck Chapel in 1779 and the Boys' Boarding School was in building from April 1784 to August 1785 and further additions made in 1818.

In the earliest years the only place where labourers resided, apart from Fulneck was Gomersal, where every two or three months a married pair lived. The rest boarded altogether at Fulneck and went from there to visit, preach and hold meetings where societies were gathered. A different arrangement began about the time of the completion of the Chapel in Fulneck. Then, a married labourer was stationed at Mirfield, and another at Scholes, near Wyke. The service of the various other societies by means of out-preaching places continued and in 1750 there were twelve of these regularly supplied probably from Fulneck alone. By 1779 there were as many as seventeen being cared for

by this congregation. (12)

The interests of the young were not forgotten. A brother and sister, known as "the children's father" and "the children's mother", were given the special oversight of the children. Day schools were begun in various parts for the use of the societies, and the children of those brethren and sisters who were set apart for the service of the church, together with the children of some others who desired it, were collected into one family which formed the nucleus of what was later to become the boarding schools at Fulneck. This children's "oeconomy" was at Broadoaks in Essex in 1743, the boys being moved later to Buttermere in Wiltshire and thence to Smith House in Yorkshire in 1748, finally moving to the rooms under the Chapel at Fulneck in 1753, which rooms they occupied until the building of the Boys' School in 1784-5. (13)

DAILY
LIFE AT
FULNECK.

Daily life was organised in accordance with the settlement system at Herrnhut and Herrnhag, each inhabitant having his or her own duty. Men and women were divided into their various groups or "choirs" according to sex, age and state. There were nine choirs - the Married Couples, the Widowers, the Single Brethren, the Single Sisters, the Youths, the Great Girls, the Little Boys, the Little Girls and the Infants in arms. Each choir was headed by a Labourer or Labouress and had its own special services, festivals,

Love-feasts and hymns. The whole congregation had daily meetings, and in the church they sat in their various choirs, the Brethren on one side and the Sisters on the other. The day began with prayer and singing and the reading of the Text-book at 5.0.a.m. and ended with more prayers and singing at 9 p.m. A congregational Love-feast was held once a month on a Sunday afternoon, when prayers and hymns and reading of missionary reports were accompanied by the chapel-servants (Sisters in white shawls and cāps) bringing round to each person a cup of water and a piece of rye bread. Such a service took place in an open field in Great Gomersal in 1742 when many people took part and were addressed by Ingham and Spangenberg, and which lasted for four hours.(14)

The Settlement system was a real attempt to show that a Christian republic was a possibility. The Brethren maintained that so long as the Settlement existed at Fulneck, there one could find a realm where the law of Christ would be supreme, where Single Brethren, Single Sisters and Widows would be screened from the temptations of the wicked world, where candidates would be trained for the service of the Church and her Master, where missionaries, on their way to the British Colonies, could rest awhile and learn the English language, where children in an age when schools were scarce, could be brought up in the

fear of God, and where trade would be conducted, not for private profit, but for the benefit of all. At Fulneck the principles of Christ were to be applied to the whole round of the Settlement life; dishonesty would be unknown, cruel oppression impossible, and doubtful amusements forbidden. There people would learn by practical experience that it is more blessed to give than to receive, more satisfying to work for a common cause than for a private bank account. (15)

THE DIACONIES.

To this end they organised what they called diaconies. A diacony was simply an ordinary business conducted, not by a private individual for his personal profit, but by some official of the congregation for the benefit of the congregation as a whole. So a Single Brother, James Charlesworth, was made manager of a cloth-weaving factory which did a good trade with Portugal and Russia for some years, kept the Single Brethren in employment, and supplied funds for general Church projects. (16). A whole series of these diaconies became established as the years went by: a Congregation General Dealer's Shop, a Congregation Farm, a Congregation Bakery, a Congregation Glove Factory, and finally a Congregation Boarding-House or Inn.

In each diacony the manager and his assistants received a fixed salary and the profits helped to

swell the congregation funds. Thus daily labour was sanctified, men toiling not because they aimed to line their pockets but because they wanted to help the cause of Christ. It was for the sake of the Church that the baker kneaded, the weaver plied his shuttle and the Single Sisters did their remarkable needle-work. For many years, indeed, the Brethren at Fulneck employed a Congregation Doctor whose object was not to build up a flourishing practice but preserve the good health of his Brethren and Sisters. (17)

Two other features which were characteristic of life at the Settlement worthy of notice were the Festivals and the Pedilavium or "Foot-washing".

THE FESTIVALS.

The Festivals at Fulneck were always a leading feature of the place, especially in the latter part of the 18th Century and the early part of the 19th Century. (18). On these occasions many came from the congregations and societies at Holbeck, Baildon, Wyke, Dudley Hill, Gomersal, Mirfield, Heckmondwike and other parts to join in the services which followed at short intervals during the day. The converging of the Societies on to the centre at Fulneck, small parties wending their way along the roads must have done much to strengthen the fraternal feeling and political unity of the locally divided members of the Church of the Brethren.

These Festivals were of two classes - General

Festivals, relating to the whole community, and the Anniversaries, immediately connected with the individual congregation. There were eight General Festivals:-

1. The Beginning of the Building of Herrnhut, June 17.
2. The Laying of the Foundation Stone of the first Meeting Hall at Herrnhut, May 12.
3. The Renewal of the Brethren's Church, 1722, August 13.
4. The Great Awakening among the Children at Herrnhut, August 27.
5. The Beginning of the Hourly Intercessions, August 27.
6. The First Mission to the Heathen (Negroes at St. Thomas', West Indies), August 22.
7. The First Mission to the Heathen in Greenland, January 19.
8. The Experience in the Unity that Jesus is the Chief Shepherd, September 16 and November 13.

The observance of Festival Days usually commenced with a short early service, followed by an ordinary service and address. Later there was a Love-feast, and this was succeeded by an evening service which was usually the Holy Communion. A particular characteristic was the passing round of a loving cup or the "Cup of Praise" when the whole "choir", or congregation of

members, stood and joined hands and passed the cup from one to another, each one as he, or she, took it making a solemn promise to belong wholly to the Lord.

At the Centenary Festival of the establishment of Herrnhut the words from Psalm 84 v.3, uttered by Christian David when he struck the first blow with his axe, were the theme of the sermon on 16th June, 1822, which, we are told in the diaries:-

"Treated on the excellency of our religious ordinances, enjoyed for a hundred years, with full security under every Government in whose dominions we have been planted".

The account continues:-

"In the evening the congregation met for a solemn conclusion of the last century of the revived Brethren's Unity; a powerful emotion pervaded the whole assembly, and we received manifest proofs that the Lord still owns us as His flock and people". (19).

On the following morning, the 17th, the true memorial day:-

"As early as five o'clock we were, by musical instruments, roused from sleep, and then already our distant brethren and sisters began to arrive from various quarters. At eight we assembled for the morning blessing; and at ten an extensive and very

affected narrative was read of the events we commemorated. The meeting was opened and concluded with the singing of some verses composed for the occasion by our brother James Montgomery, in which the congregation joined with uncommon life and spirit. The Chapel could scarcely contain the congregation, especially at the Love-feast, when an ode was sung which was the substance of a translation of that which had been composed for the congregation at Herrnhut. Want of room prevented us from admitting, with very few exceptions, any but members of the congregation. The discourse was held on Gamaliel's words, Acts V. 38-39. That the cause committed to the Brethren's Unity is of God we were most powerfully convinced, by tracing His way with us hitherto. To belong to such a people becomes increasingly dear to us, and at the Cup of Praise we covenanted with one accord to be faithful to Him who hath called us. We can hope, from our experience this day, that our Saviour will grant to our Church a season of revival and renovation".(20).

THE
CEREMONY
OF "FOOT-
WASHING"

In the use of the Pedilavium, the Moravians were following the action of Jesus on the night of the Last Supper, and His injunction "Ye ought also to wash one another's feet", which was accepted literally in the Brethren's congregation. The following extracts from the Fulneck diaries tell us something of the practice:

Wednesday, April 11th 1770. "At the Pedilavium of the place, we, who were to wash the feet of our Brethren of the Pudsey congregation tomorrow, had our feet washed with the brethren of the place, and those who washed them were also to be washed with us tomorrow".

April 12th. "At seven in the morning and at five in the evening was read the day's portion of the Acts of the Son of Man, and presently after a suitable discourse and prayers, kneeling, was the Pedilavium for the communicants of this congregation, and for those of the place (Fulneck) who had washed their fellow members yesterday". (21).

How important was this foot-washing as a matter of conscience and obedience is shown from the following notice in the Diary for February 28th, 1778:

" Brother Samuel Fowler, a widdower(sic) had the "foot-washing" previous to his going to the Holy Communion tomorrow, as he had exempted himself from it for many years through unprofitable reasoning". (22).

The establishment of the Moravians' work in Yorkshire was accompanied by remarkable success and at the same time violent opposition. At the first Easter Morning Service at Fulneck some four thousand people

THE
MORAVIANS
MEET WITH
SUCCESS
&
OPPOSITION

assembled to witness the solemn Service. Many had come out of superstitious curiosity thinking that whilst the Moravians walked round the graves of their dead, rejoicing in the Resurrection of Jesus Christ, they were going to try to raise the dead! When Benjamin La Trobe preached from the parapet of the Chapel on Easter Sunday 1753 his audience numbered some five thousand, and John Cennick had preached to a similar number on his visit in the previous year. (23). Thus, whilst the actual numbers of the Brethren were always small, they contributed tremendously to the revival of evangelical piety in the West Riding of Yorkshire. In 1755 "country congregations" were established at the villages of Wyke, Gomersal, and Mirfield, each with a Chapel and Minister's house.

On the other hand, when the Moravians came to Smith House in 1742 they found all the windows smashed in by hostile folk. (24). During the Young Pretender's rebellion in 1745 they were suspected, without any cause, of being Papists and were threatened by angry mobs. Ockerhausen was arrested and imprisoned in York Castle; young men attending Moravian meetings were threatened with the Press-gang; and, on one occasion, a mob came out from Leeds and threatened to burn Fulneck to the ground. A neighbouring landlord sent his men one day to Fulneck to destroy all the linen

hung out to dry.(25). Most of the opposition was due to ignorance and deliberate misrepresentation of their religious practices to folk naturally suspicious towards "foreigners".

SETTLEMENT
OF THE FIVE
YORKSHIRE
CONGREGATIONS
1755.

Until the year 1755 all the work done in Yorkshire had been under the style of the Yorkshire Congregation established for the purpose at Fetter Lane in London. It was in 1755 that Fulneck and the congregations at Gomersal, Wyke, Mirfield, and Pudsey were "settled", or in other words, received the constitution and privileges of congregations of the Brethren's Unity. The event is perhaps best described in the words of the 1785 manuscript chronicle of John Müller:

"Fulneck was then declared a place-congregation of Jesus, and the four congregations, Wyke, Gomersal, Mirfield, and Pudsey, were likewise solemnly declared to be congregations of Jesus in the way of other country-congregations; yet so as to be under the direction of the Elders' Conference at Fulneck, to which the labourers of the respective congregations were to look for decision and advice, in all matters belonging to them as members of the said Conference. The settling was done in the following manner, during a visitation of the brethren Johannes(de Watteville) and La Trobe. A general Congregation-day was appointed for April 14th, and in the Love-feast Br. Johannes related all that had been resolved upon at the last

Synod, touching this place and the plan in Yorkshire. Then at a particular meeting was the ordination of Br. Prosky, as a Deacon of the Brethren's Church; some brethren were also accepted as acoluths. Afterwards all the members of the congregation met the first time, to a general congregation-conference. After singing a few verses, Br. Johannes explained the name and intention of the meeting and that instead of one brother speaking, all who had something to propose, or say, might do it freely, though with due moderation, and the consciousness that every one was met before the eyes of our dear Lord".(26).

After referring to the reasons which had weighed with the Synod for making the proposed change the chronicle goes on:

"The plan of this new regulation was to be as follows: Gracehall (Fulneck) should be the chief place, upon which all the others should depend, and where also every Saturday the labourers of the respective congregations should meet and consult together about the concerns of the whole. The congregations were to meet at Fulneck every quarter of a year to a general celebration of the Holy Communion, which would at other times be held in the country chapels. In like manner with prayer-days, there was to be a "general-day" attended by all the Yorkshire congregations and held alternately at Fulneck and

Gomersal". (27).

The boundaries of these five congregations were defined. Fulneck was to be confined to its own place. The Pudsey congregation included Holbeck, Dudley Hill, Horton, and Baildon. Gomersal included Hightown and Cleckheaton. Golcar and Ossett were associated with Mirfield. The Wyke congregation was given charge of the Halifax Societies.

Then the names of the labourers were announced. Br. Traneker was to be Ordinary (Bishop) of Fulneck and the whole, and his wife also was to be a general labouress or Elder. Br. Charlesworth was to be Vorsteher (Warden) and his wife to be considered an office-bearer. Br. and Sr. Gross were stationed at Pudsey, Prosky at Gomersal, Hauptman at Mirfield, and Rice at Wyke. Br. Planta was appointed congregation physician and Br. Ockershausen appointed "Gaius" or congregation inn-keeper.

It is significant that great care was taken to emphasise, time and time again, that the brethren and sisters were still one body, although divided into several congregations for the sake of convenience.

In 1755 also a new work was begun across the Pennine border in Lancashire at Dukinfield, and in the same year Count Zinzendorf and the Jüngerhaus moved their headquarters from London back to the Continent where the Count died in 1760. (28).

MORAVIAN
WORK
SPREADS TO
LANCASHIRE.

Some of the Moravians at Dukinfield, later seeking a permanent dwelling place, planned and built a Settlement, much on the same lines as Fulneck, at Fairfield near Manchester. This was opened in 1785 and was a self-contained, self-governed village, centred (Unlike Fulneck) on a Square, with its Inn or Guest House, Shop, Bakery, Laundry, and Farm. It had its own fire-engine, night watchman, inspector of weights and measures, overseer of property and roads, and its own physician. There were, too, the typical community houses for Brethren and Sisters.

DANGERS
OF THE
SETTLEMENT
SYSTEM.

The Settlement system established at Fulneck and Fairfield was idealistic and noble to look at but serious dangers were inherent in it.

1.
EXCESSIVE
MANAGEMENT
REQUIREMENTS

First, it required more skill to work it than the Brethren in fact possessed, and more supervision than was humanly possible. So long as a business flourished and paid, the congregation reaped the benefit, but if it failed the congregation suffered not only in finance but in reputation. Once, in an excess of zeal, James Charlesworth mortgaged the manufacturing business, speculated with the money, and lost it.(29). This caused critics to accuse the Brethren of wholesale fraud and robbery. The system was also opposed to the strongly developing compet-

itive economy in which men were being presented with that most powerful of incentives, the profit motive. Any attempt, at that particular time, to implant this type of co-operative system was bound to meet with failure. Another disastrous effect of the diaconies was that they interfered with voluntary giving, becoming regarded as Church endowments. Instead of opening their purses the people relied on the diaconies to supply the bulk of the funds required for the current expenses of congregation life. Here the effect of the diacony system is in marked contrast to the system of free-will offerings imposed on his Methodist Societies by John Wesley. At first sight the Moravian system might appear the more Christian but it was Wesley's system which, whilst it nevertheless proved to be undemocratic and developed into a form of endowment, proved the sounder and while Methodism spread, the Moravian movement was choked at its fountain-head.

2.
TENDENCY
TOWARDS
ISOLATION.

The second danger was its tendency to encourage isolation. The laws of living at Fulneck were so strict that it is surprising that Britons became Moravians under its submission at all. One rule laid down that no member should spend a night outside the Settlement without consent from the Elders' Conference. This might have been all right applied

to the young men and women, but when it was enforced against business men who might need to travel at a moment's notice, it became an absurdity. The Choir-houses were places of the strictest discipline. The Single Brethren's House stood at the West End and there the young men lived together, sleeping in one long dormitory. They all rose at the same time, met for prayers before breakfast and were expected to attend certain services designed for their particular benefit. All had to retire to bed at a fairly early hour. The Single Sisters' House stood at the East End, about two hundred yards away, and was subject to similar rules. The dress regulations for the Sisters ruled that nothing in a lady's dress should indicate whether she were rich or poor. All wore the same kind of material in black, grey or brown, with the same kind of three-cornered white shawl. The only dress distinction was the ribbon in their cap which indicated the wearer's state of life - blue for a married woman, white for a widow, pink for a young woman, and red for girls under eighteen years old. The relations between sexes were strictly guarded. If a young man desired to marry, he was not even allowed to speak to his choice without the consent of the Elders' Conference, which generally submitted the question to the Lot. If the Lot firmly refused, he was told that God disapproved his choice and commanded

to fix his affections on someone else! All this led to a degree of purity and peace, but also to an unhealthy spiritual pride.

3.
EXCESSIVE
OFFICIALDOM.

The third danger was the proliferation of officials. At the top was the Elders' Conference. This consisted of all the Ministers of the Yorkshire District, the Fulneck Single Brethren's Labourer, the Single Sisters' Labouress, and the Widows' Labouress. It met once a month at Fulneck and had the general oversight of all the Yorkshire work and the personal conduct of every individual member. Next in order was the Choir Elders' Conference, consisting of a number of lay assistants called Choir Helpers. This had no independent powers of action and provided an advisory board to the Elders' Conference. The third body was the Congregation Committee, elected by voting members of the congregation, and it had charge of the premises and finances, and acted as a board of arbitration in cases of legal dispute. Then came the Large Helpers' Conference, consisting of the Committee, the Elders' Conference, and certain others elected by the Congregation. This was followed by the Congregation Council, a still larger body, elected by the Congregation. If these bodies give an impression of democracy it is an entirely mistaken impression, for the mode of election was peculiar. As soon as the votes were collected, those at the top of the poll

were submitted to the Lot, and only those confirmed by the Lot were held to be duly elected. The real power lay in the hands of the Elders' Conference, who were the supreme court of appeal, by virtue of their office members of the Committee, and alone had the final decision as to who should be received as members of the Committee, and alone had the final decision as to who should be received as members and who should not. The conception of this system was German rather than English and was one of ecclesiastical official authority rather than popular control.

4.
THE
DISADVANTAGE
OF
CENTRALIZATION.

The other great danger lay in the centralization of the system. If the Brethren had deliberately set out to keep their Church as small as possible they could not have devised a more successful method. The centre of the Yorkshire work was Fulneck. There the Elders' Conference met; there all the Choir Festivals were held, at which the other congregations were expected to be present. John de Watteville came on the scene in 1754 and ruled that although in the future there were to be "as many congregations as chapels in Yorkshire" they were yet to be still one body and all members must appear at Fulneck at least once a quarter.(30). Only at Fulneck was a cemetery laid out and there all funerals were to be conducted. Thus, as long as the other congregations were tied to Fulneck in this way, they could never have independent

growth. In fact the early Brethren had no desire for Moravian Church extension. They never asked people to attend their meetings and never invited any to join their ranks. If one wished to become a member of the Moravian Church he was told at first "to abide in the Church of England" and only if he persistently begged was his application given further consideration, and then obstacles were thrown in his way. First the matter was submitted to the Lot, and if the Lot said "No", he was informed that the Lord did not wish him to join the Brethren's Church. If the Lot said "Yes", it did not mean that he was accepted but only that his case could be further considered. He then had to wait two years, during which the Elders' Conference enquired into his motives and gave him a searching examination and even after two years he was just as likely to be refused as accepted! In this way the Brethren scrupulously avoided the charge of being sheep-stealers from the Church of England.

2. Activity. 1755-1825.

The next Seventy years following the "settlement" of the first congregations centred on Fulneck were marked by a constant congregational activity, missionary labours and work in the field of education. The intensest congregational activity seems to have occupied the first half of this period and the latter part was especially notable for the educational interest.

CONGREGATIONAL
ACTIVITY, AT
HOME AND IN
THE MISSION
FIELD.

The minister and his assistants provided outstanding examples of industry, extending their journeys from the various congregations in the West Riding to more distant societies at York, in Swale Dale, and even as far as North Wales. Within about fifteen years the numbers in the Congregations reached their peak. Various extensions to the accommodation at Fulneck took place. The road runs through the estate from East to West and on the higher level along the north side is a row of cottages some of which existed when the settlement was begun. At the lower level along the south side are the Chapel, Choir houses and schools arranged in a long line with a wonderful terrace extending the whole length on the south of these buildings and overlooking the valley. In 1755 the main features of the Settlement were clearly discernible but still incomplete. The Chapel and the main parts of the Brethren's and Sisters' houses were

the only representation of the fine row of buildings along this terrace. Additions were made to both the Brethren's and Sisters' houses in 1758 at the same time as the west end of the place arose, the first house of which was a small building for the "manufactory" or cloth business. (31) In 1762 the Congregational shop was begun for the congregation, the Brethren who carried on Grocery and Linen Drapery "having given up the business, and themselves, to the service of the whole". The "Inn" was established in the main part of the settlement instead of being housed as before at the Lane End. The Congregational Bakehouse was erected and also a block adjoining it to be used for weaving and joinery. (32) In August 1763 the foundation stone was laid for the Widows' house which was occupied on the 2th September, 1765. (33) The manufactory was separated from the estate of the congregation in 1763 and in 1766 was entirely in the hands of the Single Brethren and being carried on in the name of Clifford, Naylor & Co. It is recorded that in 1766 three Brethren went from Fulneck "to serve the Saviour among the Heathen". (34) Accommodation was so inadequate that in 1767 a Single Sisters' Oeconomy was settled not far away at Little-moor and the following year saw a Single Brethren's Oeconomy begun at Wellhouse, Mirfield. ... 1768 was also marked by the end of eleven years of service at

Fulneck by Br. La Trobe who left to become the Provincial Helper. That year Fulneck was visited by the Directory, or supreme board of the Brethren's Church, and three more Brethren went to work amongst the heathen. The next year two Single Brethren went to missionary work in Guinea and one married couple went to Jamaica.

At a meeting at Fulneck in 1768 Brother La Trobe stated that since the settling of the place thirteen years previously:-

"It had yielded 20 servants and handmaids who had gone from it to be employed actually in our service, and that Samuel Isles, one of them, had been the Apostle of the Blacks in Antego: and William Balmforth, another of them, was now, with much diligence and success, employed to carry forward the work of the Lord in Island (Iceland)". (36)

An entry in the Fulneck Diary for Feb. 26th 1773 states:-

"Late at night was the Cup of Covenant (Praise) with dear Brother Meder, who sets out in the morning for London and Antigua". (37)

And another for January 15th, 1777:-

"The day was concluded in the Hall with the Cup of Praise with our dear Brethren and Sisters bound for St. Kitt's, who are to set out tomorrow....the people felt a good deal at parting
110.

with them from this place, especially Br. and Sr. Birkby". (38)

Not only was Fulneck a place of departure for labourers in the mission field but converted natives from the various fields of labour came to reside in the Settlement. We read, for instance that in 1769:-

"The Eskimo boy Karpick departed (died) here very happily, being baptised by Brother Drachart upon his sick bed". (39)

And in the burial ground of the congregation at Mirfield there were interred two Otaheitan youths, Christian Mydo and Joseph Oley, who died in 1803.

About this time a certain internal unrest seems to have ruffled the peace of Fulneck. The chronicler of 1785 writes:-

"Of the year 1770 and some following years it is observed with pain that a hurtful reasoning Spirit of Mysticism crept in among the congregation and especially some of the Single Brethren which caused great pain in the congregation and proved finally an occasion of separation of many from the congregation". (40)

An interesting indication of the way this worked out and the community accepted spiritual discipline is seen from an extract from the entry for 1772:-

"The year 1772 will always be memorable to the congregation in Fulneck, as a year in which,

from September to November, our dear Lord kept a close and salutary school with us by occasion of a visitation of the Brethren Henry, 28th Count Reuss, and La Trobe. Our dear Saviour, being displeased with several members of the congregation, who had lost true simplicity, and the Jesus - like way of thinking and acting, which might have ended in the final ruin of the congregation, thought it necessary, by withholding the enjoyment of the Holy Communion for three months, to cause a general and strict heart's examination, and to point out to each brother and sister what was displeasing to him in them: but after many tears of shame and sorrow had been wept before him, he also renewed his mercy, and cured the hurts of his people. The 13th November when our Lord and Elder declared anew his thoughts of grace and peace over this their mourning and distressed congregation, and gave them full absolution, permitting them again the enjoyment of the Holy Communion, will remain unforgotten". (41)

It was in December 1772 that the great friend of the Moravians at Fulneck, the Rev. Benjamin Ingham, died.

EARLY
EDUCATIONAL
WORK.

All the congregations, with the exception of Mirfield, had established day schools during this period. The only boarding school was at Fulneck and this was mainly for the children of Ministers. At first the course of tuition was very limited being restricted pretty well to reading, writing and arithmetic, and the hours not spent in learning were given to manual labour. Brother Steinhauer (1763) was the first to raise the standard of instruction by the introduction of such studies as Latin, German, French, Music, etc. which considerably encroached on the time set apart for manual labour. Both at Fulneck, and later, as Minister at Wyke (1773), Steinhauer made use of his own press to circulate copies of hymns and addresses among the children - thus anticipating the work of Sunday Schools by some twenty years. His work at Fulneck was ably followed up by Brother Benade (1772). (42)

INDIVIDUAL
POVERTY.

There were hard times for the people of the Settlement. It is recorded in 1779:-

"Victuals were very dear and trade not very flourishing, the outward maintenance of some poor Brethren and Sisters was rather heavy and difficult to them; yet our gracious Lord provided them the necessaries of life". (43)

Some idea can be formed of the poverty of the Brethren when it is seen that the married couple who

served the Pudsey congregation were expected to maintain themselves on eight shillings a week, and even thirty years later the Congregation-helper in Fulneck was in receipt of only twelve shillings weekly! This apparent poverty was probably relieved to some extent by perquisites which we have no means of evaluating.

THE
"BROTHERLY
AGREEMENT".

There were some fifty societies and preaching places in the close area of the West Riding between Bradford and Leeds and the district just south of the river Aire. Seventeen of these were served from Fulneck. It was in dealing with the problem of what to do with these places, that the Brethren made their great strategic mistake. The one alternative way was to treat each one as the nucleus of a future congregation and this would have led to extension. The other way was to keep it as a mere Society and this was the course that the Brethren, under orders from the Directors in Germany, chose. All full members of the Moravian Church had to sign a document known as the "Brotherly Agreement" by which they swore fidelity to the Augsburg Confession, promised to do all in their power to help the Anglican Church, not to proselytise from any other denomination and to be subject to a very rigid and strict discipline. (44) These strict rules were enforced in the Congregations, but

did not apply to the Societies and preaching places where the bulk of the members were refused membership of the Moravian Church and, for the most part, remained members of the Church of England. Once a quarter these society members, with a Moravian Minister at their head, marched in procession to their parish church to the Holy Communion. There are a number of reasons for the smallness of the Moravian Church in England now, but this singular policy was one of the main factors in preventing extension.

RECONCILIATION
OF WESLEY
AND OTHERS
TO THE
MORAVIANS.

The old antipathy towards the Moravians was being dispersed. More than anyone else, perhaps, Br. Benjamin La Trobe, helped to shake off the mud thrown by Rimius and Frey, with his writings and preaching. John Wesley began to revise his views of the Brethren and think and act more kindly towards them. He defended them against an attack by Lord Lyttleton, saying in his Journal:-

"Could his Lordship show me in England many more sensible men than Mr. Gambold and Mr. Okeley? And yet both of these were called Moravians...

What does he know of them but from caricatures drawn by Bishop Lavington or Bishop Warburton?" (45)

He visited Bishop John Gambold in London and recording this event in his Journal he remarked:-

"Who but Count Zinzendorf could have separated such friends as we are?" (46)

He and his brother Charles called on John de Watterville in London; he renewed his friendship with the old man James Hutton on December 21st, 1771, after not having seen him for twenty five years.(47) He visited the Moravian Settlement at Zeist in Holland in 1783, where he spent a very happy 80th birthday.
(48)

On more than one occasion he called in at the Settlement at Fulneck when he was in the West Riding of Yorkshire.

DEVELOPMENT
OF
EDUCATIONAL
WORK.

During the thirty years or so of the existence of the Yorkshire Congregations following their settlement in 1755 a remarkable industry had firmly established them and their settlement system. In the forty years that followed - 1785-1825 - a reaction is noticeable on the one hand whilst, on the other, the Brethren exhibited an equal energy and activity in a field untried by them before - the conduct of large educational establishments. At the General Synod in 1782 a resolution had been passed that education should be a recognised branch of Church work and so, following the example set in Germany, the English Brethren now opened a number of public Boarding Schools. The first attempt was made at Fulneck.

FULNECK
SCHOOL.

A few parents who were not completely connected with the Moravian Church but kept close touch with it

had placed their children in the two schools already established at Fulneck. An increase in such applications for admittance and the insufficiency of the accommodation for the schools in the rooms under the Chapel made an additional building necessary. In August 1785 the older portion of the present boys' boarding school was solemnly opened for this purpose by Brother Traneker who, at that time, combined the functions of congregation-helper and minister with those of the school-director. The number of pupils increased steadily from 50-60 in 1785 to 200 in 1817. (49)

Girls' schools were opened at Dukinfield and Gomersal in 1792, and another at Wyke in 1794. Girls' schools followed at Fairfield in 1796, Gracehill in 1798, and Ockbrook in 1799. A boys' school began at Fairfield in 1801, and in the same year a girls' school at Bedford and another at Mirfield. A boys' school came into being at Gracehill in 1805 and another at Ockbrook in 1813.

The hard, unselfish work of the Moravians was undoubtedly responsible for the success of their schools, but certainly an important factor was their absolute refusal of any appearances of proselytism. Their name became known and parents had confidence in them that whilst giving instruction on a sound religious basis they would not use any sectarian

influence. Another factor of importance was the connections with the Moravian German congregations which secured a supply of well-educated classical and mathematical teachers fully capable of carrying on a course of instruction beyond what was then usual in the majority of English private schools.

In 1782 there were two forms in addition to the little ones who were simply taught reading and writing. The upper form, with an average age of about 11 yrs., had in their weekly time-table, 8 hours of Latin, 2 hours of Greek, 2 hours of German, and additional instruction in Ancient History, Geography, and Euclid. The lower form had plenty of Latin but no Greek or German. The records of a public examination of the boys in the presence of the members of the Elders' Conference and other Brethren and Sisters on April 10th, 1794 give some idea of the scope of the school curriculum and the text-books in use. This examination began at 7.30.a.m. and ended at 6.30.p.m. The proceedings consisted of seventeen items, of which items five, nine and the last three were in the nature of "speech - day" performances.

The first subject for examination was Christian Doctrine and a thorough questioning was conducted on a knowledge of the Augsburg Confession. Next was reading and the children of the three classes, starting with the lowest, were required to stand up and read

aloud. Children of the first class were required to read from Aesop's Fables, numbers three, four, five, seven, nine, twelve, fifteen, twentyone, twentytwo, twentythree and twentyfour. The second class had to read from "The Curiosities of Literature" - The Excellent Preacher, the Venetian Horseman, The Porridge Pot of the Cordeliers, The Gift of Imitation in Animals, and Dethroned Monarchs and Pope Sixtus VI. For the top class two papers from the Spectator had been selected - "The present life to be considered only as it may conduce to the happiness of the future", and "The advantages of a good education". Brother Steinhauer, who was presiding, remarked that it was with much pleasure that he observed the majority of the children had, in great measure, lost that singing tone in reading so very disagreeable to the ear. The third item was an inspection of specimens of the pupils' handwriting.

Fourthly came the arithmetic test in which the boys were required to do sums on the blackboard. The first class had to multiply 2710432 by 375 and then do questions 92 and 94 from "Walkingame's Tutor's Assistant". The middle class had to do sums from four species in Integers and Money and examples in reduction taken from the 56th in Walkingame. The top group were tested on the 93rd in Reduction (Land Measure) from Walkingame, also his Single Rule of Three, Double

Rule of Three, Interest and Purchasing of Stock, The Extraction of Square Roots (they had to find the square root of 7596796), and some questions from Clare's "Introduction to Trade and Business".

Next, the scholars from Brother Clayton's reading school rehearsed pieces of prose from Fenning's "Universal Spelling Book". This item was followed by a test in geometry. Questions were asked on Lines, Angles, Triangles and other figures, together with this problem:- "To measure the distance of two places to one of which only you may have access from C." This apparently was formed in two ways using first equal triangles and then similar triangles. The time then being 10.a.m. the company adjourned for a break of 15 minutes.

Immediately following re-assembly the boys were examined in the 7th item, Book-keeping, and then in English Grammar. In this latter subject there were two classes; the lower class were examined in the ten parts of speech according to Ash's "Grammatical Institutes", and the upper group were examined on the rules of syntax, concord, government and the right disposition of words in a sentence, based on Alex Bicknell's "Grammatical Wreath". In item 9 certain scholars recited their own compositions in verse, and then those who did Greek were tested on a passage from the New Testament (St. John Vll). Item 11 was the

test in Latin for three classes. The lowest group were tested on the parts of speech and the distinguishable marks of the 5 declensions and 4 conjugations, the genders of nouns, and degrees of comparison. The middle class had to translate into English from the first 6 chapters of the 6th book of Eutropius' "Roman History". The top group had to rehearse (translating into English) the Latin Dialogue of Amos Comenius from his "Agenda Scholastica". Then at 12 noon they had a break until 1.30.p.m.

In the afternoon the first examination was in Geography in three classes. The first class was required to show a knowledge of the map of Europe (political); the second group a knowledge of the geography of England (counties, town, etc.); and the top class were tested on the geography of Germany. Item 13 was an examination in French which took the form of a dialogue conducted in French between Brother Steinhauer and various pupils. Then came a test in History in 4 classes. The lowest group were examined on the Old Testament (mainly the story of Moses) based on Doctor Watts' "Scripture History". The second group were questioned on Roman History (the reigns of Augustus and Tiberias). The third group's subject was Old Testament History from the Exodus to the Monarchy; and the top group were tested on English History (the

Houses of Lancaster and York to Henry VII).

The final 3 items were the rehearsal of pieces of poetry, performances on musical instruments, and the performance of a sacred drama entitled "Daniel".

The text books referred to included a number of Readers such as Fennings Universal Spelling Book, Aesop's Fables, and Curiosities of Literature; Ash's Grammatical Institutes and Alex Bicknell's Grammatical Wreath, for English; Walkingame's Tutor's Assistant, and Clare's Introduction to Trade and Business, for mathematics; Doctor Watt's Scripture History, Dr. Goldsmith's History of England, and Russel's Modern Europe; and a number of classical texts for Ancient and Modern History and Latin.

The staff at the Fulneck school were originally divided into two categories; one were the learned, for teaching purposes, and the other the "unlearned", for purely supervisory purposes. One member of the staff in the eighteenth century is worthy of mention for his long service in the school - Job Bradley, who served for forty-five years from 1765-1810! (51)

This school has produced many worthy and eminent sons in its two centuries and among the more outstanding were the following. James Montgomery, the poet and hymn writer entered the school in 1777. Richard Oastler, the philanthropist responsible for the relief of

children working in factories, entered at the age of eight in 1798. An extract from the School Accounts book has some interest:

"September 1798.

Oastler, Richard. To board 4/14/6; Pmy 2/2;
Papers 1/6; Lfs 9d.
Cuttg.hr. 2d. shoe bill 4/3.
music 10/6; taylor's bill 1/2;
Arnold's lessons bound 12/-;
mending linen and stockings
 $\frac{1}{2}$ yr. 3/-; total £6.10.6."
(51)

Charles Joseph La Trobe entered school in 1807 and later became Governor of Victoria. Charles Parsons Reichel entered in 1824 and later became Bishop of Meath. William Lewes Jackson entered in 1854 and was later Baron Allerton, Chief Secretary for Ireland. Arthur Herman Gilkes entered in 1858 and became Master of Dulwich College. Herbert Henry Asquith, Prime Minister of England, entered the school in 1861. Sir Robert Robinson O.M., a President of the Royal Society and a Nobel Prize Winner for Chemistry, entered the school in 1899. (52)

THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY
AT FULNECK.

Another step in the educational field was in connection with the training of ministers, who at the time had to go to Germany for their education and training. This had been made difficult owing to the interruptions of communications with the Continent during the Napoleonic wars. So an academy or theological seminary was opened at Fulneck in 1809 to

provide ministerial training in England and it continued to do a very useful work until it was discontinued in 1827 and the practice of training ministers in Germany was restored. (53) However, this experiment was to be renewed later in the nineteenth century.

SUNDAY SCHOOLS.

In looking at this point of educational activity the work of Sunday Schools cannot be overlooked. Scarcely ten years had elapsed since these institutions had been introduced into England when they were successfully established at Fulneck in 1800 by the exertions of Br. C.I. La Trobe. They prospered at first but then the novelty seems to have worn off and many parents in the neighbourhood stopped using the advantages they offered. So they were closed in 1806 and then very successfully re-opened in 1813. Sunday Schools began at Wyke in 1802, at Gomersal in 1816 and at Mirfield in 1827. (54)

REACTION IN CONGREGATIONAL STRENGTH.

The concentration on educational work undoubtedly had a tremendous effect in bringing Moravian influence for good to bear indirectly on society through the lives of the children who had passed through their hands. But it resulted also in a one-sided development of interest and work. The congregations began to suffer because the schools drained the resources of ministerial and other help. Everything seemed to be ploughed into the schools and there was a falling off of congregational activity. This was probably

encouraged by the alternative provision of spiritual care in the neighbouring regions by the building of new churches and the provision of dissenting chapels with resident ministers, so that the Moravians felt perhaps they could relax their former enthusiasm and industry. The first question of visiting brethren seems not to have been "What spirit animates the congregation?" but "How full are the schools?" To some extent this reactionary tendency seems to have been held up by the brilliant ministry at Fulneck of Brother Ramftler 1812-24. Still, in 1817, Br. Moore, the Provincial-helper, visiting the Yorkshire congregations, found abundant reason to deplore the degenerate spirit prevailing. (55) The Pudsey congregation had to be united with Fulneck in 1811 because of the decreasing numbers, but, on the other hand an extension was given to the work by the organisation of the members at Baildon into a congregation in 1816. The latter part of the period was also characterised by a depression amongst the diaconies, probably resulting from some luke-warmness on the part of the managers by which many opportunities of extension were lost never to be presented again as the competition of the times increased, though this failure in competition was, in any case, probably inevitable.

3. Decline and Recovery

1825-55
A PERIOD
OF DECLINE.

There seems to be an entire absence of striking events of a positive character during the thirty years from 1825-1855. This time of inactivity was perhaps a natural reaction to the rather feverish activity of earlier years but it was also, in some ways, a natural legacy of the policy of the previous period. The first century of the life of the Moravian Church in Yorkshire after the settlement of the congregations in 1755 seems to fall into three inter-related parts. The first thirty years were the time of greatest congregational activity, the next forty years were an almost exclusively educational period, and the third period, of thirty years, was one of comparative inactivity. The success of the schools can almost surely be traced to the fruits of the first exertions of the Yorkshire congregations and it would appear that the burdens of the third period were produced by the rather one-sided labours of the second.

FAILURE
OF THE
DIACONIES.

It has already been mentioned that at the beginning of the 19th Century the service of the schools was swallowing up a great number of the brethren without creating an equivalent supply of new members. The depressed state of the diaconies compelled even more to go out to earn elsewhere a livelihood which they could no longer find at Fulneck. (56) The coming of the machine was beginning to make itself really

felt in the industry of the West Riding and the establishment of the big mills was making it harder for the older forms of manufacture. This tendency was reflected in the outside world in the Machine Riots such as those at Shipley in 1822 and Addingham in 1826. Looking at Bradford where industry was tending to centre we see a rapid growth of big mills and population. Its population of 13,264 in 1801 had grown to 16,012 in 1811, when there were 5 mills. In 1821 there were 20 mills and the population had risen to 26,309. Ten years later there were 31 mills and a population 43,507. In 1841 the population had grown to 66,715 and in 1851 there was a population of 103,771, with the number of mills at 129. (57) This sort of development was bound to affect the Settlement at Fulneck, especially on its trading side.

The hardness of the times was aggravated by the increased costs of living due mainly to the effect of the Napoleonic wars. Wheat which had been 7/6 a bushel in 1783 had risen to 17/- a bushel in 1800, giving rise to the Bread Riots in Leeds, and to 22/- a bushel in 1812. (58) There are frequent entries in the diaries of the second decade of the nineteenth century referring to the poor state of trade and hard times. In 1819 the Inn was given up as a business; in 1837 the Cloth business was discontinued and in 1846 the Bakery business was given up. (59) In 1855 only one

diacony remained in the hands of the congregation and one belonged to each choir house. Thus the congregations were on all sides using up their resources without taking adequate steps to recruit them. By the middle of the Century the way in which the congregations were crippled for want of men rather than lack of means was all too clear and some began to see that the schools also would have to decline if they, in turn, were to be exposed to a want of faithful and efficient teachers.

STATISTICAL
SUMMARY
OF THE
YORKSHIRE
CONGREGATIONS.

It is apt at this point to look briefly at some of the statistics for the various congregations through the course of the Century.

At Wyke there were 62 members present at the settlement of the congregation and the numbers in society - fellowship around Wyke were 140 and in Halifax 70 - total 210. The average number for the first ten years was 175, and the greatest average, about 250, was reached in the fourth decade. In the ten years prior to 1855 it was only 71. A girls' school was established in 1794 and its numbers reached an average of 33 between 1804 and 1814. (60)

At Mirfield, 50 members were present at the settlement of the congregation but the numbers in society - fellowship were 160 around Mirfield, 25 at Ossett and 25 at Golcar - total 210. At the end of the first eight years the number had reached its

maximum of 259 and in 1855 had fallen to 168. A boys' boarding school had begun in 1801 and by 1855 some 52 teachers had served it, 20 of whom had become ordained ministers of the Moravian Church, three ordained ministers of the Church of England, and one the pastor of an Independent congregation. About 650 pupils had passed through the school. (61)

At Gomersal 111 were present at the Settlement of the Congregation but there were others in the area in society-fellowship. The average number in the first ten years was 174; the greatest average 215 was achieved between 1788 and 1797, and at the end of the hundred years it was down to 116. A girls' day school existed at Gomersal from 1758-64 and later a boarding school operated successfully. (62)

At Pudsey 150 were present for the settlement but the total in fellowship was 345 - 125 at Pudsey, 60 at Dudley Hill, 70 at Great Horton, 30 at Baildon, 60 at Leeds and Holbeck. (63) In the first ten years this number averaged 660 and towards time of union with the Fulneck Congregation in 1811, the number was about 400.

The average numbers at Fulneck were 268 during the first ten years, 425 at the highest point, and less than 400 at the time of union with Pudsey.

Out-preaching places had been maintained at Holme, Wibsey, Horton, Baildon, Woodhall-hill, Farnley, Crimbles, Troydale, Gildersome, Cutler's-Heights, Dudley Hill, Farnley, Armley and Pudsey. By 1855 there were only seven monthly preaching places, at Woodhall-hill, Farnley, Greenside, Chapel Town, Waterloo, and two at Littlemoor; (64) all but the first two of these seven were in Pudsey. Two of the out-preaching places, however, had grown into important offshoots of the congregation .

Baildon had become by 1855 the largest of the country congregations, being settled as a distinct congregation in 1816. In its first ten years the numbers averaged 224 and in its last ten years they had reached an average of 261. In fact, of the Yorkshire congregations, Mirfield and Baildon were the only ones showing an increase in numbers and prosperity in other respects, at the middle of the 19th Century.

The congregational figures (65) at Fulneck show a steady progress in the first ten years and then the rate notably increased in the second decade. A retarding of the increase in 1768 probably reflects the departure of a number of women to the new Sisters' house at Littlemoor Hall in 1767 because of the lack of accommodation at Fulneck, but the advance continued until the peak was reached in 1775. After 1775 it would seem that losses by death and departure for one

reason or another more than counter balanced any recruiting and the numbers began to fall considerably. The dates of deaths are generally given but the dates and reasons for Brethren or Sisters leaving are frequently not recorded, so that it becomes impossible to get accurate annual membership figures for some years, but the numbers had dropped by 100 in 15 years. The downward tendency proceeded steadily during the last decade of the century, apart from the year 1795 which reflects the return of the Sisters to the Fulneck Community from Littlemoor Hall which closed in 1794. Despite this temporary augmentation the numbers continued to fall almost down to 300 at the end of the century. This state of affairs does not seem to have existed in the other congregations generally in the same period, for the Pudsey figures show an improvement in the last 5 years. Also, whilst the figures for 1795 show a drop in the other congregations and no separate figures are available from then in 1798, the total figure for that year shows no decrease in 8 years in spite of Fulneck's drop. (See the lists of Congregational membership on pages 132-4).

When the congregations of Fulneck and Pudsey were made one, it is clear that Pudsey had the preponderance of numbers, but it must be remembered that they included the "daughter" society at Baildon, and the

Numerical strength of the
Yorkshire Congregations in every tenth year
of their first century of existence.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Fulneck</u>	<u>Pudsey</u>	<u>Wyke</u>	<u>Mirfield</u>	<u>Gomersal</u>	<u>Baildon</u>	<u>Total</u>
1755	224	449	150	50	180	-	1053
1765	322	660	175	259	168	-	1584
1775	494	560	205	208	187	-	1654
1785	407	453	267	207	194	-	1528
1795	411	441	180	153	215	-	1400
	- united -						
1805	771		170	165	185	-	1291
1815	643		130	153	185	-	1111
1825	651		140	141	168	224	1324
1835	625		127	174	129	222	1277
1845	628		100	173	116	232	1249
1855	605		71	168	100	261	1205

Annual Congregational Figures

(where available)

for the last 15yrs. of the 18th. Century

<u>Year</u>	<u>Fulneck</u>	<u>Pudsey</u>	<u>Wyke</u>	<u>Mirfield</u>	<u>Gomersal</u>	<u>Baildon</u>	<u>Total</u>
1785	407	453	267	207	194	-	1528
1786	-	-	-	220	-	-	-
1787	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1788	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1789	419	419	269	216	209	-	1532
1790	394	367	260	206	210	-	1437
1791	393	382	251	-	-	-	-
1792	367	370	257	207	235	-	1436
1793	339	-	-	-	-	-	-
1794	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1795	411	441	180	153	215	-	1400
1796	393	-	-	-	-	-	-
1797	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1798	355	433	-	-	-	-	1437
1799	305	-	-	-	-	-	-

Annual Congregational

Figures for Fulneck

1755 - 1775

<u>Year</u>	<u>Fulneck</u>	<u>Increase</u>
1755	224	-
1756	238	14
1757	243	5
1758	248	5
1759	258	10
1760	272	14
1761	283	11
1762	298	15
1763	305	7
1764	312	7
1765	322	10
1766	340	18
1767	369	29
1768	382	13
1769	401	19
1770	416	15
1771	433	17
1772	450	17
1773	464	14
1774	476	12
1775	494	18

establishment of the latter as a separate congregation in its own right, is reflected by the drop in the joint Fulneck-Pudsey numbers from 1815 onwards.

The way in which the catalogue of members was kept in the first half of the 19th century makes it impossible to work out the yearly figures, but it seems fairly certain that in 1849 the Fulneck congregation membership was 304 (more or less the same as it was in 1799) and that it was the Pudsey part of the Union which had continued to decline in those 50 years. The new congregation at Baildon, on the other hand, had steadily grown in strength.

The offshoot of Baildon had mainly contributed to keep up the numbers in fellowship in Yorkshire. In the other places the average number in the last ten years was less than the first, so that without Baildon the average number in the whole district could scarcely be 1,000, or 50 less than in the first year, whereas with Baildon they come well above 1,200. Already in 1855 Moravians were beginning to think that propagation by offshoots was in fact necessary for the vigour and fruitfulness of a Christian Church, (66) and to realise the fatal results of their policy of centralization inherited from Germany.

The decline in congregational institutions was helped by several other factors. The system of ministerial training, except for the provision of

OTHER
FACTORS
ASSISTING
CONGREGATIONAL
DECLINE:

1. SYSTEM OF
MINISTERIAL
TRAINING

the seminary at Fulneck 1809-27, compelled all candidates to go to Germany if they desired a good education. (67) The result of this was that those who did not go were poorly educated, and those who did go to Germany stayed there so long, first as students and then as masters, that when they returned to England they were full of German ideas of authority and the impression was often given that the Church was not only German in origin, but meant chiefly for Germans. Ministers too were overworked and underpaid and at the Provincial Synod held at Fulneck in 1835 it was openly confessed that one of the chief hindrances to progress was lack of time on the part of the ministers. (68) There seems to have been a reluctance to adapt either the system or its services to the exigencies of the age and especially it can be seen that whilst the general trend in England was to greater lay participation, the Moravian Church was a strongly authoratarian society.

2. THE USE
OF THE LOT.

Another hindrance was the persistent use of the Lot. For many years the English Brethren stuck to the custom of enforcing its use in marriages and even when its use was abolished in marriages, it was applied in applications for membership. The rule of the use of the Lot in connection with membership was still enforced at the Provincial Synod held at Fairfield in 1847. (69)

3. LACK OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE.

The lack of periodical literature due to official policy discouraging the airing of views, was a factor in the general decline, for during a hundred and eight years (1742-1850) the Moravians had struggled on in England with no official or unofficial Church magazine. The only literature they possessed of a periodical sort were the quarterly missionary reports "Periodical Accounts". (70)

Thus Church members had little means of airing opinions. If some member conceived a scheme of reform and wished to expound it in public, he had to wait for the next Provincial Synod, and this opportunity did not come often because only five Synods were held in fifty years! Further, no member was allowed to publish a book or pamphlet dealing with Church affairs without the consent of the Unity Elders' Conference or the Synod. This muzzling order was eventually repealed and the first to speak his mind in print in Britain was John Carey, an Irishman who had been stationed as the resident minister at Horton in 1839. In 1850 he issued a monthly magazine entitled "The Fraternal Messenger" which numbered Bishop Alexander Hassé among its contributors. (71) Carey described visits to places in Ireland where the Brethren had been strong and revealed what opportunities they had thrown away in

the past.

FIRST
SIGNS OF
RECOVERY.

In Yorkshire perhaps the first sign of returning life was the petition of the Single Brethren in 1847 to have the office of Labourer filled again after a vacancy of some five years. (72) Then at the Provincial Synod held at Fulneck in 1853, it was apparent to all that a new influence was at work. There, for the first time, the Brethren resolved that in their efforts for the Kingdom of God they should "aim at the enlargement of the Brethren's Church". They sanctioned the employment of lay preachers, and established the "Moravian Magazine" edited by John England, and even encouraged a modest attempt to re-kindle the dying embers at Arva and Drumargan, in Ireland. (73) A further spurt was given by the tremendous interest shown in and aroused by the Yorkshire Centenary Jubilees in 1855.

NEW
POLICY
REGARDING
CHURCH
EXTENSION.

At the next Synod held again at Fulneck in 1856 the change in policy was even clearer. The Synodal sermon was preached by William Edwards, a member of the Directing Board, who deliberately declared that, instead of following the German plan of concentrating their energy on settlements, the Brethren ought to pay more attention to the town and country congregations. "It is here", he said, "that we lie most open to the charge of omitting

opportunities of usefulness". The Synod proceeded to make arrangements for a Training Institution, rejected the principle of a "Church within a Church" which had ruled so long, and resolved to form a society called "The Moravian Home Mission Society" with the object not only of evangelising dark and neglected districts, but to establish Moravian Congregations wherever possible. Charles E. Sutcliffe, who had pleaded the cause of home missions for many years, was made the general Secretary of this Society. (74)

DEVELOPMENT
OF
PROVINCIAL
HOME RULE.

It was at this point that the ruling of the entire Moravian Church by the Unity Elders' Conference, with the consequent stifling influence of German direction in the affairs of English Moravians ceased, and the principle of Home Rule came increasingly into operation in three independent provinces. The British Moravians, considering the benefit to them of Home Rule, played only a modest part in the movement for its establishment. The bulk of the work - the agitation that each Province should have its own property, hold its own Provincial Synods and manage its own local affairs - must mainly be credited to the Moravians in America. As their Home Mission work had extended so very rapidly the American Church felt more and more the absurdity of their work being managed by a Directing Board in

Germany. So at the Provincial Synod held at Bethlehem, Pa., on 2nd May, 1855 they laid down a proposal that American affairs should be managed by an American Board, elected by an American Provincial Synod. (75) Thus they demanded independence in all American affairs to manage their own concerns, to make their own regulations at their own Provincial Synods and to have their own property. They requested the Unity Elders' Conference to summon a General Synod at the first convenient opportunity to consider their proposals. These demands awakened only a partial response in England and in Germany they excited anger and alarm for there they were afraid that the granting of these demands would destroy the unity of the Church. At the German Provincial Synod in 1856 they condemned the American proposals as unsound and rather pathetically asked the Americans to reconsider their position. (76)

THE NEW
CONSTITUTION
OF 1857.

Finally the General Synod met at Herrnhut on 8th June, 1857 and began with an appeal by Bishop John Nitschmann that in their deliberations they should avoid anything that meant separation among the Brethren. So they began to examine the American's proposals and eventually framed a new constitution. If the unity of the Church were to be maintained there still had to be one supreme authority and so they decided that henceforward the General Synod should be the supreme legislative body, and the Unity

Elders' Conference the supreme administrative body. The constitution of the General Synod was changed and though there were still a number of ex-officio members, there were a large majority of elected deputies. The functions of the General Synod were defined as follows:-

1. To determine the doctrines of the Church.
2. To decide as to all essential points of Liturgy.
3. To prescribe the fundamental rules of order and discipline.
4. To determine what is required for membership in the Church.
5. To nominate and appoint Bishops.
6. To manage the Church's Foreign Missions and Educational work.
7. To inspect the Church's general finances.
8. To elect the Unity Elders' Conference.
9. To form and constitute General Synods, fix the time and place of meetings and establish the basis of their representation.
10. To settle everything concerning the interests of the Moravian Church as a whole.

The Unity Elders' Conference was, for the sake of efficiency, divided into three Boards, the Educational, Financial and Missionary, and they managed the schools in Germany, the general finances, and the whole of the foreign missions, and they also acted as the Provincial Elders' Conference for the German Province. (77)

In this way the unity of the Church was

maintained and then, to satisfy the American demands, they decided that each Province should have its own property, and hold its own Provincial Synods. The three Provincial Synods should each have power to make laws, provided they did not conflict with those laid down by the General Synod. In Britain and America their own Provincial Elders' Conferences should have power to manage the affairs of the Province, controlling all provincial property, appointing ministers to their posts and summoning Provincial Synods as needful.

ABOLITION
OF THE USE
OF THE LOT.

This constitution remained unaltered for twenty-two years and some changes then took place in 1879 and 1889 when all reference to the Lot was struck out of the regulations of the Church. (78) The final change in the constitution was of British origin. The continuing trouble in the constitution had been, at each General Synod, the problem of reconciling the unity of the Church with the rights of its respective Provinces. The flaw lay in the membership of the Unity Elders' Conference which was the supreme managing board. It was obviously unfair to the Americans and British that eight of the twelve members were really the German Provincial Elders' Conference, elected by the German Provincial Synod. At the Provincial Synod held at Mirfield in 1898 the British Moravians drew up a plan which would bring an end

to the Unity Elders' Conference (79) and this plan was practically carried into effect at the General Synod at Herrnhut in 1899. (80)

THE NEW
CONSTITUTION
OF 1899.

Under the new constitution the General Synod remained the supreme legislative body. The Church was then divided into four Provinces, German, British, American North and American South, each of which was to hold its own Provincial Synods, make its own laws and elect its own Provincial Elders' Conference. The supreme Unity Elders' Conference ceased to be a body seated in Germany capable of holding frequent meetings, and now was composed of the Mission Board and the four governing boards of the four independent Provinces. There can be little doubt that this decentralising change in the general constitution of the Church and the control of its affairs was an important factor in the recovery of the Moravian Church in Yorkshire in the latter half of the nineteenth Century. The way was cleared for the change in character from a "foreign" church to an English church able to progress in its own way unfettered by the cramping effect of German ideas of institutions and customs. In Yorkshire, as elsewhere, the change of policy, expressed at the Synod at Fulneck in 1856, began to have its effect.

EFFECTS
OF THE NEW
CONSTITUTION
IN
YORKSHIRE.

1.
MINISTERIAL
TRAINING.

First, in respect of the training of ministers, as soon as the British Moravians became independent

they again opened their own Theological Training Institution at Fulneck. As long as the students lived there they saw little of the outside world, but in 1874 the College was removed to the Settlement at Fairfield in order to let the students take advantage of the lectures at Owens College. In 1886 they began to study for a degree in the Victoria University (Manchester) and then in 1890, they were allowed to study at the Universities of Edinburgh and Glasgow. (81) Thus the ministry of the Moravian Church bearing English names, training at British Universities, learning their theology from English or Scottish Professors, imbued with English ideas of Christianity, even though some did go to spend a year or two in Germany, was divested of the foreign flavour which had characterised it in the earlier years.

2.
CONGREGATIONAL
EXPANSION.

Secondly the decline in the congregational activity which had caused such concern in the preceding quarter of a century was now replaced by a steady expansion resulting in the establishment of a number of new congregations. Rather significantly, whereas the earlier congregations were established in small country places, the new ones now tended to appear in growing towns and populous areas.

In 1859 new work was begun from Mirfield at Heckmondwike which received a resident minister of

its own in 1871 and was given congregational status in 1874. It was in 1859 also that work began at Crook, in County Durham, from the congregation at Baildon. William Allinson secured a house there which was used for services, and his work was continued by J.P. Libby. Then John Carey, who had been Pastor at Little Horton in 1839 and retired to Greengates, Apperley, near Leeds in 1856 (where he had started a mission) moved to Crook and did some stalwart work there resulting in the provision of a permanent Chapel in May 1860 and the recognition of Congregation status in 1867. Carey died on January 27th 1867 at Gracefield, to which he had retired. In 1864 a new Congregation was established at Wellfield (Shipley) ~~and a further one at Horton (Bradford) was established at Wellfield (Shipley)~~ and a further one at Horton (Bradford) was established in 1867. Across in Lancashire new congregations were begun at Westwood (Oldham) in 1874, and at Openshaw in 1899.

3. FREEDOM OF SPEECH.

As the effect of German authority waned and democratic ideas began to work out in Home Rule there was a natural growth in freedom of speech. This is most clearly seen in a movement arising at the Theological College at Fairfield where, for the first time in the British Province a number of radical Moravians combined to express their opinion in print.

Led by Maurice O'Connor they issued a pamphlet in 1890 entitled "Defects of Modern Moravianism". In this they suggested:-

1. That Theological students should be allowed to study at some other Theological College.
2. That a Moravian Educational Profession be created.
3. That all British Moravian Boarding Schools should be regularly inspected.
4. That the monthly magazine "The Messenger" be improved, enlarged and changed to a weekly paper.
5. That in the future the Church should concentrate its energies in large towns and cities.
6. That all defects in the work of the Church be openly stated and discussed. (82)

Some of these points were met at the Provincial Synod at Ockbrook in Derbyshire a few months later, which decided to hold Synods annually instead of every four or five years and also to change the character of the magazine. (83) Henceforth it was to be a fortnightly instead of a monthly, its title to be "The Moravian Messenger", and less "official". In its new form it certainly increased circulation and influence and became a recognised vehicle for the expression of public opinion. The Synod also resolved that their theological students should be allowed to study at some other Theological College. At the Synod at Horton in

1904 arrangements were put in hand for the establishment of a teaching profession, (84) and the Synod at Baildon in 1905 arranged for the inspection of the Boarding School. (85)

4.
WORSHIP.

There was an increasing influence of English ideas on public worship and the observance of traditional customs. At the Provincial Synods of 1878 and 1883 committees were appointed to revise the Moravian Hymn Book and when the next edition appeared in 1886 it contained a large number of hymns by popular English writers. Since they were also wedded to popular English tunes these were admitted into the next edition of the Tune Book in 1887. However, whilst they readily included the new hymns from such writers as Toplady, C. Wesley, Rawson, Lyle and new tunes from composers such as Sullivan, S. Wesley and Hopkins, they did not give up their own traditional chorale. There was some objection to this older form by people who said that the old chorales were too difficult for Englishmen to sing. In the preface to the Moravian Tune Book, Peter La Trobe crushed this objection, saying that, at St. Thomas, Zinzendorf had heard negroes sing Luther's fine "Gelobet Seiest"; at Gnadenthal in South Africa, Ignatius La Trobe had heard the Hottentots sing Grummer's "Jesu, der du meine Seele"; in Antigua the negroes could sing Hassler's "O Head so full of bruises"; and so he concluded that

chorales not above the level of Negroes and Hottentots could easily be sung, if they only tried, by Englishmen, Scotchmen and Irishmen of the nineteenth century. Despite this official attitude, many of the standard chorales did eventually fall into disuse being replaced by somewhat lighter English tunes.

CHANGES
IN THE
GENERAL
CHARACTER
OF THE
MORAVIAN
CHURCH.

An inevitable result of the developing English character of the British Province was a decline of the customs peculiar to Moravians and, in some cases, their replacement by new institutions. By the end of the nineteenth Century British congregations could be divided into two classes, one of which, consisting mainly of the older congregations such as Fulneck, Fairfield, Ockbrook and Bristol, tended to retain the old customs, and the other in which many of the old customs were quite unknown. In the more conservative group at the opening of the twentieth Century, there could still be found the Love-Feast, division into choirs, the regular choir festivals, and the observance of the Memorial Days, though as time went on, even in these congregations these things tended to become more streamlined, so that fewer festivals and fewer Memorial Days were kept. In the other group these things were absent and little would have impressed a visitor as of specific Moravian stamp beyond the use of the Moravian Litany at the morning Service and the existence of some hymns in the hymn book which would not be found else-

where. In place of the special meetings for Single Brethren and Single Sisters, there would be Men's and Women's Guilds and the Christian Endeavour: in place of the Brethren's House, the Men's Institute; in place of the Diaconies, the Weekly Offering, Sale of Work, and Bazaars; in place of the Memorial Days, the Harvest Festival and the Church and Sunday School Anniversaries. By the mid-twentieth Century many of these new institutions have infiltrated into the older-fashioned congregations and Fulneck has long had its Boys' Brigade; its Memorial Days have been streamlined and reduced to four:-

1. March 1st ; Founding of the Brethren's Church, 1457.
2. May 12th : Renewal of the Brethren's Church, 1722.
3. July 16th : Martyrdom of John Hus, 1415.
4. Aug. 21st : First Mission to the Heathen, 1732.

Two Choir Festivals are still in use, the Single Sisters' Festival in May, and the Married Choir Festival in September. There are those who would like to see the old fashioned titles such as "Single Sisters" abolished as being out of keeping with the modern outlook. Fulneck still holds its Love-Feast on the first Sunday of each month. Whilst much else has undergone change, the interest in and support of Missionary work have never lagged and reports from ever widening work in this direction are still received

and read with enthusiasm.

The buildings and lay-out of Fulneck are the same today as they have been for most of its two hundred years and more - the long road through the middle, with houses on the upper side and the Chapel and School buildings on the lower side, with the wonderful terrace on the south. Much of the old atmosphere clings but much has changed. The Settlement system broke down and the congregation-diaconies were given up one by one. The houses on the north side of the road are occupied mainly by Moravian members as private houses; the Chapel has the Parsonage to one side and the Widows' house (the only "House" to remain as such) on the other. East of the Parsonage are the buildings occupied by the flourishing Boys' Boarding School, and the buildings to the West of the Widows' House are occupied by the equally flourishing Girls' Boarding School. The whole estate is the property of a Moravian Trust, and the Congregation which is no longer tied to the "place" is only concerned with the Chapel.

One can still visit many of the places which have figured in the story of the Moravians' Settlement in Yorkshire, such as Smith House, now privately owned and occupied, and the old Sisters' House at Wyke, but there are now only the nine Yorkshire Congregations of Fulneck, Gomersal, Wellhouse (Mirfield), Wyke, (Bradford),

Baildon, Crook (Co. Durham), Wellfield (Shipley),
Horton (Bradford) and Heckmondwike, carrying on very
much the same as the Churches of other denominations
in the area, which witness to the remarkable story
of industry, zeal and faith of two centuries ago.

APPENDICES

1. Lists of Officials.
 1. Holders of Office 1742. Yorkshire Congregation.
 2. Vorstehers at Lamb's Hill (Fulneck).
 3. Ministers and Assistants at Fulneck.
 4. Directors of the Schools at Fulneck.
 5. Ministers in the other Yorkshire Congregations 1755-1855.
 6. Various Lists of Labourers, Co-Labourers, Wardens, etc.,
2. Chronological Summary.
3. List of Moravian Churches in the British Province 1965.
4. Doctrine in the Moravian Church.
5. Moravian Liturgy and Worship.
6. Footnote references.
7. Map. I. Map. II.

APPENDIX. 1.

Lists of Officials.

APPENDIX 1 - LISTS OF OFFICIALS

1. Holders of Office in 1742. Yorkshire Congregation

General Helper or Vorsteher	:	Spangenberg
Assistant Vorsteher	:	Piesch
Elder	:	Toeltschig
Vice Elder	:	Viney
Eldress	:	Sister Piesch
Vice Eldress	:	" Gussenbauer
Sick Waiter and Admonisher on Sisters' Side	:	" Toeltschig
Servant on Sisters' Side	:	" Stonehouse
Sick Waiter and Admonisher on Brethren's Side	:	Ockershausen
Servant on Brethren's Side	:	Marshall

2. Vorsteher at Lambs Hill (Fulneck)

1742-3	:	Spangenberg
1743	:	Piesch
1743 (July to Nov.)	:	R. Viney
1743 Dec.	:	W. Holland
1747	:	E.L. Schlicht (In 1748 P. Münster appointed Cong. Helper - took pre- cedence over Vorsteher)
1750	:	B. La Trobe
1752	:	W. Horne
1754	:	Brodersen (pro-tem)

In 1755 the Office of Vorsteher was merged with that of Congregational Helper.

3. Ministers (Congregational Helpers) and Assistants
at Fulneck.

	<u>Minister</u>	<u>Assistant</u>
1748	P. Münster	
1750	A. Seiffert	
1750	F. Marshall	
1752	J. Hauptmann	
1755	G. Traneker	
1757	B. La Trobe	
1759		Pugh
1768	M. von Dohna	Worthington
1770		Syms.
1772		Erasmus Müller
1776	G. Traneker	Vacant till 1791
1791		J. Steinhauer
1797		J. Hartley
1800	S.T. Benade	
1805		Henry, 55th Count Reuss (for one year)
1812	C.F. Reichel	
1813	Ramftler	
1824	Holmes	
1829		S. Wilson
1837		J. Smith
1839		J. Carey, as Asst. at Horton.
1843	Rogers	
1849	Essex	Assistant's Office ended

Ministers (Congregational Helpers) and Assistants
at Fulneck (Cont.)

Minister

1850 W. Edwards
1852 Libbey
1865 G. Clemens
1881 J. Baxter
1899 J.E. Zippel
1907 L.G. Hassé
1908 L. St. A. Hassé
1912 P. Ksmüssen
1916 H.W. Mellowes
1917 R.B. Willey
1923 C.H. Shaw
1924 C.H. Mellowes
1932 W. Smith
1938 W.A. Summers
1944 J.H. Foy
1948 E. Wilson
1954 H.P. Connor
1961 L.J. Britton
1963 G.E. Birtill

4. Directors of the School

In the earlier days the same person usually held the offices of Congregational Helper (or Minister) and School Director. Later the School Director became the Assistant Minister and then from 1848 he ceased to have regular

congregational duties.

1749 Almers ?
1751 G. Traneker (began at Smith House)
1757 B. La Trobe
1768 M von Dohna
1776 G. Traneker
1791 J. Steinhauer
1797 J. Hartley
1801 S.T. Benade
1812 C.F. Reichel
1829 S, Wilson
1848 B. Seiffert (pro tem)
1849 W. Ellis
1852 J. Willey
1879 J. Jackson Shawe (1879 Girls' School separated
under its own Headmistress)
1882 W.T. Tittering ton
1915 E. Walder
1917 E.J. Libbey
1928 J. Connor
1938 C. Taylor
1944 L.J. Britton
1948 A.J. Lewis
1953 Hill
1961 J. W. Ackroyd

5. MINISTERS IN THE OTHER YORKSHIRE CONGREGATIONS 1755-1855

	<u>Pudsey</u>	<u>Wyke</u>	<u>Mirfield</u>	<u>Gomersal</u>
1755	Gross	Rice	Hauptman	Prosky
1756		F. Okely		Pyrlaeus
1757	Hauptman	Ockershausen	Pyrlaeus	Watson
1759	Pyrlaeus	Watson		Ockershausen
1760	Pugh	Pyrlaeus	Watson	
1762	Watson	Ockershausen	Pyrlaeus	Pugh
1763	Hauptman	Schulze	Worthington	Pyrlaeus
1764	Schulze	Watson		Watson
1765	Charlesworth	Worthington	Watson	(1765-70 No resident Minister)
1767	Gruening	Zander		
1768			Gussenbauer	
1770				Hassé
1771	Zander	Syms (temp)		
1772		Birkby (temp)		
1773	M. Willey	Steinhauer		
1776	Caldwell	E. Miller	Willey	
1779				Sulger
1781			Caldwell	
1783	Watson			Rice
1788	J. Miller		J. La Trobe	Caldwell
1790		Verney	Zander	
1792		S. Church		
1793	Caldwell	Foster		S. Church
1795			L. West	

MINISTERS IN THE OTHER YORKSHIRE CONGREGATIONS 1755-1855
(Cont.)

	<u>Pudsey</u>	<u>Wyke</u>	<u>Mirfield</u>	<u>Gomersal</u>
1798	Cowley			
1800	J. Smith	Holmes	S. Church	Ign. Traneker
1802	S. Church		W. Okely	
1804	Klinesmith	Ike (temp)		
1805		W. Okely	Pohlman	
1806	J. La Trobe			J. Church
1807				Cowley
1809		J. Smith		
1811	<u>Pudsey united with Fulneck</u>			
1812			Grimes	
1813		Beck		
1815		Rudolph		
1816	<u>Baildon</u> Cong. established Shufflebotham			
1818		Lauten		Rudolph
1821			T. Mallalien	
1823				Liley
1824			Ign. Traneker	Grimes
1826			D. Craig)	
1827	Libbey		Rea	
1828		W. Edwards		
1830	Shawe			Beck
1831	Crosby			
1835	Libbey			

Ministers in the other Yorkshire Congregations 1755-1855
(Cont.)

	<u>Baildon</u>	<u>Wyke</u>	<u>Mirfield</u>	<u>Gomersal</u>
1836		Grimes	J. La Trobe	Lauten
1841	Kirkland		C. West	
1844	Edwards			
1846	Sutcliffe			W. I. Okely
1847			W. Ellis	
1849			Jno. Lang	
1850	Herman	Porter		
1851				Willey
1852	Jn. Smith			Jas. Lang
1854	Clemens			

6. Various Lists of Officers at Fulneck

(a) Single Brethren's Labourer

1742 A, Reinicke
1743 W. Horne
1744 J. Charlesworth
1747 C. Schulze
1751 R. von Laer (pro tem - Co-labourer at the
time)
1752 H. Jorde
1755 J. Königsdörfer
1756 A. Taylor
1765 (Jan. - Aug.) S. Utley
1765 (Sept.) J. Lochmann
1767 J.C. Marteus
1770 H. Jorde
1772 J.F. Moeser
1779 J. Swertner
1783 J. Miller (Müller)
1788 J. Dawson
1791 W. Arme
1797 J. Chambers
1798 J. Holmes
1800 J. Newby
1802 C.A. Pohlman
1805 J. Newby
1808 T. Mallalieu
1812 J. Willey
1814 C. Prosky

Various Lists of Officers at Fulneck
(Cont.)

Single Brethren's Labourer

1815	N. Rea	
1821	Shawe	
1824	Libbey	
1828	G.A. Cunow	
1830	Chambers	
1833	Kirkland	
1836	J. Waugh	
1840	W.H. Oates	
1842-47	Office vacant	
1847	Clemens	
1850	W. Taylor	
1852	S. Connor	
1853	J. Lee	
1855	J. Baxter	
1860	J. Jackson Shawe	
1862	H.E. Shawe	
1864	R. Elliott	
1865	W. Eggleton	
1868	J. Elliott	
1870	H. Edwards	
1872	H.E. Blandford	
1873	A. Wiggins	
1873	J. Waugh	
1877	B. La Trobe	
1878	W.O. Lang	162.

Single Brethren's Labourer (Cont.)

1880 W. Titterington
1881 W. Birtill
1883 E. Hassé
1883 H.R. Mumford
1884 W. Robbins
1886 P. Asmussen
1891 A.H. Mumford
1893 J.E. Hutton
1894 E.J. Libbey
1896 W. Hawk
1897 W. Lacey
1899 E. Walder
1901 C. Jackson Shawe
1904 C.H. Shawe
1904 G.J. Clemens
1906 N.F. Orr
1907 C.H. Mellowes
1908 J.W. MacLeavy
1911 W.A. Summers
1915 P. Horton
1916 Vacant - it would seem that the office came
to an end.

(b) Single Brethren's Co-Labourers

His duties were mainly to do with the Great Boys.

1747 J.F. Hintz
1749 U. von Lüdecke
1750 R. von Laer
1758 J. Worthington
1762 S. Utley
1765 J. Steinhauer
1767 J.F. Möhring
1770 J. Nieder
1773 S.T. Benade
1775 J. Swertner
1779 J. Bradley (ad interim)
1782 J. Miller
1784 W. Foster
1789 H. Reuss
1795 J.G. Brett
1800 Job Bradley

With Job Bradley the Office of Co-Labourer came
to an end.

(c) Single Brethren's Wardens

In the early days this officer was often called Choir Deacon or Servant. The office seems to have come into existence about 1747 though James Charlesworth, whilst Labourer, may have also acted as Warden from 1744 onwards.

- 1747 T. Knight
- 1748 J. Charlesworth and T. Knight. (T. Knight being away from Fulneck)
- 1752 H. Backer and T. Knight (T. Knight being away from Fulneck)
- 1754 J. Frankelton
- 1757 J. Hargrave
- 1759 F. Bagge
- 1765 J.F. Moeser
- 1765 J.F. Moeser and C.F. Lochmann
- 1767 C.F. Lochmann
- 1768 J.F. Moeser
- 1772 T. Grinfield
- 1774 J.F. Moeser (held office together with Labourership)
- 1779 J. Church
- 1784 J. Wilson
- 1786 T. Verney with J. Chambers as Co-Warden
- 1791 J. Chambers (from 1797 he held office together with Labourership)
- 1798 J. Newby (from 1805 he held office together with Labourership)
- 1808 J. Willey
- 1810 C. Prosy

In 1814 C. Prosy became Labourer and from that year

the: Wardenship was combined with the Labourer's Office and then in 1840 the Warden's duties were transferred to the Congregational Warden.

(d) Single Sisters' Labourer

- 1742 Marg. Lloyd (married T. Moore)
- 1744 Eliz. Claggett
- 1748 Anna Maria Arché
- 1752 Marg. Vogelsang (In 1756 July-Dec. pro tem
Dorothy Crellins whilst Marg.
Vogelsang visited Germany).
- 1765 Anna Rosina Anders
- 1766-67 Vacant
- 1767 Eleonora van Seidlitz
- 1772 Anna Rosina Anders
- 1803 Karen Borg
- 1817 Ann Templeton
- 1820 Elizabeth Clarke
- 1824 Esther Tanett?
- 1832 Eliz. Bull
- 1834 Sarah Church
- 1840 Eliz. Smith
- 1843 Ann Jackson
- 1851 Eliz. Hunting
- 1879 Eliz. Clough (held office together with
S. Sisters Wardenship)
- 1890 Henrietta Titterington " " " "
- 1896 ? Carey " " " "
- 1897 Emma Caroline Lawford " " " "
- In 1904 the Sisters' House and Girls' School
exchanged buildings.
- 1912 Eliz. C. Clemens (Was Laboureress without Warden-
ship until 1923 when she took such duties of

Single Sisters' Labourer (Cont.)

Warden's office as remained). Eliz. Clemens remained in office till 1932 and was its last holder; it was then merged with the office of Warden of the Widows' House in the person of Gertrude Belshaw.

(e) Single Sisters' Co-Labourer

Except in the cases of co-labourers before 1752 and also in the case of Eliz. von Seidlitz, who seems to have been General Co-Laboureress and also to have supervised external affairs, this office was especially for the care of the Great Girls. Until 1748 the Great Girls were included with the Children and were looked after by the "Children's Parents", and then from 1748 until 1750, or later, Sister Held (the "Children's Mother") continued to assist with the Great Girls although they were recognised as part of the Single Sisters' department.

- 1742 Eliz. Claggett and Susan Claggett
- 1744 Jane Chambers
- 1748 Sarah Cennick
- 1750 Marg. Vogelsang
- 1752 Eliz. von Seidlitz
- 1754 Eleonora von Seidlitz
- 1755 Sophia Engelback (married Geo. Traneker)
- 1759 Henreitta Ohlson
- 1773 (Jan.-Aug.) Helena von Seidlitz
- 1773 Sarah Bryant
- 1778 Eliz. Lewis
- 1784 Mary Shoemith
- 1786 Eliz. Mortimer (married J. Miller)
- 1789 Benigna Syms (married C.J. La Trobe)
- 1791 Mary Watson
- 1794 Eliz. Lewis (married J. Chambers)
- 1798 Martha Sinfield

Single Sisters' Co-Labourer (Cont.)

1801 Karen Borg

When Karen Borg became S. Sisters' Labourer in 1803 the office of Co-Labourer was discontinued and was only revived for one brief period -

1829-32 Eliz. Bull

(f) Single Sisters Warden

It is not possible to identify a Wardeness (in the later sense) in the earliest days. In the Foundation Stone Document, 1746, E. Claggett is referred to as "Eldress" and J. Chambers is called "Vorestair" (Supervisor) and these two have been classed as early co-Labourers. By about 1760 the Sister specially in charge of external affairs is recognised by the title of Choir Deaconess and Ann Kirkby is the first to be so called. Probably until about that time the supervision of externals was part of the Labourer's work, or, as long as "Liesel" (as Eliz. von Seidlitz was generally known) was there, part of her work as Co-Labourer. She is sometimes thought of as the first Warden, but no title of Deacon or such is found for her in the records. A. Willoughby and S. Ripley were the first to do the bulk of external work, and though they are not called by the title of Warden, seem to deserve to start the list.

1752 Ann Willoughby

1755 Sarah Ripley

1758 Ann Birkby

1781 Susan Watkins

1786 Rachael Cox

1801-4 Ann Hargraves

1805 Office vacant

1806 Hannah Connor

1820 Eliz. Clarke (held office together with Labourer
ship)

Single Sisters Warden (Cont)

1820-25 Co-Warden: Eliz. Jarrett

1824 Esther Jarrett 1825-29 No Co-Warden

1829-32 Eliz. Bull as Co-Warden as well as Co-Labourer.

1833 (Jan.-Aug.) Frances Bryant

1833 (Aug.) Eliz. Bull (held office together with Labourership)

1834 R. Spence

1850 Sarah Fletcher

1870 Eliz. Clough (From 1879 held office together with Labourership)

1890 Henrietta Titterington (held office together with Labourership)

1896 ? Carey (" " " ")

1897 Emma Lawford (Until 1912 " " " ")

1923 Eliz. C. Clemens (" " " ")

Until 1932.

(g) Widows' Labourer

This office was combined with Widows' Warden, and only one Warden was separately appointed. It is the only one of these offices which is extant and the recent holders have been known as Widows' Wardens.

- 1750 Augusta Brumm
- 1756-7 Office vacant
- 1757 Alice Vicars (pro tem. She was called to manage a business and then was asked to act as Labourer).
- 1760 Barbara Held (Often referred to as Warden, for Alice Vicars continued to help).
- 1765 ? Cammerhof
- 1766 Barbara Held (married Ab. Taylor)
- 1768 ? Cammerhof
- 1771 Esther Steeman (1787-94 Ann M. La Trobe, Co-Labourer).
- 1797 Eliz. Miller 1792-1803 Mary Taylor was Warden and from 1797 Co-Labourer.
- 1799 Jane Moore
- 1812 Hannah Hartley
- 1814 Rachael Jackson
- 1816 Anne Eliz. Church
- 1825-27 Office vacant and duties undertaken by Sister Kaltofen
- 1827 Ann Kaltofen
- 1835 Mary Okely
- 1840 Susan Taylor
- 1853 Mary Ann Collis
- 1858 Harriet Mallaliem (married Br. Hassé)

Widows' Labourer (Cont.)

- 1862 Ann Eliz. Coleman
- 1866 Sarah Waugh
- 1875 Mary Blandford
- 1889 Ann Zippel
- 1897 Hannah Jane Connor
- 1904 Eliz. Shawe
- 1909 Eliz. Willey
- 1919 Mary Emma Hassé
- 1921 Gert. Belshaw, held the office until she resigned in 1929, leaving Fulneck.
- 1932 Gert. Belshaw, returned to Fulneck as Warden of both the Widows' House and Sisters' House. These offices were merged from then on.
- 1936 L. King
- 1944 E.A. Moreton
- 1952 A.M. Douglas
- 1961 Emily Shaw, the present holder of the office of Warden of the Widows' and Sisters' Houses. (1965)

(h) Children's Labourer

These officers were appointed only in the early days and dealt with the children of the congregation at Fulneck and the Country Congregations but not with the children of the "Oeconomies".

1745 Br. and Sr. Held

1752 " " " Kohn

1755 " " " Gross (as well as being Pudsey
Minister)

1757(Oct) Br. Schulze, and from Dec. 1757 (date of
his marriage) Sr. Schulze.

In 1763 the Children were given into the care of the Labourers of the respective congregations.

(i) Congregational Warden

The earliest period is not clear as to titles and duties.

1743 - 52 Chas. Metcalfe (James Charlesworth seems to have acted as his assistant)

1755 - 70 James Charlesworth

1768 - 75 M. de Schweinitz, Co-Warden

1770 - 72 Ab. Taylor, Co-Warden with Schweinitz and took over Congregational affairs.

1772 Ockershausen

1776 J. Moore

1780 W. Collis

1785 J. Autes

1798 J. Chambers, Co-Congregational
Servant as well as Shop Manager.

1809 H. Lautenschlaeger (Known as Lauten)

1818 Ben. Brooke - but Agency separate and in the hands of C. Hanneman until 1841, and then in hands of B. Brooke.

1846 G. Robbins - but Agency in hands of Brooke until 1862, then in hands of Robbins.

1866. C.B. Ellis

1871 W.B. Nelson

1876 J. Elliott In 1878 the Wardenship was discontinued and duties divided between Agent and

Steward.

(j) Shop Managers

The Shop started in 1762 out of a union of Brogden's and Walker's shop in one Congregational business.

1762 Wm. Matthias
1771 Jeremiah Haley
1797 Jn. Foster (pro tem)
1798 J. Chambers
1801 Roederer (pro tem)
1802 Fred. Smith
1804 H. Lautenschlaeger
1809 Jn. Hinchcliffe
1810 Christ. Hanneman
1818 Ben. Brooke
1832 Samuel Sykes
1863 Henry Dawson Clough
1878 Stead Glover
1912 - 26 Ralph Barker

About this time the Shop ceased to be a congregational business and was leased to a private tenant.

APPENDIX 2.

Chronological Summary.

APPENDIX 2.

CHRONOLOGICAL SUMMARY

- 1738 The Rev. B. Ingham requested that Toeltschig help him in Yorkshire.
- 1739 Toeltschig arrived to work with Ingham in Yorkshire.
- 1741 Boehler came to Yorkshire.
- 1742 "Yorkshire Congregation" formed at Fetter Lane, London, and came to Smith House, near Halifax. Ingham placed his societies in Moravian hands.
- 1743 Zinzendorf visited Pudsey and fixed the site for the settlement.
- 1744 Ingham was commissioned to buy the Fulneck Estate for the Moravians. The Brethren occupied houses on the hill top, one as a dwelling house and one as a meeting-house.
- 1745 A cloth "manufactory" was begun at Bankhouse (Fulneck).
- 1746 May 21st Foundation stone of the Chapel laid.
- 1748 Ministers house and other rooms built. Boys moved to Smith House from Buttermere.
- 1749 Visit of Zinzendorf and his son, Renatus. Foundation stones of the Brethren's and Sisters' choir houses laid. Consecration of Burial ground at Fulneck.
- 1751 Chapel built at Gomersal. House used as Chapel at Mirfield.
- 1752 Brethren's and Sisters' houses completed and inhabited. Chapel begun at Wyke.
- 1753 Chapel at Wyke completed. Boys arrived from Smith House to Fulneck - establishment of Fulneck Boys' School.

Chronological Summary - Cont.

- 1755 Settlement of the Place Congregation at Fulneck and the Country Congregations at Pudsey, Gomersal, Mirfield and Wyke. New work begun at Dukinfield in Lancashire.
- 1757 Distress owing to bad state of trade.
- 1758 Additions made to the Brethren's and Sisters' Houses. Appointment of a Watchman.
- 1760 Death of Zinzendorf. Board of Arbitration established at Fulneck to decide disagreements between Brethren.
- 1761 Road repaired.
- 1762 Congregational Shop begun. Bakehouse and block adjoining for weaving and joinery erected. The Inn moved from the Lane end to within the Settlement. Extensions to Brethren's and Sisters' Houses.
- 1764 Brethren La Trobe and Charlesworth went as deputies to the Synod at Marienborn. Widows' House erected.
- 1765 Widows moved into their new house. Extension of land to the estate. Perpetual lease arranged for Chapel and Labourers house at Mirfield.
- 1766 Provincial Synod at Fulneck.
- 1767 Sisters' house full, so a house taken at Littlemoor for their accommodation.
- 1768 Brother Dohna attended the Synod at Marienborn.
- 1770 Death of James Charlesworth. Widows' House extended.
- 1771 New Shop built and Inn finished. Brotherly Agreement drawn up.

Chronological Summary - Cont.

- 1772 Discipline by Deprivation of Congregation of
Communion. Sept.-Nov. Death of Rev. B. Ingham in Dec.
- 1774 Day school for boys begun. Chapel procured at Wisbey.
- 1775 Last visit of Peter Boehler. (Chapel at Wyke rebuilt
and enlarged.
- 1777 A Society established at York. Smallpox at Fulneck.
- 1779 Trade Bad and conditions hard. Belfry built.
- 1780 Apprehension at Fulneck as result of a mob at Leeds
threatening Moravians accused of being Papists.
- 1783 Plans considered for a Square at the east end of the
Fulneck Settlement.
- 1784 Additions to Chapel (Porches). Tontine established.
Settlement at Fairfield (from Dukinfield) opened.
- 1785 Boys' Boarding School moved from rooms under the
Chapel to new buildings (present Headmaster's house)
between the Chapel and Brethren's House.
- 1789 Societies begun at Doncaster and Kirby Lonsdale.
- 1792 Girls' Schools opened at Dukinfield and Gomersal.
- 1794 Girls' School opened at Wyke. Evangelistic work at
Keld.
- 1795 Provincial Synod at Fulneck.
- 1796 Girls' School opened at Fairfield.
- 1800 Sunday School held in the Boys' Day School and the
Sisters' House.
- 1801 Boys' School opened at Fairfield. Girls' School
opened at Tanfield.

Chronological Summary Cont.

- 1802 Bishop Traneker died. Sunday School began at Wyke.
- 1803 Brethren purchased themselves free from militia service.
- 1804 Brother Fr.v.Schweinitz and S.R. Reichel were shipwrecked off Flamborough Head on the way from New York to Germany and given hospitality at Fulneck.
- 1808 Brethren Verbeck and Forestier of the Unity Elders' Conference, on their way from America, visited Fulneck.
- 1809 Theological Seminary opened at Fulneck.
- 1811 Drighlington Preaching place was given up.
- 1816 Sunday School begun at Gomersal. Baildon settled as a congregation.
- 1817 Brethren C. G. Reichel, L. D. von Schweinitz and Cunow visited Fulneck on their way to the Synod from America. Galleries enlarged in Chapel.
- 1818 Br. Ramftler attended Synod at Herrnut as a Deputy. Boys' Boarding School extended.
- 1819 The Inn diacony was given up.
- 1823 Br. Wild from Unity Elders' Conference visited Fulneck.
- 1827 Sunday Schools begun at Mirfield. William Wilberforce visited Fulneck. Theological Seminary closed.
- 1835 Provincial Synod at Fulneck.
- 1836 Br. W. Mallalieu deputy for Fulneck at Synod at Herrnhut.
- 1837 Cloth-making diacony given up. Br. Früauf from the Unity Elders' Conference visited Fulneck.

Chronological Summary. (Cont.)

- 1838 Scripture reader appointed. Some alterations in Chapel to the gallery and organ.
- 1846 Gas lighting introduced. Baking diacony given up. Br. J. G. Herman of the Unity Elders' Conference visited Fulneck previous to setting out with Br. W. Mallalieu on visitation of the missions in the W. Indies.
- 1848 Br. G. Clemens went as deputy for Fulneck to Synod at Herrnhut.
- 1850 New organ opened in the Chapel.
- 1853 Centenary celebrations of the Boys' Boarding School. Provincial Synod held at Fulneck.
- 1855 Yorkshire Congregations' Centenary celebrations.
- 1856 Provincial Synod again at Fulneck.
- 1857 General Synod at Herrnhut. Beginning of Provincial Home Rule. Theological Seminary begun at Fulneck.
- 1859 Work begun at Heckmondwike from Mirfield and Crook from Baildon.
- 1863 Congregation established at Crook, Co. Durham. The monthly "Messenger" started.
- 1864 Congregation established at Wellfield (Shipley).
- 1867 Congregation established at Horton (Bradford).
- 1871 Provincial Synod at Fulneck.
- 1874 Congregation established at Heckmondwike. Theological College moved to Fairfield to enable students to attend Owen's College, Manchester.
- 1879 Boys' Boarding School took over the Brethren's House.
- 1886 Provincial Synod at Fulneck. New edition of Hymn Book.

Chronological Summary. (Cont.)

- 1889 Reference to Lot struck out of Church regulations at General Synod.
- 1890 The monthly "Messenger" became the fortnightly "Moravian Messenger".
- 1898 Provincial Synod at Mirfield. Plan for constitutional rearrangement prepared for submission to General Synod.
- 1899 General Synod at Herrnhut. Final Constitutional revision.
- 1904 Provincial Synod at Horton. Arrangements for the establishment of a teaching profession.
- 1906 Provincial Synod at Baildon. Arrangements for the inspection of the Boarding Schools.
- 1955 Bi-centenary celebrations at Fulneck.

APPENDIX 3.

List of Moravian Churches in
the British Province. 1965.

APPENDIX 3.

LIST OF CHURCHES IN THE MORAVIAN BRITISH PROVINCE. 1965.

The date indicates the year of establishment as a congregation.

1. Yorkshire District

Fulneck	1755.	Crook(Co.Durham)	1863.
Gomersal	1755.	Wellfield(Shipley)	1864.
Wellhouse(Mirfield)	1755.	Horton(Bradford)	1867.
Wyke(Bradford)	1755.	Heckmondwike	1874.
Baildon	1816.		

2. Lancashire District

Dukinfield	1755	Westwood (Oldham)	1874
Fairfield(Manchester)	1785	Wheler St.(Openshaw)	1899
Salem (Oldham)	1836		

3. Eastern District

Fetter Lane (London)	1742	Prior's Marston (Rugby)	1806
St.Luke's (Bedford)	1745	Kimbolton (Bedford)	1823
Ockbrook (Derby)	1752	Queen's Park (Bedford)	1896
Riseley (Bedford)	1759	Hornsey (London)	1908
Eydon (Woodford)	1760	Upton Manor (London)	1912
Woodford (Rugby).	1796		

4. Western District

Tytherton (Chippenham)	1748	Brockweir	1833
Bristol	1755	Swindon	1899
Kingswood (Bristol)	1757	Bath (Coronation Ave.)	1907
Leominster	1759	Bath (Weston)	1954
Malmesbury	1770		

List of Moravian Churches in the British Province, 1965.
(Cont.)

5. Irish District.

Dublin	1750	University Rd. (Belfast)	1887
Ballinderry	1755	Cliftonville (Belfast)	1909
Gracehill (Ballymena)	1755		
Kilwarlin (Hillsborough)	1755.		

APPENDIX 4.

Doctrine in the Moravian Church.

DOCTRINE IN THE MORAVIAN CHURCH.

Doctrine in the Moravian Church can be gathered from statements in the "Results" of the very important General Synod of 1899, from the Catechisms, Liturgies and Hymnals, and can be expressed under the following heads:-

1. Personal Faith
2. Scripture, the sole Norm. of Faith
3. The Trinity
4. The Fall
5. The Atonement
6. Justification by Faith
7. Grace
8. Prayer and the Ministry
9. Sacraments
10. Eschatology

1. Personal Faith

Moravians have always placed life before merely intellectual apprehension and assent and so seek to exemplify a living Church of Jesus Christ, constituted of regenerated men and women, whilst it offers a meeting point for Christians holding to different dogmas. Personal faith in the crucified Saviour forms the chief foundation for fellowship.

"We aim at the comprehension, in a higher living unity, of the diversity of Doctrinal views, in so far as this diversity turns on the interpretation of Scripture, and arises from the different modes in which the same

scriptural truth is apprehended by different minds. This aim, however, we do not seek to attain by simply shutting out differences of opinion, or by leaving them unnoticed. On the contrary, we desire that such differences should find expression, and be recognised as legitimate. Nor again, would we establish unity by allowing all possible opinions to subsist, and letting love bear the sway over their heads. We seek rather a positive and living unity. This we find in the faith in the crucified Christ, in whom, as in the Son of God, we have reconciliation to God - that is, the forgiveness of our sins. (Rom.V.10., Eph.I.7). This faith, and the personal living fellowship with the Saviour which goes with it, we place, with all emphasis, in the very centre of the Christian life; indeed we give these so high a place that for us everything else, in comparison therewith, is relegated to a relatively subordinate place".

(1) (Results of the General Synod of 1899 p.23).

"The chief thing, then, for us all as members of this Brethren's Unity is, and remains, to strive to be One, and to become more and more One in all that is essential, so that we may have a sure ground for our state of grace, and may become true members of the One Body whose Head Christ is".

(2) (Results of the General Synod of 1899 p.24)

2. Scripture the Sole Norm of Faith

However, the doctrinal position is not one of colourless negation. The statements of Synods, the language of the authorised catechisms and liturgies and hymnals, clearly present the position regarding the cardinal truths of Salvation. The Church carefully guards the right of private judgement but also just as carefully provides against dissemination of error and unfaith in pulpits and schools. The sole norm of faith is the inspired record of revelation in the Old Testament and New Testament. Nothing is stated, however, as to the mode of inspiration, for this God has not revealed.

"The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are, and shall remain, the only rule of our Faith and practice. We venerate them as God's Word, which He spake to mankind of old time in the prophets, and at last in His Son and by His Apostles, to instruct us into Salvation through faith in Christ Jesus. We are convinced that all truths that declare the Will of God for our salvation are fully contained therein.

"We continue strictly to hold to what has ever been the principle among the Brethren, that it is not our business to determine what Holy Scripture has left undetermined, or to contend about mysteries impenetrable to our human reason".

(3) (Results of the General Synod of 1899. p.26).

3. The Trinity

The Trinitarian position of the Moravian Church is

explicit in their forms of worship. The entire structure, for instance, of the Litany for Easter Sunday is based on the doctrine of the Trinity. (4) However, the Trinity is one of the mysteries of faith which the Church does not define although it firmly holds that Holy Scripture implies God as triune - Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and in the American Catechism the Apostles' Creed is cited in connection with this doctrine.

4. The Fall

The Fall and the consequent inheritance of sin and death by the human race is affirmed clearly; but dogmatizing on theories, such as infralapsarianism or supralapsarianism, is carefully avoided. Total depravity is taught but theoretical discussions concerning original sin are not pursued.

"The doctrine of the Total Depravity of human nature, that since the Fall, there is no health in man, and that he has no strength to save himself. (John III 6., Rom. III 23; VII. 18, I 18-32; III 9-18., Eph. II 8-13)..."
(5)

"What do we mean when we say that human nature is sinful? We mean that there is in it a natural tendency to sin, a love of evil, an indisposition to that which is good, and a predominance of evil passions over better convictions". (6)

Sin is shown to be alienation from God as well as the concrete act of disobedience, and a matter of awful consequence.

"What is sin, therefore, in its very essence, or true nature?

Sin, in its true nature or essence, is a falling away, or estrangement from God, and is therefore, in itself hateful and evil, as darkness is darkness". (7)

"What is the punishment of sin called?

The punishment of sin is called death". (8)

"What is meant in Scripture by death?

By the word death is meant, not only that the body dies and is exposed to external sufferings, but especially the misery of the souls of the wicked in this world and in the world to come. Temporal or natural death denoted the external consequences of sin, as shown in this world, as pain, suffering, dishonour and natural death (or the death of the body)., Eternal death denotes the consequences of sin in the life to come, everlasting damnation". (9)

5. The Atonement

The Moravian Church teaches the Love of God manifested in redemption through Jesus Christ, the Incarnate Son of God. They hold up His vicarious atonement as the only objective means of salvation, but they do not insist on the acceptance of a particular theory of atonement or Scholastic presentation of justification:-

"The doctrine of the Love of God, the Father, 'who has chosen us in Christ before the foundation of the world', and 'so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish but have everlasting life'. (John III 16; Eph. I 3 & 4; I John IV. 9; Eph. II 4)....

"The doctrine of the real Godhead and the real Humanity of Jesus Christ - that the only begotten Son of God, by whom all things in heaven and earth were created, forsook the glory which He had with the Father before the world was, and took upon Him our flesh and blood, that He might be made like unto His brethren in all things, yet without sin. (John I 1-13, 14; XVII.5; I John V.20; Cor.I.17-19; Phil.II 6 & 7; Heb. II. 14.17; IV.15)". (10)

"The doctrine of our Reconciliation unto God, and our Justification before Him through the sacrifice of Jesus Christ - that Christ 'was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification', and that by faith in Him alone we obtain through His blood forgiveness of sin, peace with God, and freedom from the bondage of sin. (Rom.III 24 & 25, V.I, I Cor. I.30; Heb.II. 17, IX 12; I Pet.I. 18 & 19, I John I.9, II Cor. V.18 & 19)". (11)

6. Justification by Faith

Justification by Faith alone and the necessity of regeneration, the work of the Holy Spirit in the human heart, are stated as facts of personal experience rather than tenets of theology:-

"The doctrine of the Holy Ghost and the operations of His grace, that without Him we are unable to know the truth; that it is He who leads us to Christ by working in us the knowledge of sin and faith in Jesus,

and who 'beareth witness with our spirit that we are children of God' (Johm XVI. 8-11, 13-14. I Cor.XII.3; Rom. VIII.6).

"Living heart-faith is necessary, for one becomes a true Christian only through faith; but it is also necessary that the soul be brought to a deep and thorough conviction of its sin and misery, of its worthiness of damnation, and of its need of redemption. For the more earnest is the longing for peace the more confidently, on the evidence of God's faithful Word, can the redemption wrought out by Christ be laid hold of by faith.

"Through faith the sinner received from God, through grace, the forgiveness of his sins, purification in the sight of God, and peace with God; and he receives the power (the right) to become a child of God. (Luke VII 48-50; Rom.V.1, John I.12).

"As to the manner in which God, in His merciful compassion, effects this great change in the human heart, both Holy Writ and the experience of believers show that there is great diversity in God's ways of leading souls to their eternal salvation. Some, like Paul, are able to give the hour of the decisive turning in their inner life, when, called and awakened by the voice of God, they found justification and peace in believing. With others, again, the experience of their awakening and pardon cannot be defined as

belonging to any one particular moment", (12)

7. Grace

The Moravian Church does not teach perfectionism but it rejoices in the reality of sanctifying grace, holding that those who have received forgiveness of sins and a conviction of their sonship with God, receive divine power for resisting evil and overcoming sin. Their duty and their privilege is to pursue holiness proving their faith by works of love as they reach for the goal in imitation of Jesus Christ, the perfect example:

"The doctrine of Good Works as the fruit of the Spirit, inasmuch as faith manifests itself as a living and active principle by a willing obedience to the Commandments of God, prompted by love and gratitude to Him who died for us. (I. John V. 3-5; Eph. II 8-10; James II 17)". (13)

"The same grace which effects in the soul the knowledge of sin, and justifies the sinner before God and makes him a child of God, works in him further also true sanctification. This sanctification however, consists not merely in the laying aside of certain sinful habits and vices, but far more in the renewal of the inmost mind, and the decision of the whole heart and will to be the Lord's. We love Him who first loves us, with the whole heart, the whole soul and the whole mind, and we give proof of our love by doing the will of God with the whole heart, and obeying His commandments.

"The concurrent mark of all true children of God is this, that they have received the Spirit of Christ (Rom. VIII.9). It is this Spirit of Christ who first certifies them by His witness that they have the forgiveness of sins, that they are children of God and heirs of eternal life. He works in them, instead of the spirit of a slave and of fear of the wrath of God, the spirit of sonship in which they cry 'Abba, Father!' He impels them to follow after that sanctification, without which no man shall see the Lord. He sheds abroad in their hearts the love of God by which they receive power no longer to let sin reign in their mortal body that they should obey it in its lusts. He reproves them, makes them sorry with a godly sorrow for the sin that is still present with them, and at the same time produces in them heartfelt confidence in their Lord, so that they ever and again confess their sins to Him who is faithful and just to forgive them their sins, and to cleanse them from all their unrighteousness. In view of the goal of sanctification in Christ, the child of grace, in deep humility, and also with holy and earnest decision, confesses with Paul 'not that I have already obtained, or am already made perfect; but I press on, if so be that I may apprehend that for which I was apprehended by Christ Jesus' (Phil. III 12).

"But all the power thus to press forward towards the goal is given us by the gracious operation of the Holy

Ghost, if we do not cease to look in faith at the whole merit of His life, sufferings, death, and resurrection - and if we abide in that constant and confidential intercourse with Him which a pardoned sinner has with his Saviour. That intercourse is none other than the abiding of the branch in the vine, of which Christ says: 'As the branch cannot bear fruit or itself, except it abide in the vine; so neither can ye, except ye abide in me; for apart from me, ye can do nothing'. (John XV. 4 & 5).

"Thus the new life of the regenerate child of God is safely carried forwards towards its maturity, according to the measure of the stature of Christ, toward its glorification in the image of Christ and its perfection in eternity". (14)

8. Prayer and the Ministry

The Moravian Church stresses the need of prayer and other private and public means of grace for the culture of spiritual life but, whilst complete liturgical ritual is provided for the Lord's Day, the Sacraments, and various rites such as Confirmation, Marriage and Burial, and the Christian Year is observed, they do not tie their Ministry down to Church seasons in the pulpit nor keep them from the use of free prayer.

The three orders of the Ministry, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, are perpetuated, but not with a hierarchical conception of episcopalian function, and the congregations,

through the Elders, share the administration of discipline:-

"What is our part and duty in the work of sanctification? We should watch over ourselves, and maintain our communion with God, our Saviour, by means of prayer.

"What do the Holy Scriptures teach us with regard to prayer? It is our privilege and our duty to bring all our feelings, wishes and desires in prayer before God, in all places and at all times". (15)

"The Christian Church has not considered it sufficient to dwell upon our Lord's redeeming work in general only on Sundays, but has also recommended the commemoration of the essential parts of that redemption by special festivals. From these has arisen the course of festive seasons, which embrace in historical sequence the whole counsel of God for the salvation of the human race, and occupy the first half of our Church year". (16)

"Regulations belonging to our ritual and liturgy must never be allowed to become a dead letter, or to degenerate into dry, cold form. It is rather a principle of our Church to be highly esteemed, that we have and maintain liberty to introduce changes and improvements in our ritual as circumstances may require.

"Every Minister presiding at a service must be at liberty, in unessential points of ritual, to act as the Spirit moves him". (17)

"What has Christ instituted for the establishment and the spread of His Church on earth? Christ instituted the sacred ministry for the purpose of maintaining the knowledge of the Gospel, and spreading the same by means of living witnesses". (18)

"The ministry in the Protestant Church of the Brethren, by means of which it can enjoy an independent and undisputed activity in the Kingdom of God in the same manner as every other organised Church rests upon the consecration of Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons". (19)

"The Diaconate is the first degree of orders in the Church. It entitles to the exercise of the ministry of the Word and of the Sacraments. After the example of the Apostolic Church, this consecration be also imparted to those brethren to whom the control of the temporal affairs of the Church is committed". (20)

"The degree of presbyter is primarily to be conferred upon such deacons as are appointed to the ministry of the Word, and to the charge of a congregation in one of the three Provinces of the Unity, or are entrusted with the direction of any particular branch of Church work". (21)

"The office of a bishop imparts in and by itself no manner of claim to the control of the whole Church, or of any part of it; the administration of particular dioceses does not therefore, belong to the bishops. A bishop, like every other Minister of the Unity, must receive a special commission from the Synod, or from the Directing Board of a Province, for every office which he may have to fill.

"A bishop alone is authorised to perform ordinations to the various grades of the Ministry of the Church". (22)

9. Sacraments

The Moravian Church refuses to formulate definitions in respect of the sacraments, classifying them among the "mysteries" of revelation. However, it does affirm that Baptism is a sacred rite, by which under the emblem of water, we receive a pledge of the forgiveness of sin and admission into the covenant of God, through the Blood of Christ; and that children also may be baptised as a sign and pledge to them of the promise of Christ that theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven; and furthermore, that in the Lord's Supper the believer receives a divine seal of the covenant which was ratified by the Blood of Christ, and that he is thereby drawn into the most intimate communion with Jesus Christ:

"What are Sacraments?

Sacraments are sacred rites, which Jesus Christ has ordained in His Church, in order to communicate and to confirm to us the gifts and promises of the Gospel". (23)

"How many Sacraments has the Christian Church?

The Christian Church has two Sacraments; Holy Baptism and the Lord's Supper or the Holy Communion". (24)

"What is Baptism?

Baptism, as an external rite, is a sign of dedication to God, and of reception into the Christian Church". (25)

"What is the higher and spiritual signification of Baptism?

The external emblem signifies a dying of the old man, and at the same time, an admission into the covenant with God". (26)

"What do we, therefore, receive by Baptism?

By Baptism we receive, under the condition of faith, the promise of the grace of God in Christ Jesus for the forgiveness of sins, and at the same time the communication of the Holy Spirit for sanctification". (27)

"What then is the Lord's Supper?

It is a sacrament instituted by Jesus Christ in memory of His death". (28)

"What is it besides?

It is also a Communion or Covenant-rite, and as such a Divine seal of the Testament (or covenant) which was ratified by the Blood of Christ for our salvation and

reconciliation with God. 'Take, eat: this is My Body. This is My Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins'. (Matthew XXVI 26.28). The Holy Communion is, therefore, a mysterious enjoyment of the Body and Blood of Christ; that is, when the Lord's Supper is enjoyed according to the mind of Jesus Christ, the partaking of the bread and wine is connected with the enjoyment of the Body and Blood of Jesus, in a manner incomprehensible to us, and therefore, inexpressible.

"The fourfold fruit of the Communion, therefore, is:-

1. The assurance of the forgiveness of sins.
2. The strengthening of faith.
3. The increase of mutual love.
4. The confirmation of the hope of eternal life, and of a glorious resurrection". (29)

"What is requisite in order that we really become partakers of all these blessings?

We can become partakers of the fruits and promises of the Lord's Supper only by approaching the table of the Lord in a worthy manner". (30)

"What is necessary if we would approach the Lord's table in a worthy manner?

WeriouS preparation and self-examination are requisite to a worthy participation of the Lord's Supper. (31)

10. Eschatology

Whilst the defining of dogma regarding eschatological questions has also been avoided, the Moravians plainly teach

a conscious existence of the individual after death and the resurrection of the body, the visible return of Christ in glory for judgement, and that those who are His will enjoy the consummation of perfect life for ever, whilst the condemned will suffer eternal punishment:

"When will the work of grace be completed?

At the glorious coming of our Lord Jesus Christ."

"When will He come?

The day and hour no man knows, for He will come unexpectedly".

"What will then take place?

Then all the dead will be raised up by Jesus Christ; but the dead in Christ (believers) will rise first".

"What will happen to those believers who

are still alive at the coming of Christ?

Those believers who are still alive at the coming of Christ will be changed; and their bodies will be made like unto the glorified body of Jesus Christ, in the same manner as the risen bodies of the saints".

"What will take place after the general resurrection?

After the general resurrection of the dead, the Final Judgement will take place.

"Who will be the judge?

Jesus Christ, the Judge of the quick and the dead, will recompense to every man according to his works.

"What will be the condition of man after death?

After the resurrection and final judgement, man will partake either of everlasting happiness or of everlasting misery.

"Who will be the partakers of everlasting life?

The righteous; that is, all who have believed in Jesus Christ, will attain to everlasting happiness, being released from sin, from death, and from all pain, admitted to the most intimate communion with God and Jesus Christ, and made partakers of His glory.

"What will become of the wicked?

The wicked, that is, all who hold the truth is unrighteousness, and are not obedient to the Gospel, shall go into everlasting punishment, and shall be separated from God and all His Saints.

"What will then happen to the Universe?

The whole visible creation (heaven and earth) will then undergo an entire change. This is called the end of the world!

"And I saw a new heaven and a new earth, for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away"
(Rev.XXXI.1).

"We, according to His promise, look for new heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness" (II. Peter III 13)". (32)

APPENDIX 5.

Moravian Liturgy and Worship.

APPENDIX 5 MORAVIAN LITURGY AND WORSHIP

A. DIVINE SERVICE

1. Public Worship.
2. The Lord's Supper.
3. The Love Feast and the Cup of Covenant.

B. OCCASIONAL OFFICES

1. Baptism, Confirmation and Reception.
2. Marriage.
3. The Thanksgiving of Mothers.
4. Burial.
5. Ordination.

C. SPECIAL OCCASIONS, ETC.

1. The Christian Year.
2. Memorial Days.
3. The Moravian Text Book.
4. The Moravian Hymnal.

A. DIVINE SERVICE

1. PUBLIC WORSHIP

The Preaching of the Word has always occupied the central place in the worshipping activity of the Moravian Church and we are told that in old times "their Ministers gave most of their attention to this point, not only on sabbaths and festivals, but also on common week-days, whenever a funeral, a wedding, or a similar solemnity gave them an opportunity". (1)

In the early days Sunday was devoted entirely to Divine Service and the congregation assembled four times to hear the Word of God, twice in the forenoon and twice in the afternoon. In the first gathering select passages from the prophets were expounded and at the second, which was the principal Service, sermons were preached from the Gospels. The first afternoon service used the Epistles as subjects for meditation, whilst at the evening service the Bible was read, in portions of suitable length, from beginning to end, the Minister making occasional instructive observations as he read. These four services were added to by a fifth during the summer, commencing at Easter, which was specifically for the purpose of catechising the children but was also attended by parents and other adults. This was immediately after the mid-day meal.

The preacher was allowed great latitude in the choice of his text and treatment, but it was laid down as a principle that long and tedious sermons were to be avoided. So it was a rule that the morning and afternoon services,

including any singing should not last more than an hour, but in the principal service one hour was allotted for the sermon. The noon and evening services were limited to half an hour. The manner of preaching was to be simple, not using the aids of rhetoric and generally to be in the words of Scripture, and to be devised to suit the ages and conditions of the hearers.

All services opened with singing and concluded with a prayer, singing and the blessing. The Brethren's collections of hymns were often enlarged and issued in new editions, and their main aim was to impress scriptural truths on the memory through the medium of singing. The old Brethren set a high value on singing and the congregation sang with one voice led by a precentor and without the use of "artificial church music". Their hymns were adapted to Gregorian chants borrowed from the Roman Church and, later, sometimes precentors introduced popular German melodies which were more easily learned. This practice was often frowned upon because the tunes "awakened recollection of the unspiritual songs, for which they were originally composed, and thus disturbed devotional feeling". (2)

The centrality of preaching in the conduct of worship has remained with the Moravians, but the antipathy to "artificial" musical aids had died out amongst the Brethren of the Renewed Church and many of their Churches in Germany and here in England were furnished with fine organs.

The old use of Gregorian chants also gave place to the German chorale form. Even so there is a cautious note in the approach to Church music and in the Church Book, Section 74, issued by the British Synod in 1892, it is stated:

"Music that accords with the character of the Brethren's Church tends in a high degree to render the Services of the Congregation harmonious and devotional. This refers to the more artistic pieces as well as to the organ accompaniment of the usual singing of the congregation...All the more is it necessary that it should be wisely and judiciously directed in accordance with the spirit of the Church. For when music, however artistic, beautiful and sublime, improperly obtrudes itself, as though it were of the first importance...its effect is not to edify, but to do harm and disturb... The Minister of a Congregation has therefore, to see to it that only such Brethren are entrusted with the conduct of the music of the Congregation as are fitted for it by their spiritual character and insight". (3)

The normal pattern for Sunday worship today is two services, one in the late morning and one in the evening. The Service of Catechism was long ago replaced by the Sunday School. Each of these services centres around the sermon and, generally speaking, the morning one

follows a liturgical form provided in the Moravian Liturgy, and the evening Service takes the rather freer form associated with the Worship of the Free Churches.

The Moravian Liturgy was revised, authorised in 1958 by the British Provincial Synod, and issued in 1960, in the preface of which, it is said:-

"While in no way seeking to restrict or stereotype public worship, the Moravian Church values her liturgical tradition as a gift bestowed by her spiritual forefathers, since they felt that in this way full participation by the congregation and a satisfactory inclusion of the wide ranges of prayer might be assured". (4)

There are six orders of service which may be used at the discretion of the Minister. Of these the fifth is particularly suited for use at Youth Services and the sixth as a form of ante-Communion Service. Often the first four are treated in turn as the basis of the Morning Service on successive Sundays.

The first order preserves the Church Litany, which is the oldest and most characteristic form of Moravian Liturgy. It was compiled by Martin Luther based on ancient litanies of the Church and was printed in the Brethren's Hymn Book in 1566 and continued to be used until it was revised and recast by Count Zinzendorf in 1741 and published in the first German Liturgy Book of the Renewed Church in 1744.

The second order has passages more reminiscent of the Litany of the English Book of Common Prayer and the fourth order has a number of elements in the type of the Morning or Evening Prayer in the Book of Common Prayer. Each order opens with some sentences, includes the singing of a Psalm or a Hymn, proceeds with the reading of Lessons and hymn singing, forms of prayer more or less on the pattern of a litany, continues with a Hymn, the Sermon, another Hymn, and concludes with the Blessing.

Extempore prayer and "free" forms of worship are extensively used but most frequently for the second (evening) Service on Sundays. No directions are laid down as to the vesture of a Minister when conducting Divine Worship but it is the general practice for Moravian Ministers to wear a white surplice on such occasions.

2. THE LORD'S SUPPER

In a sketch of the ritual of the Ancient Unitas Fratrum in Bohemia, Moravia and Poland, re-issued by the Synod at Herrnhut in 1818 we are told:

"The Brethren celebrated the Lord's Supper, four times in the year, generally on the high church festivals, and sometimes, when it seemed proper, more frequently. When the communion approached, they took great care to prepare all the communicants to enjoy it worthily. Hence this sacred feast was proclaimed a fortnight or three weeks beforehand by the Minister, on which occasion he spoke on the aim, dignity and the blessing of this mystery. He at the same time called upon each of his hearers, to examine himself, to prepare for the great solemnity by penitence and prayer, and also to visit him for the purpose of private conversation.

"Before the communion was proclaimed, the minister sent for the Elders of the Congregation, and asked, whether the Lord's Supper could be held at that time, or whether there were any impediments in the way? He then inquired, what was the general walk and conversation of the Brethren and Sisters, and if they knew anyone, who stood in need of admonition, reproof or punishment? According to the reply received, the minister gave notice, when the Communion was to be celebrated, and began his examinations. Each house-

father, with all the inmates of his family, waited on the minister at a stated time, when they were examined as to their punctual attendance on divine service, as to the profit they had derived from it, whether they adorned the doctrine of Christ by godly living, whether the heads of families set a good example to their household, instructing them in piety and good morals; whether children were obedient to their parents, domestics to their masters and mistresses, etc. Of course these examinations gave occasion for admonition, instruction, and warnings. Whoever was found unworthy, was not allowed to go to the Communion for that time, unless he faithfully promised amendment. If any one shewed himself stubborn, refusing to acknowledge his faults, or to confess his sins, he was totally excluded, until he should again submit to the yoke of Christ. Distressed and mourning sinners, who owned and repented of their deviations, were strengthened with divine consolations, and assured of God's forgiveness through Christ, though the greatness of their sin was by no means palliated. If anyone absented himself from the Holy Communion, the minister asked him the cause, expostulated with him, if indifference to this bond of fellowship of the saints was his motive.

"No strangers were admitted to the Lord's Supper, unless furnished with testimonials by their own

minister or recommended by a member of the congregation, to whom they were well known.

"Immediately before the solemnity, the communicants were encouraged in an address, to draw near to Christ's table with real hunger and thirst for the bread and wine of eternal life. After this was the general confession, when the congregation invoked our heavenly Father, to be gracious to His feeble children for Christ's sake, to forgive them their sins, to cleanse, justify and renew them, to strengthen them by His Spirit, and to make them worthy to receive the true body and blood of His Son. Then the forgiveness of sins was solemnly proclaimed in the name of the Trinity, as also the right of God's children to draw nigh unto the Lord's table.

"The minister, arrayed in a white surplice, now read the Lord's last Testament. At the words: "he took bread and brake it", the minister took the bread in his hand, and broke it in sight of the whole congregation, and at the words: "in like manner He also took the cup", the minister put his hands upon the chalice. He added a brief explanation of the words of institution, calling upon all to believe, that these outward symbols were, in a sacramental mode, the body and blood of our Lord, given for us unto death, and shed for the remission of our sins. He encouraged them to enjoy this heavenly feast in

faith, and to lift up their hearts unto the Lord. The communicants then approached the table, which was covered with a clean white linen cloth, with all due reverence; first the servants of the Church, then persons of magisterial authority, next the Elders, and finally the remainder of the congregation according to age, first the men, then the youths and last the boys. Then followed the females in the same order. While receiving and enjoying the consecrated bread, they used to fall down on their knees, because their earlier forefathers, when they began to enjoy it standing, in order to avoid the appearance of adoring the host, had thereby drawn violent persecution upon them. They also found this devout custom profitable, as it awakened feelings of humility before God, and joy of heart, combined with holy trembling. During the enjoyment of the bread and wine, the congregation praised the Lord in hymns, treating of the sufferings of Christ and the blessings of His salvation. Finally the whole congregation again knelt down, to thank God for the benefits received. At the same time they besought Him, to aid their growth in the inner man, and to give them stedfastness to withstand temptation, to free His church from the errors of Antichrist, to fill His servants with His gifts, to make them faithful in their calling; to preserve the congregation in faith

and fear, love and hope, to raise up the fallen, to shew mercy to the penitent, to comfort the mourner, to support those imprisoned for the truth, to heal the sick, to enable magistrates and governors to rule well, to subdue the enemies of the Church, and convert them into friends, and to grant His peace unto all.

"The congregation was finally encouraged to walk worthily of the grace received, and to shew their gratitude by giving alms to the needy. The whole solemnity was concluded with the Old Testament blessing". (5)

The Moravian Church Book of the British Province, 1892, makes the following points:-

1. "The Kiss of peace, a usage taken from the Apostolic Churches (Rom. XVI. 16., 1 Pet. v. 14) is to be retained where it can be continued with acceptance, as a token of brotherly love and renewed union based on the Lord's death. But where there are grounds of objection, the giving of the hand is recommended instead". The Kiss of peace and the right hand of fellowship were alternative practices which had developed in connection with the Holy Communion in the Renewed Church of the Brethren almost from its beginning.

2. No fixed regulation was provided for the frequency of celebration of the Lord' Supper, but it was recommended as desirable at least once a month.

3. "With all true Church Members it must be a heart's necessity to partake frequency of the Lord's Supper" - but it was left to the state of heart and conviction of each one to partake less frequently. No-one should partake from unworthy motives e.g. thinking his abstaining would lower him in the eyes of his Brethren.
4. However, continual and unworthy withdrawal from the Lord's Supper was a matter of unfaithfulness and sin against the Saviour.
5. The Holy Communion should be administered to the sick if they requested it and the circumstances of their illness allowed it.
6. People who were not members of the Brethren's Church could be admitted as guests of the congregation.

(6)

With regard to the care about admitting "strangers" to the Holy Communion we may recall how the Brethren had excluded John Wesley whilst admitting John Ingham on the occasion of their visit to Marienborn.

The current practice seems to be to hold the Holy Communion once a month on a Sunday as an extra Service, usually in the afternoon.

It begins, usually after the Love-feast, with the Sixth Order of Liturgy, which includes the "Christ Litany" of Count Zinzendorf, continues in the form for the Lord's Supper, with a prayer for preparation and a prayer of

humble access and then a prayer of consecration either extempore or according to the form as set. After a hymn the Bread is distributed, and then the Wine, to the standing Congregation. After receiving each element the Congregation kneel and sing the verse of a hymn. Hymns are also sung during the distribution. A prayer of thanksgiving follows and after that a Covenant Hymn is sung during which the Right Hand of Fellowship is given. The Service closes with the patriarchal blessing.

3. THE LOVE FEAST AND THE CUP OF COVENANT

(a) The Love Feast

The Moravian "Lovefeasts" stand connected with a similar usage, the Agape, in the early Christian Churches and "express the family tie uniting Brethren and Sisters in their common love towards Christ". (7)

The custom was revived spontaneously in the Renewed Moravian Church at Herrnhut following the deep experience of unity and fellowship at the Communion Service on 13th August, 1727. Zinzendorf had sent food then to sustain the groups which continued in prayer and hymn singing. Later it became a recognised service expressing the fellowship in a special way. There are two kinds of Love-feast: The first is a more formal service and precedes the usual celebration of the Lord's Supper. It consists of talk on the affairs of the Church and Congregation and meditation on some aspects of the Lord's Supper—usually based on a text from the Text Book. The object of this Love-feast is to deepen the sense of fellowship through the covenant to follow Christ. The second kind is in connection with celebrating a Festival — whether of the whole Church, or the local Congregation, or even a smaller group or "choir". It is held to promote the fellowship of Christian believers and has no set form. The characteristic features are hymn singing, addresses on some appropriate topic, and the serving of a simple meal.

(b) The Cup of Covenant

The Cup of Covenant is really a third form of Love-feast and must not be confused with the use of the Cup in the Lord's Supper. It is a custom peculiar to the Brethren's Church and originated with the Single Brethren at Herrnhut in 1729. (8) When a young Brother was called to serve in the Mission Field, the whole "choir" met and entrusted him to Christ in this particular way, as a pledge of united service and trust. The practice soon spread to other "choirs" and today may mark a Church Festival, or any corporate act of re-dedication. The order prescribed is as follows:

All stand and the Minister says "Jesus took the cup, and gave thanks, and said "Take this and divide it amongst yourselves". (9) Then follow a hymn and prayer, and a Reading or Address, after which the Minister says: "Jesus said, I am the true vine, ye are the branches: he that abideth in me, and I in Him, the same bringeth forth much fruit, for without me ye can do nothing". The cup is then passed from hand to hand whilst verses expressing Brotherly union in the service of Christ are sung. After the partaking the Minister says, "One is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren". Then a covenant hymn is sung and the Right Hand of Fellowship given and the service closes with the New Testament Benediction.

In some congregations individual cups are used and

in that case, when they have been distributed the Minister says, "Now ye are the body of Christ, and severally members thereof", and they all then partake together.

B. OCCASIONAL OFFICES

1. Baptism, Confirmation and Reception

The three modes of admission to full communicant membership are Adult Baptism, Confirmation and Reception. Whilst Adult Baptism, which involves the conscious and willing acceptance of the Faith by the candidate, is therefore, the norm of admittance to communicant membership, it readily appears that, in a Christian society practising Infant Baptism, such form of Baptism with the complement of Confirmation, is the mode of admission in most frequent use. Reception is the mode of admission for those entering from communicant membership of other Churches.

Infant Baptism.

The Sketch of the Ritual of the Ancient Unitas Fratrum issued by the Synod at Herrnhut in 1812 says that:-

"A few days after birth, the children were incorporated into the church of Christ by Holy Baptism. After a text had been read, a short discourse was held, to show that the divine covenant extended also to the children of believers. This covenant was made by the parents and sponsors repeating the creed in the name of the child. The parents, at the request of the Minister, took the sponsors to be their assistants in educating the child, giving them full powers to instruct him in the Christian religion, and to reprove them, if they should be guilty of negligence in the task of education. On the other

hand, the godfathers and godmothers assured the parents of their willingness to undertake this task, and engaged more particularly, to execute their duty with all faithfulness, in case of the parents death. Hence it was a rule, that no ignorant or aged persons, whose days could not, in all probability, be long, should be invited to stand sponsors, much less were parents allowed to ask rich people or men of rank, from impure motives, to perform this duty.

"They all then prayed our Heavenly Father to cleanse the infant from its native corruption by the blood of Christ, to regenerate it by the Holy Spirit, to give it the seal of this grace by Baptism, and to grant it a place among His chosen.

"After the prayer the Minister gave the child the name proposed by the parents, and baptised it, agreeably to Christ's command, with pure water, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

"The parents and sponsors were then once again admonished, to remember their duties, and to educate the child in all diligence, until they could present him to the care of the Minister, as a well-bred, well-taught and pious child". (10)

The practice of Infant Baptism is clearly considered to be in accordance with Holy Scripture and agreeable to Christ's command. Section 84, in the Moravian Church Book of the British Province (1893) states:

"Our children are already by their birth within the Christian Church, called of God to a participation in the Kingdom of Jesus Christ (1 Cor. VII.14) and Christ Himself blessed little children and declared them to be of those who belonged to the Kingdom of God (Mark X 14-16). It is, therefore, in the Brethren's Unity the duty of parents to present their children for Baptism at the earliest age as soon as circumstances permit". (11)

Except in special cases, and then only by consent of the Provincial Elders' Conference, children past the age of two years were considered too old for the Administration of Infant Baptism. The rite of Infant Baptism was to be treated as a public matter and not administered, except in extreme cases of illness or great distance, in private houses but in Chapels or a public meeting of the Congregation.

The opening exhortation in the Service for the Baptism of Infants in the present Moravian Liturgy (authorised 1958) states:

"Baptism sets forth the saving work of Christ, wherein we are washed from our sins, and raised into newness of life; and in this sacrament we make confession of faith in him.

"In infant baptism we declare that our children share with us these benefits of our Lord's redeeming work, and we claim them for the following of Christ as members of his body, the Church.

"Moreover, it is written in the Gospel that Jesus said "Suffer the little children to come unto me; forbid them not, for of such is the Kingdom of God. And he took them in His arms and blessed them, laying His hands upon them". (12)

Confirmation and Adult Baptism

The confession of faith in Christ is made on behalf of infants by their parents and sponsors who promise to "teach them the truths and duties of the Christian faith" and to bring them up "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, and in the fellowship of the Church". (13)

Thus, for full adult membership, this confession of the faith must be made for himself by the person who was baptised in infancy. This takes place in Confirmation, and infants or minors who have been admitted by Baptism forfeit their Church Membership if Confirmation does not follow in due course. Section 85 in the Moravian Church Book (British Province 1892) says:-

"As in other sections of the Christian Church, it is the rule also with us that between Baptism and the Lord's Supper Confirmation comes in for the ratification (or Confirmation) of Baptism, and for conferring the right to partake of the Lord's Supper. In the case of persons who have been baptised as Adults, Confirmation is, therefore, as a rule not used.

"The age at which Confirmation is to take place cannot be definitely fixed; but it is recommended that

the step be not taken hastily. It should be preceded by a full course of instruction in the whole doctrinal system of Salvation, and by an examination in the chief points of the same". (14)

In the Ancient Unitas Fratrum, we are told, "the children who had been born and bred in the Brethren's Church, and learned the fundamental truths of Christianity either at home or at school, were publicly committed to the Minister's care, in the presence of the whole congregation, and confirmed in their baptismal covenant, before they were admitted to partake of the Holy Communion. (15)

In the ceremony the candidates, who had previously been examined, made their affirmation of faith and resolve to live in accordance with the promises of their parents and sponsors at their baptism and, joined in a prayer of general confession. After this:-

"they received absolution, and their right to approach the Lord's Table as children of the living God, was proclaimed. The Minister concluded the ceremony by laying his hands upon them in the apostolic manner, and calling upon the Lord on their behalf, that the hope of divine grace might be confirmed in them". (16)

In the modern liturgy of the British Province Adult Baptism takes place in the same office as that of Confirmation. After the first part of the service, which includes the declaration of faith, and intention to live a godly life in the fellowship of the Church, the Minister

lays his hands on the head of the candidate, recites a suitable text of Scripture, and then baptises him in the usual Trinitarian formula. (17)

Candidates for confirmation who had made the same affirmations as those required of candidates for adult baptism, are confirmed by the Minister, who stands in front of them, names them, and lays his hands on the head of each, reciting a suitable text of Scripture, and then pronounces the Blessing over them. Then, in the cases of both baptised adults and those confirmed, the Right Hand of Fellowship is given in token of reception into the communion of Christ's Church.

Reception

The third mode of admission into communicant membership is the reception of members from other Churches. In the Ancient Unitas Fratrum, when persons from other Churches made known their desire to join:-

"they were asked, in the first instance, what induced them to seek fellowship with the Brethren, if they were fully convinced of the truth of their doctrine, and of the utility of their rules and discipline. If it appeared that the applicant was properly acquainted with the Brethren's doctrine and discipline, and that he would go along with them, and moreover, led a blameless life, they received him without hesitation: if not, the reception was deferred to a more suitable time".

"The reception was not public, but took place in the presence of the Elders of the Congregation. Those who were about to be received were asked, if they would promise obedience to God and His congregation, if they were willing to submit to the servants of the Church in Christ's stead, empowering them to instruct, to admonish, to warn, to punish them, especially when they should fall into transgression; if they had laid their account with suffering reproach and persecution for the sake of Christ and His Church, and if they were ready to abide steadfast in the truth unto death. After they had promised obedience to enter into sacred fellowship with the other believers and to take their refuge, in all distress of conscience, to the Ministers". (18)

Later, in the first century and more, of the renewed Church of the Brethren, the decision about reception was referred finally to the Lot, which was an arbitrary procedure and probably excluded a number of desirable potential members until it was discontinued well on in the 19th Century. (19)

In modern times reception is, as formerly, more readily extended to those genuinely desiring to share the fellowship of Moravian Church Membership, but the Reception now takes place publicly at the Communion Love-Feast, or at the beginning of the Communion Service, usually in the

following form:-

"Dearly beloved, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ we give welcome to M.M. who has already confessed the faith of Christ before His people and has been received into full communion with the Church, and now desires to join our Congregation.

"May the blessing of God rest upon us in our fellowship and service; may we help and enrich one another, living together in the spirit befitting the company of Christ's people, and bearing witness in the sight of the world to the strength and grace of Jesus Christ our Lord and Master". (20)

Then, during the singing of a Reception Hymn, the Right Hand of Fellowship is given by the Minister to the one received.

2. MARRIAGE

In the Ancient Unitas Fratrum those who intended to marry had to do nothing without first consulting their parents or guardians, and the Minister, and clandestine promises of marriage were strictly forbidden, any being found guilty of them falling under ecclesiastical discipline.

"The marriage ceremony was performed publicly. After a text of Scripture had been read, and various hints founded upon that text had been given as to the duties required of married Christians, the couple were desired to step forward. They pledged themselves mutually in the presence of the congregation, who were witnesses of their free and lawful union, to show constant and unceasing love and faithfulness to each other. Then the Minister joined their right hands, and declared them to be lawfully married, confirming his declaration with the Words of Christ: "What God hath joined together, let no man put asunder" (Matt.XlX.6) in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. A prayer was then put up on their behalf, and they were encouraged by the hope of divine blessing, and exhorted to be moderate and becoming in celebrating their nuptials". (21)

In later times, in the Settlements of the Renewed Church of the Brethren, the final decision as to whether two people could marry or not was made by submission to the Lot. Even after the use of the Lot had been dis-

continued in this respect, the question of the marriage of Church members was still considered a matter of concern to the congregation and should be contracted within its sphere.

"The Provincial Synods are especially enjoined by the General Synod to make it a matter of serious attention that even in countries where Civil Marriage has been introduced, members of the Brethren's Church should not marry without receiving the blessing of the Church on their marriage".

In order to facilitate the marriage of members in the presence of their own Congregations it was strongly recommended that, "all Congregations should have their Chapels licensed for the solemnization of Marriages". (22)

The ritual for the solemnization of Marriage in the present Liturgy (Authorised for the British Province 1958) is based very largely upon that in the English Book of Common Prayer. The significant additions being the solemn declaration by both the man and the woman that they know of no lawful impedient to the marriage, the words of the man at the giving of the ring:

"I give this ring as a pledge and token of our union; and I call upon these persons here present to witness that I, M.M., do take thee N.N., to be my lawful wedded wife, to have and to hold, from this day forward, for better, for worse, for richer, for poorer, till death us do part, according to God's holy law; and thereto I give thee my troth". (23)

And the words of the woman in reply:

"I receive this ring as a pledge and token of our union; and I call upon these persons here present to witness that I, NN., do take thee M.M., to be my lawful wedded husband, to have and to hold, from this day forward, for better, for worse, for richer, for poorer, till death us do part, according to God's holy law; and thereto I give thee my troth". (23)

It is then that their right hands are joined and the Minister pronounces them man and wife.

The Service proceeds with prayer, Scripture reading, probably an address and a hymn, and closes with the Blessing.

3. THE THANKSGIVING OF MOTHERS

It is difficult to believe, that in a society so devout and spiritually aware as that of the Brethren's Church, women did not come to the Church to express their thanksgiving after giving birth to a child, but it must be presumed that such an act of thanksgiving was formerly a matter of individual piety and informal expression. No mention is made of a formal liturgical provision for such an occasion in the earlier days of the Unitas Fratrum, nor does the Moravian Church Book of the British Province of 1892 make any reference to it. However, in the Authorised forms of Liturgy for use in Great Britain and Ireland (revised in 1912) the fifth item provided for "The Thanksgiving of Mothers". The rubric directed that:

"When a mother desires that the Congregation join her in giving thanks to God, this may be done at the Baptismal Service, or on some other fitting occasion". At the time chosen the Minister had to say:

"Our Sister (N.N.) here present desires to render thanks to God in the presence of his people for the special mercy and deliverance he has vouchsafed to her". And the final rubric followed:

"(Then may be read Ps. 116 verses 1-9, 12-14, 19, followed by Prayer, Hymn No. 762 and the Old Testament Blessing)". (24)

The provision in the liturgy authorised in 1958 is rather more formal and extensive. After an opening

hymn the Minister says:

"Let us pray.

O God, the Protector of all who trust in thee, without whom nothing is strong, nothing is holy; increase and multiply upon us thy mercy, that thou being our Ruler and Guide, we may so pass through things temporal, that we finally lose not the things eternal; grant this, O loving Father for Jesus Christ's sake. Amen.

Our sister, N.N. here present, desires to render thanks to God in the presence of his people for the special mercy and deliverance he has vouchsafed to her.

Gracious is the Lord, and righteous; yea our God is merciful. The Lord preserveth the humble. I was brought low and he helped me. What shall I render unto the Lord for all his benefits towards me? I will take the cup of Salvation and call upon the name of the Lord. I will offer to thee the sacrifices of thanksgiving. I will pay my vows unto the Lord now in the presence of all his people, in the courts of the Lord's house. Praise ye the Lord.

Let us pray.

(here all kneel)

V. Lord, have mercy upon us,

R. Christ, have mercy upon us.

V. Lord, have mercy upon us.

R. Christ, hear us".

Then after the Lord's Prayer has been said by all,

there follow the following responses and prayers:

V. "O Lord, save thy servants.

R. Who put their trust in thee.

V. Be thou their strength and stay.

R. May all their ways be peace.

V. Lord, hear our prayer.

R. And let our cry come unto thee.

We thank thee, O heavenly Father, for thy gracious providence over our homes, and especially over this home in which thou hast given deliverance to the mother, life to the child, and gladness to all. Grant that the parents may have grace and wisdom to bring up their child in the nurture and admonition of the Lord; and, as thou hast added him to the number of mankind, so also unite him to thy holy Church, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Amen.

(If the child is dead, this Prayer may be used:

O Lord God, we would join with thy Servants who desire to thank thee in thy Church for thy gracious providence in a time of trial and danger. For the life thou hast preserved we bless thee; and the life which thou hast withheld we would humbly resign to thee, in full reliance on thy wisdom and goodness. Console and comfort these thy servants, we beseech thee, O thou Father of mercies and God of all comfort; and grant unto them the assurance of thy tender compassion and unfailing love; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.)

We thank thee, O God, for the skill and care of those who minister to us in times of illness and pain, for the love which we have for one another in our homes, and for the greater love which embraces all thy children in this life and the next; through Jesus Christ our Lord, Amen". (25)

After the hymn 762 the Service closes with the Old Testament blessing.

4. THE BURIAL OF THE DEAD

At funerals in the Ancient Unitas Fratrum the Minister and the school children accompanied the deceased to the burial-ground, singing verses, and there the Minister held an address to those present "instructing, comforting, warning them as circumstances required". (26)

The Church Book of 1892 advocated a "memoir" of the departed at funerals to "give occasion to glorify the riches of the grace of Jesus, also to warn the Congregation, and to give comfort and strengthen the faith".

But it further enjoined that:

"Empty praise, or the passing of a strict judgement upon the dead, must be avoided in the funeral discourses". (27)

Remains about to be interred in the Burial ground were to be brought into the Chapel during part of the ceremony. Generally speaking, only those who were acknowledged members of the Moravian Church or under the immediate care of one of its Congregations were to be interred in their Burial grounds, but this rule could be waived in extraordinary cases by the Minister and Committee of the Congregation acting together. Simplicity and uniformity of gravestones and inscriptions was the rule.

There are no grounds for the rumour which once spread abroad that the Moravians buried their dead in a standing position. This amazing notion took hold in the mis-

understanding by outsiders of the Moravian conviction regarding resurrection which strongly coloured their attitude towards burial. By burying in this position the "gossips" supposed Moravians placed their dead in a more ready position for the final awakening!

In the present day rite (authorised 1958) the Office for the Burial of the Dead falls into three parts. (28) First, there is the Service in the home which opens with these sentences spoken by the Minister:

"Peace be to this house, and to all who dwell therein.

In nothing be anxious, but in everything by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving let your requests be made known unto God. And the peace of God shall guard your hearts and thoughts in Christ Jesus".

Then follows a reading from the Scriptures after which the Minister offers prayer. Five prayers are printed in the rite, including one particularly for use on the death of a child.

The second section is the Service in Church which opens with the Minister reading a series of Scripture sentences and a prayer. The singing of a hymn or Canticles is followed by the reading from the Scriptures and an Address. The prayers that come after the address are introduced by a short imprecatory litany and the Lord's Prayer, and includes special prayers provided for the occasion of the death of a child and a death by accident

or disaster. The section closes with a hymn and
Benediction.

The last section is the Service of Committal. This is a brief section introduced by Scriptural sentences which lead straight on to the Committal in the following form:

"Forasmuch as it hath pleased Almighty God to take unto himself the soul of our brother here departed, we therefore commit his body to the ground (elements), in sure and certain hope of the resurrection to eternal life of all believers, through our Lord Jesus Christ; who shall change our earthly body that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the mighty working whereby he is able to subdue all things unto himself.

"I heard a voice from Heaven saying unto me, From henceforth blessed are the Dead which die in the Lord; even so, saith the Spirit; for they rest from their labours; and their works do follow them".

The section closes with four short prayers, an ascription of glory to Christ "The Resurrection and the Life", and the Grace.

5. ORDINATION

In the Ancient Unitas Fratrum there were five types of Church Offices into which a man could be ordained. In every congregation a MINISTER was appointed, who had DEACONS and ACOLUTHS under him. The Unitas was governed generally by the CHURCH-ELDERS (SENIORES) or BISHOPS, whose assistants were the CO-ELDERS (CONSENIORES) or CO-BISHOPS.

The Office of the MINISTER (or CURATE) consisted chiefly in preaching the gospel, administering the sacraments, and acting as counsellor and guide to his flock. In general the Brethren laid more stress on piety, unblemished moral conduct and intimate acquaintance with the Scriptures as the Word of God, than upon great learning and knowledge of the liberal arts. One good reason for this was the fact that in the early days the Brethren were not able to attend any University and it was not until after Luther's Reformation that young Brethren, distinguished by talents in the field of learning, attended the German Universities to study the learned languages and divinity. Mostly, however, young men were prepared for the Ministry by the Curates, who educated them.

Ministers did not canvas for places, nor were they chosen by the congregations they served. The Bishops appointed Ministers, selecting those who seemed best fitted to do the work in particular places, and the Minister

went obediently to the place to which he was called and there was accepted and respected by the congregation as its appointed shepherd. (29)

When a new Minister was to be introduced to a congregation he preached a sermon before them, and then the Bishop stepped forward and announced that the Bishops had, after mature deliberation, fixed on this man to be their future Minister. He begged them to receive him in love as a servant of Christ, and exhorted the Minister to be faithful in his office and careful in watching his flock. The Minister promised faithfulness to the congregation, who, in return, declared that they would give him the obedience due to a servant of Christ, confirming this declaration through their Elders who gave their hands to the Minister. When the congregation had dispersed, the retiring Minister, in the presence of the Bishop and the Elders, handed his successor a list of the congregation and all the Church property.

The Minister was obliged to give an account of the state of his congregation every half year to the Bishop, who had power to correct or punish him if any disciplinary action were ever necessary. Most of the Ministers were single men though there was no law of celibacy.

DEACONS were the immediate assistants of the Ministers, regarded and treated as candidates for the sacred office. They began by publicly preaching the Gospel, often being sent, after examination and instruction by the Minister,

accompanied by an Acoluth, to preach in adjacent villages. In large congregations the Deacons assisted the Minister in the distribution of the Bread and Cup at the Holy Communion. They also baptised infants in the absence of the Minister and instructed the children in the Catechism. (30)

Each Minister was under obligation to board from one to three (or more) boys of respectable parents, in his house to educate them, and with a view of preparing them for the service of the Church. As they grew older and more advanced in their studies, these youths generally became ACOLUTHS, or disciples. As such they were often given new biblical names and were expected to distinguish themselves in the propriety and industry of their daily conduct. Generally it was among their duties to ring the bell for Service, open and lock the church doors, light the candles for meeting before daylight, and gradually become familiar with and get some experience in the duties of the Deacons by accompanying them and helping them in small ways. (31)

The Deacons, Acoluths and younger boys under the Minister's care were expected to conform most strictly and punctually with the rules of his house which had fixed hours for rising, prayer, study, work, meals and retiring. No-one was allowed to sit up at night, and certainly not to leave the house; in fact, without the Minister's knowledge none of the inmates were allowed to go out,

procure anything for their private use, send any letters of importance, lend their own property or take charge of that of someone else.

The general superintendence and inspection of the Church was entrusted to BISHOPS or, as they preferred to be called, SENIORES or CHURCH-ELDERS. A Bishop was elected by the whole body of Ministers and admitted to his office by solemn consecration. General administration was not committed to one Bishop, but to a body of four or five of equal dignity. This was made a rule at a Synod held in 1500 after the death of Matthew of Kunwald, who had been elected the first Bishop by Lot, and it was designed to obviate the dangers of supremacy. Each Bishop had a certain Diocese, or number of congregations, under his supervision and there were generally two Bishops in Bohemia, two in Moravia and one (sometimes two) in Poland. (32)

The Bishops were of equal rank, except that one had the Presidency for the sake of order, and they held office for life, except in the case of improper conduct. Each one was obliged to submit to the decision of his colleagues and Co-Seniors in affairs of importance. If any congregation or person were dissatisfied with the Bishop's decision, he could appeal to the general Synod (which met every three or four years) which gave a final decision in virtue of the power committed by God to His Church.

Each Bishop had two or three CONSENIORES for his

assistance, who shared in the deliberations of the Council and helped in the superintending of the diocese. Acoluths, Deacons, and Ministers destined for ordination were first examined by the Conseniores before being sent to the Bishop. (33)

The Acoluths, Deacons, Ministers and Conseniores were Ordained to their office and the Bishops were Consecrated.

1. The Ordination of Acoluths

Young men proposed by the Ministers from the number of their pupils as proper candidates for the office were nominated Acoluths at the Synod. After an address on discipleship, they were called out by name and asked if they were willing to devote themselves to the Service of the Church and promise obedience to its Servants. Their duties were explained and they promised to observe them by giving their hands. The elder Acoluths gave them their right hand receiving them into their company. (34)

2. The Ordination of Deacons

Deacons were chosen from the older Acoluths and were examined by the Bishops as to their readiness to devote themselves entirely to Christ and His Church, and their progress in studies. Then, summoned before the Synod, they had their duties as laid down in Tim. III, 8, read out to them, and they solemnly devoted themselves to Christ and His Church. The Bishop offered up prayers on their behalf and ordained them with imposition of hands. Then

the new Deacons pledged their right hands to the Bishop and Ministers in token of their obedience and the older Deacons (giving them their hands) received them into their fellowship. (35)

3. The Ordination of Ministers

The Minister notified his intention of presenting Deacons in his charge for ordination at the Synod and asked the elders of his congregation to provide them with written testimonials as to their life and clerical talents. These candidates were given a threefold examination at the Synod: first by the Ministers who transmitted their opinion on each to the Bishops; then by the Conseniors who saw the candidates in groups of three or four at a time, questioning them on their knowledge of divinity and their motives in devoting themselves to Christ and His Church; lastly, each candidate was sent to a Bishop to be questioned on his conscience and to be reminded strongly of the solemnity of the step about to be taken. After further preparation by fasting and prayer, the Ordination took place next day when the Synod was assembled.

After singing a hymn, a discourse was given on the ministerial office, and then the ordaining Bishop stepped forward and read a passage of Scripture, after which he announced that some had been appointed and were about to be ordained, and called upon them to present themselves to God and the congregation. As one of the Conseniors

read out their names, the candidates stepped forward from the congregation to be placed, by two Conseniors, at the side of the Bishop at the altar, saying:

"We pray thee, venerable Brother, and Bishop, in the name of the whole Church, to impart to these men, who stand before God and before thee, the office of messengers of Jesus Christ, and the full powers of the ministerial office, and that thou wouldst confirm them in their station, in due order, according to the power given thee by Christ and his Church."

The Bishop replied:

"Are these men, now standing before me, worthy and fit to take this holy office upon them, and adorned with the vitues, which should grace an ambassador of Christ?"

One of the Conseniors answered:

"God has furnished them with the needful gifts, and they have been well instructed from their youth up; they have, by the testimony of all acquainted with them, led a blameless life, and in their examinations, they have been approved as sound in faith and doctrine, and as sincerely desirous to devote themselves to Christ and His Church; they are free from an evil conscience, and God, in answer to the prayers of the Church, has fitted them to be His worthy servants".

Then the Bishop said:

"This testimony given you in the presence of a

congregation of Jesus, is accepted, and your request shall be granted in the name of God".

After the candidates had vowed to discharge their office faithfully the ordaining Bishop said:

"Beloved Brethren, that you may have immoveable hope in the Lord's support, hear the prayer of the everlasting High-priest in your behalf, when He was about to offer Himself for the sins of the world, and fervently commended to His Father those, who should proclaim His salvation among all people".

Another Bishop then read the High-priestly prayer of Jesus from John XVII and the act of ordination followed, with all the Bishops laying their hands on the candidates, praying that Christ would receive them in the number of His faithful servants and fill them with the gifts of His Spirit. Meanwhile the whole assembly, kneeling, sang the hymn "Come Holy Ghost, come Lord our God" (No.680 in the Moravian Hymn Book). (36)

After the Bishop had pronounced the Divine blessing on the candidates they rose and gave their hands to the Bishops and Conseniors in token of their obedience, and to the older Ministers in token of their initial love and trust, and the Deacons gave their hands to the newly ordained to testify their respect, and the whole transaction concluded with the Lord's Supper.

4. The Ordination of Conseniors

When any vacancies occurred on the Council (of

Bishops and their Conseniors) some pious and experienced men were chosen by the Conseniors and Ministers, who noted down the person(s) they regarded as most fitted to fill the vacancy(ies) and the list of names was sent, sealed, to the Bishops. Those having the most votes were then added to the conseniors, being ordained with imposition of hands in the presence of the Synod. (37)

5. The Consecration of Bishops

In order to elect a new Bishop a Synod was called and the first day of assembly given over to the fasting and prayer that God would fill the vacancy and point out the man He had chosen. In an address the Assembly were reminded of the Scripture's requirements for this office, and when the Assembly separated, all the Bishops, Conseniors and Ministers wrote down on papers, without prior consultation, their votes, and these were sealed, collected, and then opened by the Bishops in the belief that he who had most votes was the one appointed by God.

The name of the one thus chosen was not made known immediately, but on the following day, before the whole Assembly, the consecrating Bishop announced that God had pointed out the man and urged that that man ought not to be disobedient to the call. Then another Bishop rose and named the person elected, who then stepped forward and was asked if he acknowledged this as a Divine call, and if he were ready to serve God and His Church thus. If the answer were affirmative the duties of this office

were laid before him, he pledged himself to attend to them faithfully, and the Bishops consecrated him with imposition of hands, beseeching God's blessing, while the congregation sang the "Veni Sancte Spiritus".

After the consecration the Bishops received their new colleague by giving the right hand of fellowship and a brotherly embrace; the Conseniors and Ministers promised him obedience and pledged their hands, and the Service concluded with songs of praise. (38)

In the Renewed Church of the Brethren following the resuscitation at Herrnhut the historic episcopacy of the Ancient Unitas was adhered to and was inherited by transmission of episcopal authority and consecration from Amos Comenius through Daniel Jablonsky. (39) The main threefold order of Ministry, depending upon episcopal ordination, was preserved in the orders of Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons. Acoluths were also retained as a form of minor orders in the Church's service but were not regarded as part of the Ordained Ministry, requiring only a form of reception in place of episcopal ordination. Section 61 in the Moravian Church Book (British Province) 1891) states:

"The Ministry in the Protestant Church of the Brethren, by means of which it can enjoy an independent and undisputed activity in the Kingdom of God in the same manner as every other organised Church, rests upon the consecration of

Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons. All those who have to minister the Word and Sacraments among us receive the outward legitimate authorisation for Church transactions by Ordination. When the Brethren designated, with invocation of the Lord as Head of the Church, and in his immediate presence, accompanied by the prayers of the assembled Congregation, are consecrated with imposition of hands in the name of the Father of the Church, we regard them as specially blessed by the Lord for the important commission to feed the Church of God, which He purchased with His own blood". (40)

From the beginning in the Renewed Church, however, the Episcopate had a rather different significance to that attached to it in the Ancient Unitas. In the old days the Bishops, as such, had a prominent share in the government of the Church. They had Dioceses and, in association with the Council of Elders, and in combination with the Synods they attended to the supervision and control of the whole Church. In the Renewed Church, on the other hand, the Church was being organised and governed for a considerable time before the episcopate was transferred to it, and control rested in the hands of Elders elected by the Congregations. It was the need for regularly appointed Ministers of the Church which ultimately led to the introduction of Episcopal Ordination, but this effected no change in the supreme control of the Church as it already existed. Thus from the first the

Bishops in the Renewed Church held an office in which the emphasis was very much more on the spiritual significance rather than administrative power.

The regulations in Section 62 of the Moravian Church Book (1891) state:

"(a) The office of a Bishop imparts in and by itself no manner of claim to the control of the whole Church, or of any part of it; the administration of particular Dioceses does not, therefore, belong to the Bishops. A Bishop, like every other Minister of the Unity, must receive a special commission from the Synod, or from the Unity Elders' Conference, or from the Provincial Elders' Conference, for every office which he may have to fill.

"(b) The Bishops are entitled to attend, as voting members, the General Synods of the Brethren's Unity, and the Provincial Synods of the Provinces in which they respectively reside.

"(c) A Bishop alone is authorised to perform Ordination to the various grades of the Ministry of the Church...

"(d) The office of a Bishop is in a peculiar sense that of an intercessor in the Church of God..." (41)

Men admitted to the order of Presbyter were "such Deacons as are appointed to the Ministry of the Word and to the charge of a Congregation in one of the three Provinces of the Unity, or are entrusted with the direction of any particular branch of Church work. The latter case has special application to the spiritual Superintendents

of our various Mission Fields". (42)

The Diaconate represented the first degree of consecration in the ordained Ministry of the Church, Deacons were entitled "to the exercise of the Ministry of the Word and of the Sacraments". (Church Book, Section 64), but those could be ordained to this order "to whom the control of the temporal affairs of the Church is committed". (43)

The act of Ordination or Consecration to each of these three Orders was limited to the Bishop's function but the choice of those to be ordained was a matter for the administrative authority of the whole Church. In the case of new Bishops, their appointment was the function of the General Synod, though the Unity Elders' Conference had the right of appointment between Synods if the occasion required. The appointment of Presbyters and Deacons was the function of the General Synod, though the Unity Elders' Conference had the right of appointment between Synods if the occasion required. The appointment of Presbyters and Deacons was the function of the Unity Elders' Conference, or a Provincial Elders' Conference. In the case of appointment by a Conference of a man to be a Deacon or a Presbyter, it was then the duty of the Bishop directed by them to perform the ordination to converse and examine the candidate regarding his spiritual experience and state of heart and mind. If a Bishop found such a person not to be a fit candidate he could, for his part, decline the Ordination,

Section 65 - "As to Acoluths" - of the Moravian Church Book (1891) states:

"The reception of Acoluths - followers in the sense of Matt. 1v 19, XVI.24 - is a usage introduced in the Brethren's Church, according to which Brethren and Sisters give the right hand of agreement to serve the Saviour in the Church, and to be obedient to the Servants of the Unity who are set over them.

"The reception takes place within the Unity Elders' Conference, or within a Provincial Elders' Conference. It may, however, take place in another Conference by commission of one of the above-named Boards". (44)

An explanatory footnote to this section goes on to say:

"Our adoption of "Acoluths" as a minor Order in the Ministry is due to the example of our Ancestors in the Ancient Church of the Brethren, who looked upon it as sanctioned by Scripture and by Christian usage from the earliest times.....

"The essence of the office of an Acoluth or Follower lies in entire and solemn surrender: - primarily, to the Lord Jesus so as to be a follower of Him in person al attendance on and constant communion with Him like as were His Apostles from the period of their call; secondarily, to the absolute and exclusive service in person of the Church, involving (whilst such service continues) obedience to the constituted authorities and readiness to "follow in person" the call of the Church.

"The Order of Acoluth with us is open to Brethren and Sisters alike; and it is the only Order to which Sisters are admitted. The reception of an Acoluth is not an Episcopal Function.....

"There is no settled form of Procedure on Admission of an Acoluth beyond the giving of the Hand mentioned above. It is left open in other respects to the discretion of the officiating Brethren, but the ceremony is concluded by the Acoluth receiving the blessing of the Church in reference to the particular work in which he or she is about to engage".

An Elders' Conference, or a Minister, who was not connected with an Elders Conference having the consent of the Committee of his Congregation, were empowered to make use of Lay Evengelists, who were sound in faith and acceptable to the Congregation, to help in the holding of meetings and preaching. (45)

The present Moravian Liturgy (Authorised 1958) provides a form of Service for the Ordination of Ministers which is used at the ordination of Deacons and Presbyters and the consecration of Bishops. The function of these Orders within the Church and their relationship to the administrative Councils of the Church are much as they were. Considerable use is still made of lay workers in the Moravian Church but the title of Acoluth seems to have dropped out of general use.

The Service of Ordination begins with sentences,

said responsively, by all standing: (46)

V. Lift up your heads, O ye gates: and be ye lift up, ye everlasting doors.

R. And the King of Glory shall come in.

V. Thou art the King of Glory, O Christ.

R. Thou art the everlasting Son of the Father".

A Hymn of adoration is sung and after that prayers are offered for the presence and help of God and the gift of His Spirit. Then, after the reading of Scripture, a member of the Provincial Board, or a person delegated by the Board, stands forward with the candidates, and presents them to the Bishop as follows:

At the Ordination of Deacons and Presbyters:

"On behalf of this Province of the Moravian Church, I request you as Bishop of the Unitas Fratrum to confer upon M.M. the pastoral office as Deacon (confirm M.M. in the pastoral office as Presbyter), by the power committed to you by Christ and the Church; and I testify before God and the Church that this man, as his words shall affirm, is sound in doctrine and faith, and that it is his sincere intention to serve Christ in loyalty with his brethren".

At the Consecration of Bishops:

"On behalf of this Province of the Moravian Church I request you as Bishop of the Unitas Fratrum to confer upon M.M. the office of Bishop in the Church of God, by the power committed to you by Christ and the Church; and I testify that he has been duly chosen and elected by

his brethren to serve the Church of God as Bishop; and his acceptance of this office declares his sincere intention to follow Christ in loyalty as a father in God among his brethren".

The Presiding Bishop acknowledges the presentation with the words:

"In the presence of the Church of Christ, and in the name of God, I accept your testimony, and grant your request".

And, after a hymn or anthem, he addresses the Congregation and gives a charge to the candidates. Then the Te Deum is sung, or some other hymn such as "Come, Holy Ghost, our souls inspire", and the Bishop reads Ephesian IV 4-7, 11-13, and exhorts the candidates to further consideration of the sacredness of the office to which they are being ordained.

In the case of ordaining Deacons and Presbyters the following questions are put to each candidate:

"Do you bring a ready mind to spend and be spent in the service of Christ and His Church?

(Answer) - I do.

"Do you accept the Holy Scriptures, and above all, the living Word, Jesus Christ our Lord, as giving the true revelation of God and His will towards men?

(Answer) - I do.

"Is it your set will and purpose to make that revelation the sustance of your teaching?

(Answer) - It is.

"Do you promise to work loyally with your brethren, according to the principles and rules of the Moravian Church?

(Answer) - I do".

The Bishop prays that they may be enabled to perform the things they have promised, and offers prayers for the Deacons and Presbyters, and for the Bishops, about to be ordained or consecrated, appropriate to the particular duties which will become theirs.

Then, as the candidates kneel, and the Bishops present lay their hands on them, the Presiding Bishop says:

"M.M. I ordain (consecrate) thee to be a Deacon (Presbyter) (Bishop) in the Church of God, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

The Lord bless thee; and keep thee;

The Lord make his face to shine upon thee;

And be gracious unto thee;

And give thee peace.

In the name of Jesus. Amen".

The act of ordination is followed by a period of silent prayer and then, when all are standing, the Bishops, and others so appointed, give the newly ordained the Right Hand of Fellowship, and a special ordination doxology is sung. The Presiding Bishop gives a further exhortation and then a Lay-member of the Church presents a Bible to the newly ordained; to Presbyters and Deacons

with these words:

"Brother, M.M. the Moravian Church sends you forth into the world as an ambassador of Christ, and places in your hand the Saviour's message of redeeming grace". and to Bishops with these words:

"Brother M.M. the Moravian Church received you as a Shepherd of Christ's flock, and places in your hand the Royal Law whereby a man of God is furnished unto all good works".

After this the Presiding Bishop invites the newly ordained to offer prayer and close the Service, which concludes with a hymn and Benediction, unless the Lord's Supper is to follow.

C. SPECIAL OCCASIONS

1. The Christian Year

According to the "Sketch of the Ritual and Ecclesiastical Discipline of the Ancient Unitas Fratrum", the Ancient Unitas, in addition to their strict observance of the Sabbath on Sundays, also

"Solemnised several other days, as being memorial days of ~~the~~ chief events in the life of Christ, his incarnation, birth, death, resurrection, ascension; the outpouring of the Holy Spirit; also the circumcision of Christ, and annunciation and visitation of Mary.

"Besides these, they also celebrated the days of the Apostles and some martyrs, to keep alive the remembrance of their constancy and patience in suffering. Yet on these days every one returned to his work, after the service was over". (47)

In the Renewed Church of the Brethren this custom of following a course of festive seasons, occupying the first half of the Church year, was preserved to "embrace in historical sequence the whole counsel of God for the Salvation of the human race". So Section 93 of the Church Book (1891) says:-

"The Love of God the Father, who gave His only begotten Son, is the subject of consideration in the Advent and Christmas season; the Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ who died for us, rose again, and ascended into Heaven, is dwelt upon in the season of Lent, the

Passion Week, and Easter, to Ascension Day; the Fellowship of the Holy Ghost is the subject of the Whitsuntide Festival; and on Trinity Sunday we close the whole festive period with a thankful retrospect of all that Divine grace has done for our Salvation".(48)

The way in which these Church Festivals were to be celebrated in the Congregations was not laid down in any set form of liturgy and so was not everywhere exactly the same, except for the Easter Liturgy, which was the only form provided in the Liturgy in use prior to 1960. The Liturgy revised through the Synods of 1954, 1956 and authorised in 1958, however, provides special forms of worship for Christmas, Good Friday, Easter, Whitsuntide, and Trinity Sunday, together with five "Confessions of Faith", a version of the Ten Commandments supplemented with New Testament equivalents for liturgical use, and the Nicene and Apostles' Creeds.

2. Memorial Days

Besides these customary general festival days of the Christian year, the Renewed Church of the Brethren has kept certain special Memorial Days of the Brethren's Church. Whilst there has never been any set form of liturgy for these occasions, beyond the provision in the Moravian Text Book of a special prayer for each Memorial Day, the Days have formed an important part of the liturgical practice of the Church. Congregational and Choir Anniversaries, referring to such events as the Settlement of the place or the consecration of the Chapel,

the times of which varied according to local circumstances, were also special occasions of liturgical activity for which no set form was provided.

The General Memorial Days of the Brethren's Church were:

- March 1st - The Founding of the Brethren's Church in 1457.
- May 12th - The Renewal of the Brethren's Church in 1722
- July 6th - The Martyrdom of John Hus at Constance, 1415.
- Aug. 13th - The Manifestation of the Unity of the Spirit, 1727.
- Aug. 21st - The First Mission to the Heathen, 1732.
- Oct. 31st - The Great Reformation, 1517.
- Nov. 13th - The Realization of the Headship of Christ, 1741.

The Church Book of 1891 stated that of these Memorial Days:

"the 13th August and the 13th November are specially observed in a festive manner, whilst the others are only mentioned in the evening meeting or on some other suitable occasion. The history of the events which gave occasion for a festival should be communicated from time to time, either on the day itself or previously to it". (49)

3. The Moravian Text Book.

The Moravian Text Book, providing the Scripture "Watchwords" and "Doctrinal Texts", is published annually and gives two sets of scriptural texts and lines from a

hymn for each day in the year. This book has now reached its 235th year of issue, but goes back to the practice at Herrnhut, in the early years of the Renewed Church, when a Scripture text, with lines from a hymn, was announced in the daily evening service as the "Watch-Word" for the following day. In 1730 a series of "Watchwords" was printed in advance for the whole of 1731, and texts were first printed in English for the year 1743. Count Zinzendorf selected the "Watchwords" until 1761 and after his death this duty devolved on the newly constituted Governing Board of the Church. It was then that two texts were given for each day, the "Watchword" always being taken from the Old Testament, and the "Doctrinal" Text was chosen from the New Testament in such a way that in one year the Gospels, Acts and Revelation were represented, and in the next year the Epistles, and in the third year all the books of the New Testament.

In addition the Gospels and Epistles for Sundays are indicated and, for other days of the week, two passages of Scripture are suggested for morning and evening reading respectively.

Since 1939 the circulation of this Book has increased tremendously reaching a million and a quarter copies in the German language, in some years. In 1948 the Y.M.C.A. provided an edition of 16,000 for Prisoners of War in England and 40,000 for Prisoners in France.

Smaller editions have been provided for many years in other languages - English, for the British Isles, America and the West Indies; French; Finnish; Swedish; Danish; Dutch; Czech; and also in many native languages and dialects for use in the Mission fields. (50)

4. The Moravian Hymnal

The Unitas Fratrum was the first of the Reformed Churches to issue a Hymn Book in the popular language and the present Hymn Book authorised in the British Province has a long ancestry behind it, stretching across more than four centuries.

The first Hymn Book was edited by Bishop Luke and printed in Bohemian at Prague in 1501 and this was followed by other issues up to the year 1659, during which period Hymn Books appeared in Polish and German. The German Hymnal included many of the Reformation Hymns and, in the edition of 1566, the Lutheran form of the Litany was inserted. (51) The character of these earlier collections was objective and expressed with a somewhat rugged strength and they soon rooted themselves in the hearts of the people, providing a great source of comfort and strengthening of faith in times of persecution and exile which ensued. The Hymn Book did, indeed, provide one of the strong historic links between the Ancient Unitas Fratrum and the Renewed Church of the Brethren.

After the resuscitation of the Church at Herrnhut in 1722, various private collections of hymns made by

Zinzendorf were used but it was not until 1735 that the Church Hymn Book was issued. This was compiled by Zinzendorf and was in German and various supplements were added up to the year 1748. This book was succeeded by "Das Londoner Gesangbuch", printed in London 1753-55, which had a large and catholic collection of more than 3,000 hymns. Another collection appeared in 1778 edited by Christian Gregor and this, with an appendix in 1806, and an abridgement in 1869, is still used by the German Congregations of the Moravian Church.

The first English Moravian Hymn Book entitled "A Collection of Hymns by several authors with several translations from the German Hymn Book of the Ancient Moravian Brethren" was issued in London in 1741. A second edition followed in 1742 and various additions were made up to 1752, the Litany in English being first included in 1746. In 1754 Bishop Gambold, under the guidance of Zinzendorf, edited "A Collection of Hymns of the Children of God of all ages from the beginning until now. Designed chiefly for the Congregations in union with the Brethren's Church". This contained 1,155 hymns but proved too large for general use and a curtailed edition was issued in 1769. Then, in 1789, John Swertner edited "A Collection of Hymns for the use of the Protestant Church of the United Brethren", new editions of which followed in 1801, 1808 and 1826. In 1835, James Montgomery, responding to a request from the Synod, undertook

a revision which appeared in 1849, and an appendix of eighty-two hymns was added to this in 1876. The Synods of 1878 and 1883 decided further revision was needed and this new edition, containing 1,323 hymns, was completed in 1886 and continued in use until 1912.

The present Hymnal was the result of the work of a Committee beginning in 1904 and completing its revision in 1912 and their edition was reprinted in 1920, 1930, 1946 and 1955. The number of hymns was reduced to 851, and in both character and language this last collection is more English than any of its predecessors.

Moravian Church publications come under three classes:-

1. Publications Official and Authoritative, setting forth Doctrine, Regulations and other matter to which our Members individually and personally are bound to conform.
2. Official Publications stamped with the approval of the Church, but the acceptance of which is not made obligatory on our Members, individually or personally.
3. Unofficial publications not possessing any Church sanction but dependent on their own merits for acceptance or rejection by our Members" (52)

The most important of the second class of publications are the Hymn Books which have varied at different times and now vary considerably in the different Provinces of the Moravian Church, and contain many hymns by writers who

were not members of the Brethren's Church. These points are referred to in Section 139 of the Church Book (1891) which goes on to say:

"Great care has been taken to exclude unsound Doctrine, but having regard to the foregoing facts and the character and objects of Hymnal Composition, it would be out of place to look upon our Hymns as Standards of Doctrine. Hence, much as the Brethren 's Church values its collections of Hymns, it does not permit them to be referred to as Touchstones of Doctrine. Our Hymn Books are designed to be manuals of private devotion and spiritual treasuries by means of which family worship may be enlivened and the Services of the Lord's House rendered increasingly instructive and delightful".(53)

APPENDIX 6.

Footnote references.

Part 1. The Bohemian Brethren.

- (1) Carter and Weeks, (Editors). The Protestant Dictionary.
The Harrison Trust. London, 1933. Article on the
Moravian Church by J.E. Hutton. p.442
- (2) An Account of the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren.
Translated from the German and privately published.
Bradford, 1822. p.10.
- (3) J.E. Hutton. A History of the Moravian Church.
Moravian Publication Office. London, 1909. p.29
- (4) Ibid. p.46. The Moravian tradition is that their
Church was founded March 1st 1457, but this date is
only one of pious imagination. The year, not to speak
of the month and day, of its foundation is not certain.
- (5) Ibid. p. 52
- (6) Ibid. p. 54
- (7) Ibid. p. 70
- (8) Ibid. p. 136.
- (9) Carter and Weeks. (Ed). The Protestant Dictionary.
(Supra) p.443.
- (10) J.T. Hamilton. A History of the Moravian Church during
the 18th and 19th Centuries. Times Publishing Co.
Bethlehem. Pa. U.S.A. 1900. p.7.
- (11) G.A.Wauer. The Beginnings of the Brethren's Church in
England. Leipzig. 1900. Translated by John Elliott
and published by the Moravian House, Baildon, Yorks.
1901. p.17.
- (12) Amos Comenius. Ratio Disciplinae. Amsterdam 1660.
Dedication. This work was personally presented to
Charles II in Holland as he was about to return to

England to ascend the throne. A copy is in the British Museum, and a translation was issued by Bishop Seiffert, 1866.

- (13) J.T. Hamilton. A History of the Moravian Church...
(Supra). p.8.
- (14) Ibid. p.9.
- (15) Ibid. p.10.
- (16) Ibid. p.10.
- (17) Ibid. p. 11.
- (18) Ibid. p. 11.
- (19) Ibid. p. 11.
- (20) Ibid. p.12.
- (21) Ibid. p.12.
- (22) Ibid. p.12.
- (23) Ibid. p.12.
- (24) J.E. Hutton. A History of the Moravian Church.
(Supra). p.192
- (25) Ibid. p. 196.
- (26) J.T. Hamilton. A History of the Moravian Church...
(supra) p.14.
- (27) Ibid. p.15.
- (28) Ibid. p.15.
- (29) Ibid. p.16.
- (30) J.E. Hutton. A History of the Moravian Church.
(Supra) p.197.
- (31) Ibid. p.198.
- (32) J.T. Hamilton. A History of the Moravian Church..
(Supra). p.27.

- (33) J.E. Hutton. A History of the Moravian Church.
(Supra) p.200. There were three men bearing the name David Nitschmann: (1) The Syndic (2) the first Bishop of the resuscitated Church, and (3) the Martyr.
- (34) J.F. Hamilton. A History of the Moravian Church...
(Supra) p.29.
- (35) Ibid. p.30.
- (36) Ibid. p.32.
- (37) Ibid. p.34.
- (38) Ibid. p.35.
- (39) J.E. Hutton. A History of the Moravian Church.
(Supra) p.203.
- (40) Ibid. p.206.
- (41) Ibid. p.207.
- (42) J.T. Hamilton. A History of the Moravian Church...
(Supra) p.37.
- (43) Ibid. p.38.
- (44) J.E. Hutton. A History of the Moravian Church.
(Supra) p.210.
- (45) J.T. Hamilton. A History of the Moravian Church..
(Supra) p.40.
- (46) Ibid. p.46.
- (47) J.E. Hutton. A History of the Moravian Church.
(Supra) p.230.
- (48) J.T. Hamilton. A History of the Moravian Church..
(Supra) p.48.
- (49) Ibid. p.68.
- (50) Ibid. p.69.
- (51) Ibid. p.69.

- (52) Ibid. p.70.71.
- (53) Ibid. p.71.
- (54) J.E. Hutton. A History of the Moravian Church.
(Supra) p.255.
- (55) J.T. Hamilton. A History of the Moravian Church..
(Supra) p.73.
- (56) Ibid. p.74.
- (57) J.E. Hutton. A History of the Moravian Church.
(Supra) p. 259.

PART TWO. GREAT BRITAIN.

- (1) G.A. Wauer. The Beginnings of the Brethren's Church in England. Leipzig. 1900. Translated by John Elliott and published by the Moravian House, Baildon, Yorks. 1901. p.55.
- (2) J.E. Hutton. A History of the Moravian Church. Moravian Publication Office, London. 1909. p.283.
- (3) Ibid. p.284.
- (4) J. Wesley's Journal. 28th Feb. 1736.
- (5) J.E. Hutton. A History of the Moravian Church.
(Supra) p.287.
- (6) Ibid. p.288.
- (7) J. Wesley's Journal. 7th Feb. 1738.
- (8) Ibid. 24th May 1738 and 16th April 1741.
- (9) Ibid. 24th May, 1738.
- (10) J.E. Hutton. A History of the Moravian Church.
(Supra) p.294.

- (11) J. Wesley's Journal. 31st Dec. 1738.
- (12) G.A. Wauer. The Beginnings of the Brethren's Church
In England. (Supra) p.68.
- (13) Ibid. p.73
- (14) J.E. Hutton. A History of the Moravian Church.
(Supra) p.299
- (15) Ibid. p.300.
- (16) Ibid. p.302.
- (17) G.A. Wauer. The Beginnings of the Moravian Church
in England. (Supra) p.91.
- (18) J.E. Hutton. A History of the Moravian Church.
(Supra) p.317.
- (19) Ibid. p.318.
- (20) Ibid. p.322.
- (21) Ibid. p.323.
- (22) Ibid. p.328.
- (23) Ibid. p.330.
- (24) G.A. Wauer. The Beginnings of the Moravian Church in
England. (supra) p.97.
- (25) J.E. Hutton. A History of the Moravian Church.
(supra) p.335.
- (26) Ibid. p.336.
- (27) G.A. Wauer. The Beginnings of the Moravian Church
in England. (supra) p.96
- (28) Ibid. p.101.
- (29) Ibid. p.105.
- (30) J.E. Hutton. A History of the Moravian Church.
(supra) p.106.

- (31) G.A. Wauer. The Beginnings of the Moravian Church in England. (supra) p.106.
- (32) J.E. Hutton. A History of the Moravian Church. (supra) p.346.
- (33) Ibid. p.347.
- (34) Ibid. p.349.
- (35) Ibid. p.350.
- (36) Ibid. p.351.
- (37) Ibid. p.351.
- (38) Ibid. p.353.
- (39) Ibid. p.355.
- (40) Ibid. p.355.
- (41) Ibid. p.358.
- (42) Ibid. p.359.
- (43) Ibid. p.360.
- (44) Ibid. p.361.
- (45) Ibid. p.362.
- (46) Ibid. p.365.

PART III. Yorkshire and the North: Fulneck.

- (1) J.E. Hutton. A History of the Moravian Church. Moravian Publication Office, London. 1909. p.304.
- (2) Early Letters in Fulneck Archives. Yorkshire.
- (3) Ibid.
- (4) J.E. Hutton. A History of the Moravian Church. (supra) p.307.

- (5) G.A. Wauer. The Beginnings of the Moravian Church in England. Leipzig. 1900. Translated by John Elliott and published by the Moravian House, Baildon, 1901.p. 87.
- (6) J.E. Hutton. A History of the Moravian Church. (supra) p.308.
- (7) J. Müller "Brief Historical Account concerning the Beginnings and Progress of the Work of the Lord in the Brethren's Congregation at Fulneck." Manuscript in Fulneck Archives.
- (8) Ibid.
- (9) Celebration of the Centenary Jubilee of the Congregations of the United Brethren in Wyke, Mirfield, Gomersal and Fulneck. Published by the Fulneck Jubilee Committee and Printed by Wm. Mallalieu & Co. London. April 1855. p.19.
- (10) Fulneck Diary. 1748.
- (11) Ibid. 1749.
- (12) J. Müller. "Brief Historical Account...(supra).
- (13) R.B.M. Hutton. Fulneck School through Two Centuries. 1953. Privately printed for School Bicentenary Festival. p.15.
- (14) J. Müller. "Brief Historical Account"...(supra).
- (15) Ideals set out in the "Brotherly Agreement".
- (16) J.E. Hutton A History of the Moravian Church. (supra) p. 310.
- (17) J. Müller. "Brief Historical Account"...(supra).
- (18) S. Raynor. The History of Pudsey. Longmans, Green & Co. 1887. p.408.

- (19) Fulneck Diary. 1822.
- (20) Ibid. 1822.
- (21) Ibid. 1770.
- (22) Ibid. 1778.
- (23) J. Müller. Brief Historical Account. (supra)
- (24) J.E. Hutton. A History of the Moravian Church.
(supra). p. 308.
- (25) J. Müller. Brief Historical Account. (supra).
- (26) Ibid.
- (27) Ibid.
- (28) J.E. Hutton. A History of the Moravian Church.
(supra). p.393.
- (29) Ibid. p.311.
- (30) J. Müller. Brief Historical Account. (supra).
- (31) Fulneck Diary. 1758.
- (32) Ibid. 1762.
- (33) Ibid. 1763 and 1765.
- (34) Ibid. 1766.
- (35) Ibid. 1767.
- (36) Ibid. 1768.
- (37) Ibid. 1773.
- (38) Ibid. 1777.
- (39) Ibid. 1769.
- (40) J. Müller. Brief Historical Account. (supra).
- (41) Ibid.
- (42) Celebration of the Centenary Jubilee. (supra) p.42.
- (43) Fulneck Diary. 1779.
- (44) The Brotherly Agreement. (supra).

- (45) J. Wesley's Journal. 30th Aug. 1770.
- (46) Ibid.
- (47) Ibid. 21st Dec. 1771.
- (48) Ibid. 17th June, 1783.
- (49) Celebration of the Centenary Jubilee. (supra). p.46.
- (50) R.B.M. Hutton. Fulneck School. (supra) p.17.
- (51) Ibid. p.23.
- (52) Ibid. p.39.
- (53) J.E. Hutton. A History of the Moravian Church.
(supra). p.456.
- (54) Celebration of the Centenary Jubilee. (supra).p.47.
- (55) Fulneck Diary. 1817.
- (56) Celebration of the Centenary Jubilee. (supra). p.51.
- (57) The Centenary Book of Bradford 1847-1947. Produced
for the Lord Mayor and City Council by the Yorkshire
Observer. 1947. p.25.
- (58) A.C. Price. Leeds and its Neighbourhood. Clarendon
Press, Oxford. 1909. p.288.
- (59) R.B.M. Hutton. Fulneck School. (supra). p.39.
- (60) Celebration of the Centenary Jubilee. (supra). p.28.
- (61) Ibid. p.29.
- (62) Ibid. p.29.
- (63) Ibid. p.30.
- (64) Ibid. p.30.
- (65) Catalogue of Members. Manuscript records at Fulneck
1755-1855.
- (66) Celebration of the Centenary Jubilee. (supra) p.52.

- (67) J.E. Hutton. A History of the Moravian Church.
(supra) p. 456.
- (68) Results of the Provincial Synods of the British Province. Fulneck 1835.
- (69) Ibid. Fairfield 1847.
- (70) J.E. Hutton. A History of the Moravian Church.
(supra). p. 458.
- (71) Ibid. p. 459.
- (72) Celebration of the Centenary Jubilee. (supra). p.53.
- (73) Results of the Provincial Synods of the British Province. Fulneck. 1853.
- (74) Ibid. Fulneck 1856.
- (75) J.E. Hutton. A History of the Moravian Church.
(supra). p. 468.
- (76) Ibid. p. 470.
- (77) Ibid. p. 472.
- (78) Ibid. p. 477.
- (79) Results of the Provincial Synods of the British Province. Mirfield 1898.
- (80) Results of the General Synod. Herrnhut. 1899.
- (81) J.E. Hutton. A History of the Moravian Church.
(supra). p. 492.
- (82) Ibid. p. 495.
- (83) Results of the Provincial Synods of the British Province. Ockbrook. 1890.
- (84) Ibid. Hoton. 1904.
- (85) Ibid. Baildon. 1905.

Appendix 4. Doctrine in the Moravian Church.

- (1) Results of the General Synod of 1899. p.23.
- (2) Ibid. p. 24.
- (3). Ibid. p. 26.
- (4) The Moravian Liturgy. The Moravian Book Room.
London 1960. p. 111-112.
- (5) Results of the General Synod of 1899. p.27.
- (6) The Catechism of the American Province. Question 32.
- (7) Ibid. Question 33.
- (8) Ibid. Question 34.
- (9) Ibid. Question 35.
- (10) Results of the General Synod of 1899. p.27.
- (11) Ibid. p.28.
- (12) Ibid. p.28-29.
- (13) Ibid. p.28.
- (14) Ibid. p.30-31.
- (15) The Catechism of the American Province. Questions
113 and 114.
- (16) Results of the General Synod of 1899. p.41.
- (17) Ibid. p.38.
- (18) The Catechism of the American Province. Question 58.
- (19) Results of the General Synod of 1899. p 87.
- (20) Ibid. p.88.
- (21) Ibid. p.89.
- (22) Ibid. p.90.
- (23) The Catechism of the American Province. Question 60.
- (24) Ibid. Question 61.

- (25) Ibid. Question 62.
- (26) Ibid. Question 63.
- (27) Ibid. Question 64.
- (28) Ibid. Question 70.
- (29) Ibid. Question 71.
- (30) Ibid. Question 75.
- (31) Ibid. Question 76.
- (32) Ibid. Question 121-130.

APPENDIX 5. Moravian Liturgy and Worship.

- (1) An Account of the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren.
Translated from the German and privately published.
Bradford. 1822. p.117.
- (2) Ibid. p.120.
- (3) The Church Book of the Brethren's Unity in the
British Province. Moravian Publication Office,
London, 1892. p.132.
- (4) The Moravian Liturgy. The Moravian Book Room, London.
1960. Preface, p.v.
- (5) An Account of the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren.
(supra). p.124-127.
- (6) The Church Book of the Brethren's Unity in the British
Province. (supra). p.141.
- (7) Ibid. p.137.
- (8) The Moravian Liturgy. (supra) p.54.
- (9) Ibid. p.55.
- (10) An Account of the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren.
(supra) p.121.

- (11) The Church Book of the Brethren's Unity in the British Province. (supra). p.139.
- (12) The Moravian Liturgy. (supra). p.60.
- (13) Ibid. p. 61.
- (14) The Church Book of the Brethren's Unity in the British Province. (supra) p.140.
- (15) An Account of the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren. (supra). p.123.
- (16) Ibid. p.124.
- (17) The Moravian Liturgy. (supra) p.67.
- (18) An Account of the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren. (supra). p.122.
- (19) See page 103 of this dissertation.
- (20) The Moravian Liturgy. (supra). p.70.
- (21) An Account of the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren. (supra). p.128.
- (22) The Church Book of the Brethren's Unity in the British Province. (supra). p. 142.
- (23) The Moravian Liturgy. (supra). 82-83.
- (24) The Liturgy and Hymns authorised for use in the Moravian Church in Great Britain and Ireland. (Revised 1912). Moravian Church House, London. reprinted 1955. p. 30.
- (25) The Moravian Liturgy. 1960. (supra). p.57-59.
- (26) An Account of the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren. (supra). p.129.
- (27) The Church Book of the Brethren's Unity in the

- British Province . (supra). p. 143.
- (28) The Moravian Liturgy. (supra) p.86ff.
- (29) An Account of the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren.
(supra) p. 87.
- (30) Ibid. p. 92.
- (31) Ibid. p. 94.
- (32) Ibid. p. 98.
- (33) Ibid. p. 102.
- (34) Ibid. p. 109.
- (35) Ibid. p. 110.
- (36) Ibid. p. 112-113.
- (37) Ibid. p. 115.
- (38) Ibid. p. 116.
- (39) See page 35, of this dissertation.
- (40) The Church Book of the Brethren's Unity in the
British Province. (supra) p.113.
- (41) Ibid. p.115.
- (42) Ibid. p.116.
- (43) Ibid. p.117.
- (44) Ibid. p.118.
- (45) Ibid. p.119.
- (46) The Moravian Liturgy. (supra) p. 71. ff.
- (47) An Account of the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren.
(supra) p.130.
- (48) The Church Book of the Brethren's Unity in the British
Province. (supra) p.146.
- (49) Ibid. p.147.

- (50) The Moravian Text Book. The Moravian Book Room,
London. 1955. Preface p.iii. and iv.
- (51) The Liturgy and Hymns...(revised 1912) supra.
Preface.
- (52) The Church Book of the Brethren's Unity in the
British Province. (supra) p.208.
- (53) Ibid. p.210.

APPENDIX 7.

- Maps: I. Showing centres of Moravian Activity
in England.
- II. Showing centres of Moravian Activity
in the West Riding of Yorkshire.

MAP I



MAP II

ROADS

-  Major roads on the Ordnance Survey Map Scale 1" = 1 mile.
-  Minor roads on the Ordnance Survey Map Scale 1" = 1 mile. Only those roads relevant are included.
-  Roads in Bowen's map of 1770. Relation to the present day roads is in some places conjectural.

PLACE NAMES

-  **PUDSEY** Places named in the text as centres of activity of the Moravian Church.
- BRIGHOUSE** Included for geographical location only.
-  **OSSET** Places in Bowen's map of 1770: all places not so distinguished do not appear in this map.
-  **RASTRICK**
-  Indicates present day Moravian congregations.

