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Abstract

The Moravian Church founded in Central Europe in 1457, exiled in 1627, renewed in 1722, rose from a crisis in 1753 and regained its standing by the careful control of its past. Based on a combination of archival research and contemporary fieldwork, this thesis considers contemporary Moravian identity in England from a historical perspective. It explores how contemporary members of the Moravian Church in England draw on history when presenting their identity today. Using two Moravian settlements in England, Fairfield in Greater Manchester and Fulneck in West Yorkshire, as case studies, this thesis examines how traditions and practices are employed to present and construct English Moravian identity, to both internal and external audiences. Against the backdrop of the history of the two settlements, reaching back to their early relationship with central European Moravians, this thesis considers the interplay of global, national, and local layers of Moravian identity and history. It investigates how contemporary members of these two English Moravian settlements relate to and identify with different aspects of their history and perceive their past. It explores notions of belonging to a lived-in community and the relationship that members have with the physical settlements themselves, in essence what it means to be a Moravian in England today.
Introduction

I first became aware of the Moravian Church at the Fairfield Moravian settlement when I visited it as a site of historical and architectural interest. It is a planned village with grade two listed status unspoilt by modern intrusions. It has fine examples of late eighteenth-century housing and of course the church. Outside the church was a notice board that gave a short history of the Moravian Church, its origins in the Unitas Fratrum (Unity of Brethren) founded in 1457, and how refugees from Bohemia and Moravia (now part of the Czech Republic) moved to Saxony in Germany in 1722 where the church was renewed. The fact that this history was posted outside the church sparked my interest in what I then thought of as a foreign enclave in Greater Manchester.

I established contact with the Fairfield Moravian community for an assignment that formed part of my studies for my MA in Religious Studies at the Open University in 2011 and found that my idea of this little ‘foreign’ outpost was totally wrong. My original idea was to try to establish whether there was a sense of a central European diaspora amongst the residents of the settlement. I was expecting there to be descendants from the Czech Republic and Germany who had come to Manchester in the late 1700s. When the minister introduced me to some of the church elders, he said ‘This is James, he has come to see how many of us are Czech’. This is an apparently common misconception, and the minister went on to explain to me that many visitors to the settlement expect the members to be of Czech or German descent. I went on to discover that the settlement was founded in 1785 by English members of the Moravian Church as the current sign outside the church now points out. This short visit to the Fairfield community left me wanting to know more about the Moravians, so I decided to go back to this fascinating topic for my research degree.

My early research in December 2013 brought to my attention the two-part nature of the history of the Moravian Church. I found this chequered history of the church very interesting: founded in
1457, exiled in 1627, renewed in 1722, but experiencing a crisis in 1753 that almost destroyed this church in England. It was this knowledge coupled with a claim made by Stead and Stead (2003) and Podmore (2007) that particularly caught my attention and influenced my decision to research how present-day members of the Moravian Church relate to and identify with their church and its traditions and practices. Stead and Stead (2003) and Podmore (2007) argue that English and American members of the Moravian Church are more likely to identify with the fifteenth-century church of the United Brethren, rather than with the renewed church of the eighteenth century.

My thesis investigates how members of today’s Moravian Church view the history of their church and its relevance to them now. This is achieved via a combination of both archival research and contemporary fieldwork at two Moravian settlements in England to examine contemporary notions of Moravian identity and tradition from a historical perspective. This combination of historical and contemporary research links the present with the past. It enabled me to investigate why today’s Moravians value and identify with certain aspects of their past, and why they consider them to be important. It is important to understand these preferences as I view these aspects of the past as the building blocks that today’s Moravians use to construct an English Moravian identity.

There are four Moravian settlements in the United Kingdom, three in England and one in Northern Ireland. I chose to focus on two of the English settlements, Fairfield in Greater Manchester and Fulneck in West Yorkshire, for a range of reasons, including the fact that they were the first (Fulneck 1743) and last (Fairfield 1785) Moravian settlements built in England (see Chapter 2 Methodology, subsection 2.2 Choice of sites).

My study highlights how findings of research into minority groups can challenge master narratives that often dominate historiography. My research shows that these two small religious communities reflect notions of different layers of religious, local, national and global identity. I
show that the churches at the Moravian settlements of Fulneck and Fairfield fared better than other denominations in the increasing secularisation of society in the period 1960 to 1970. Furthermore, in the same period the settlement churches also retained larger congregations than the other standalone Moravian churches. I examine the relationship between the members of these two religious communities and their environment, how their lived experience helps them form local identities. I explore the various methods that the two communities employ to develop their identity, both inward and outward facing. I explain the importance that community members assign to their identity, but also how, due to the Moravians’ name and their history, members of these two communities are concerned about being seen as foreign or as some kind of sect.

The Moravian Church is an Episcopal church. It stresses personal alliance to Jesus Christ, the significance of the Bible and places a strong emphasis on the importance of Christian fellowship. Members of the Moravian Church see themselves as a mainstream Protestant church and have adopted the motto ‘in all things essential, unity; in non-essentials, liberty; in all things charity’ (Moravian Church, n.d.). Internationally the Moravian Church is divided into twenty-four provinces with a membership of over a million. ‘The British Province’ is the official term for the Moravian Church in England, Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland and is the smallest. It consists of thirty churches, four of which are part of the planned settlements of Fairfield, Fulneck, Gracehill, and Ockbrook. The British Province in 2016 recorded a membership of 1,200 (Moravian Almanac, 2016). To put the British Moravian Church into context, the Moravian Church in Africa is divided into eleven provinces with eight hundred and seven churches and a membership of 867,830 (Moravian Almanac, 2016).

The history of the Moravian Church in England and its move to independence from continental Europe has been well documented. While academics like Atwood, Mason, Peucker and

---

1 Full details of the provinces of the Moravian Church and their membership can be seen in Appendix 2.
Podmore have all written about the Moravian Church in England, Germany, and the United States, their work has focused on the history of the Moravian Church. Indeed, a large proportion of research into the Moravian Church has been the early history of the church, often focusing on the eighteenth century. For example, Colin Podmore’s *The Moravian Church in England 1728 – 1760* (1998) and John Mason’s *The Moravian Church and the Missionary Awakening in England 1760 – 1800* (2001) are both key works that cover specific time periods of the history of the English Moravian Church. However, Geoffrey and Margaret Stead’s *The Exotic Plant* (2003) covers the history of the Moravian Church in Great Britain from 1742 to 2000, giving a good overview. This literature highlights the important role that perceptions of history have played in the development of Moravian identity. However, there is a lack of research into contemporary Moravian identity. While Peter Vogt has written about contemporary Moravian identity in the United States, little has been written about Moravian communities in the United Kingdom. While my thesis builds on this literature, it brings new material to the study of Moravian communities, bringing together historical and contemporary research on Moravian communities in England.

The main body of my thesis begins with a review of relevant literature. Chapter 1 sets out how my thesis builds on previous research into the historical and contemporary development of the Moravian Church. This includes work both by scholars who identify as members of the Moravian Church and those who regard themselves as independent from it. Furthermore, this chapter considers how my thesis relates to literature exploring notions of identity, heritage and tradition and the role they can play a role in processes of identity creation.

Chapter two outlines my methods of collecting and analysing the data. This covers my archival research as well as the different methods I combined for my contemporary fieldwork at the two Moravian settlements that my thesis focuses on. This includes the process of distributing, collecting, and analysing questionnaires, my participant observation of various events held at
the two settlements, the semi structured interviews and informal conversations I held with community residents. I also reflect on the impact that COVID-19 had on my research.

This is followed by chapter three which investigates the history of the Moravian Church. This chapter draws on my research undertaken in the archives at the two settlements as well as those at Church House in Muswell Hill, John Rylands Library Manchester, and the West Yorkshire Archives in Bradford. My research builds on the existing literature on the Moravian Church and covers key points in its long and complicated history. Furthermore, the analysis draws on my own insights as well as new evidence and viewpoints on the study of Moravian history. The chapter starts with considering the reforming efforts of John Huss (1369-1415), followed by an investigation of the formation of the United Brethren, a small community in Kunwald by Gregory the Patriarch (1420?-1473) in 1457.\(^2\) This chapter also explores the impact of the initial visits to England by members of the Herrnhut community and the determination of Zinzendorf to link the renewed church with that of the United Brethren. To provide a comparison to the development of the Moravian Church in England, I look at the way the settlements were established in the American colonies. I then go on to consider the influence of Moravian beliefs and practices upon the Wesleys, who first met with Moravians on a voyage to the colonies. The mid eighteenth century saw the start of the crisis that rocked the Moravian Church, damaged its reputation and led to a loss of a lot of its supporters, followed by a long road to its recovery. I examine efforts to conceal selected parts of Moravian history and rewrite others in order to regain respectability and change the public facing image of the Moravian Church. An exploration of the move to the independence of the Moravian Church in England and the change to the relationship with Herrnhut in Germany is followed by an examination of the strains and pressures brought upon the unity of the worldwide Moravian Church due to the impact of the

\(^2\) No definite date of birth for Gregory.
two World Wars and the reconciliation in the aftermath. I consider the impact of the division of Europe during the Cold War on the changing relationship between the British Province and Continental Europe, in particular the growing importance of the American Moravian church to the British Moravian church. Finally, I focus on the long sixties and changing attitudes to Christianity. This covers the decline in church attendance and how this affected the Moravian church. I analyse the congregations at the two settlements. This shows that attendance did not decline to the same degree as in other Protestant churches in the 1960 to 1970 period, and that church attendance at the settlements fared better than the stand-alone Moravian churches. I investigate the way the Moravian church reacted to the arrival of a new style of Moravianism, with the new African / Caribbean Moravian Brothers and Sisters. I follow the growth of African / Caribbean Moravian churches and communities in London and Birmingham.

My thesis considers the impact of increasing secularisation of society and of the feminisation of religion, and changes in the 1960s that would ‘undermine former officially accepted us and them divisions in society, (Brown, 2006, p. 207). In most communities associated with the Church of England, church attendances declined and religious authorities were increasingly questioned. Work patterns changed, more women were employed and there was ‘less time and less need to join religious activities’ (Robbins, 2008, pp. 389-390). I explore the impact that social changes had upon the two Moravian settlements of Fulneck and Fairfield. This period is particularly relevant to my fieldwork as it falls well inside the memories of the older residents at the two settlements.

While chapter three provides a broad background to the history of the Moravian Church, chapter four focuses on the two specific settlements where I conducted my fieldwork: Fulneck and Fairfield. These two settlements are central to my contemporary fieldwork and therefore it is important to fully understand their set up as well as their historical similarities and differences before engaging with today’s community members. For example, while both settlements were
founded by English Moravians and are the first and last Moravian settlements built in England, Fulneck opened at the height of Zinzendorf’s influence on the Moravian Church, whereas Fairfield opened twenty-five years after Zinzendorf’s death. In my thesis, I will explore whether this time difference has any impact not only on the settlements’ historical relationship with Zinzendorf, but also on contemporary perceptions of the settlements and the identity of their members.

Chapter five investigates the public facing history that today’s Moravians wish to present. This covers the various aspects of history that members of both the Fulneck and Fairfield communities choose to acknowledge and those that they choose to leave out. It will explore the different celebration days that were introduced over the years. These have become traditions and are still celebrated today. They range from simple church services to large scale pageants marking important anniversaries, highlighting key periods in the history of the Moravian Church, and involving large casts. This thesis will also compare the way the two settlements (Fulneck and Fairfield) are using their museums to represent their history and community to those outside the Moravian Church. What do these museum displays tell the visitor about what it means to be a member of the Moravian Church today?

Chapter six focuses on the analysis of the interviews, focus groups and participant observation that I conducted as part of my contemporary fieldwork which I undertook between 2016 and 2018 and 2021 and 2022. My fieldwork explored how today’s Moravians identify with their church from both historical and contemporary perspectives, taking into consideration the value settlement members place on key figures, places and events in the long history of the Moravian Church. Furthermore, concerns voiced by some members of the two communities of being thought of as foreign or ‘some sort of sect’ are examined.
This thesis combines both archival research and contemporary fieldwork in order to establish the role that history plays in Moravian life today. Focusing on two English Moravian settlements, it aims to bring new input to the gap on research on contemporary Moravians in England, not losing sight of historical perspectives. My research explores how members of these two communities in England view the Moravian Church today. Furthermore, it examines how members of the English Moravian Church perceive how others view them. Finally, it reveals the deep feelings today’s residents hold for their long-established settlements that to them, are more than just places to live. Through my contemporary fieldwork at two Moravian settlements in England, this thesis examines the role of history in Moravian lives today. In conjunction with this is the archival research of primary sources combined with insights drawn from a broad range of secondary literature by historians some of whom are affiliated with the Moravian Church and some who are not.
Chapter 1 Literature Review

1.1 Introduction

Central to my research is the notion of how members of the Moravian communities draw on the past to form their current identities. The aim of this thesis is to critically examine the development of a distinctively English Moravian identity at two Moravian communities. My research into contemporary notions of English Moravian identity is from a historical perspective. Whilst there has been a great deal of recent research into the Moravian Church undertaken by both American and German scholars, there is a relative gap in research into the Moravian Church in England: a gap that this thesis, with its distinctive approach to contemporary notions of identity from a historical perspective, will contribute towards filling. Focusing on processes of identity formation, the creation of a public image and notions of tradition and collective memory, this thesis explores how English Moravians have identified with the Moravian Church as well as the role of history and the use of traditions in the development of an English Moravian identity as a means of uniting the church communities. My literature review explains how my thesis builds on previous literature.

The literature review is arranged in two main sections: The first section of my literature review provides an overview of relevant literature that explores the background history of the Moravian Church and its influence on other religious groups. This includes literature looking at the early days of Moravians in England and their relationship with the different sections of English society, different approaches to Zinzendorf’s theology and the influence that Moravians had on others, especially John Wesley and Methodism. Furthermore, literature on the development of the Moravian Church in the British Province between the mid-eighteenth century to the mid-twentieth century is examined. Alongside the origins of the Moravians, and in order to contextualise this analysis my thesis focuses on the recent past for which the 1960s are a good
point of departure as it is a period experienced by the older members of the two communities. This is why I will include literature that examines the decline of Christian practice in England in the period of the 1960s. The final section of my literature review considers literature exploring notions of identity, heritage, and tradition and the role they can play in processes of identity creation.

1.2 Literature exploring the history and influence of Moravians in England

In this section I draw on literature that charts the history of the Moravian Church in England from its foundation, through the crisis of 1753, to its long road to recovery from anti-Moravian sentiments as well as its expanding sphere of influence on other religious groups. Through my archival work I will examine how these periods of crisis, recovery, and change impacted on the settlements of Fulneck and Fairfield. Furthermore, my fieldwork at the two settlements will bring out the views of today’s community residents as regards to this part of the history of their church. In his introduction to *The Moravian Church in England 1727 – 1760*, Podmore, (1998, p.2) notes that there is not much secondary literature on the Moravian Church in England. The body of literature has not grown substantially since 1998. In exploring the secondary material that does exist it is useful to distinguish between the work of academics independent from the Moravian Church (Mason, 2001; Podmore, 1998,1990, 2007; Randall, 2006; Richter, 2007; Watson, 2010; and Yonan, 2008); work that has been officially sanctioned by the church (Stead and Stead, 2003); and finally the work of academics who have personal links to the Moravian Church but are not writing official histories, including Craig Atwood (1997, 2006, 2010, 2013), Director of the Centre for Moravian Studies (Bethlehem USA), Paul Peucker (2007, 2009, 2010,
1.3 Literature exploring the history of the Moravian Church

There are two particularly influential books on the history of the Moravian Church in England that are written by authors with no personal ties to the Moravian Church. The first is Colin Podmore’s *The Moravian Church in England 1727 – 1760* (1998). This is a significant work in which he adopts a broad approach that goes beyond merely the institutional history of the Moravian Church, analysing the motives behind the plans and decisions of the early Moravians and reflecting on the outcomes of such decisions. It is this approach that has made it such a useful tool in my research. The book is essentially about ‘the role of the church, concentrating on its external relations within the Evangelical Revival, with the Church of England, Parliament and public opinion’ (1998, p.3). Podmore charts the growing influence of the Moravian Church with the formation of a small network of religious societies which had members including Wesley, Whitefield, and Hutton (1998, p.36).

Podmore regards the Moravian Act of 1749, which recognised the Moravian Church as ‘an ancient Protestant Episcopal church’ (Podmore, 1998, p. 228), as a high point in the history of the Moravian Church. However, he argues that there was no Moravian plan to win parliamentary recognition (Podmore, 1998, p. 232). As we shall see later, Podmore’s view is not uncontested. Other scholars, such as Peucke (2010) and Atwood (2013), argue that Zinzendorf (leader of the church) was determined to prove a continuity between the ancient church and the renewed church, which the Moravian Act of 1749 does.

Podmore’s book concludes with the crisis of 1753. The crisis was preceded by a spate of English anti-Moravian tracts from 1750 to 1752. Podmore argues that this was a coordinated
attack on the Moravian Church in general and on Zinzendorf in particular (Podmore, 1998, pp.279-281). Furthermore, Podmore highlights that the full-blooded anti-Moravian campaign involved figures who had previously supported and been influenced by the Moravians. With such support gone the Moravian Church lost the position of high esteem in which it had been held (Podmore, 1998, p.286).

The second influential book written by an author with no personal ties to the Moravian Church is J.C.S Mason’s *The Moravian Church and the Missionary Awakening in England* (2001) which is effectively the sequel to Podmore’s (1998) book, taking up from the period when he finished. Mason explores the way that the Moravian Church slowly began to regain respect, which led it to focus on foreign missions ‘converting the heathen overseas’ (2001, p.27).

Mason shows the growing sphere of influence that Moravian missionary work had on others. For example, the formation of Baptist mission societies in 1792 and the involvement of people such as John Newton and William Wilberforce. Mason argues that this influence on the missionary work of others was an ‘indication of the steady improvement of the church’s standing’ (Mason, 2001, p.62). Mason states that between 1760 and 1792 the Moravian Church became ‘the generally recognised authority in the field of foreign missions’ (Mason, 2001, p.193) and that they had a real influence on the English missionary awakening (Mason, 2001, p.196). Furthermore, Mason argues that the same period was also the time when the Moravian Church started to distance itself from the teachings of Zinzendorf (Mason, 2001, p.97).

It should be noted that both Podmore and Mason also explore the wider impact of the Moravians on other Christian groups. In an article written before *The Moravian Church in England 1727 – 1760*, entitled ‘The Bishops and the Brethren: Anglican attitudes to the
Moravians in the Mid-Eighteenth Century’ (1990), Podmore explores how the Anglican bishops had to come to terms with the evangelical revival and does so by focusing on their relationship with the Moravians. Podmore sees the Moravians as ‘a vital component of the evangelical revival’ (Podmore, 1990, p.623). Podmore notes how different Anglican bishops held differing opinions of Moravians: Archbishop Potter and Bishop Wilson of Soder and Man supported them (Podmore, 1990, p.627). Gibson, the Bishop of London who was also responsible for the Anglican church in the colonies, saw them as a problem due to the success of the Moravian mission work and an even greater one regarding their influence on the Methodists (Podmore, 1990, pp.631-633).

What Podmore here notes as unusual about the Moravians was their desire to establish an ecumenical relationship in England with the Anglican Church. This was Zinzendorf’s ‘Tropus’ plan which Podmore explains as being a ‘scheme that was intended to be a way of allowing Anglicans who had become Moravians to remain members of the Church of England’ (Podmore, 1990, p.637). Podmore argues that the scheme failed because the bishops ‘had no authority to engage in ecumenical negotiations or to vary the constitution of the Church of England in order to provide a special status for the Moravians and their English adherents’ (Podmore, 1990, p.638). By 1748 the Moravian Church accepted that the idea of the ‘Tropus’ was a failure in England (Podmore, 1990, p.642).

In his article ‘Zinzendorf and the English Moravians’ Podmore looks at their relationship with and how they tended to play down Zinzendorf’s role (2007, p.31). Podmore argues that this distancing from Zinzendorf is still current. He claims that if you were to ask members of the Moravian Church in Germany where the Moravian Church was founded, they would say: in
1722 in Herrnhut by Zinzendorf. English members, by contrast, would say it was founded in fifteenth century Bohemia (Podmore, 2007, p.32). Furthermore, he states that ‘many English Moravians would rather be identified with Jan Hus, Comenius and the brave Moravian exiles than with the controversial figure of Count Zinzendorf’ (Podmore, 2007, p.33). Podmore sees this as the direct and long-lasting result of the 1753 crisis (2007, p.48).

Katherine Carte Engel’s (2012) article ‘Moravians in the Eighteenth-Century Atlantic World’ looks at the impact Moravian commerce with British North America had on shaping the political and religious environment, which is not a greatly researched subject. Carte Engel argues that ‘engagement with Britain facilitated Moravian expansion’ and helped create a Moravian identity (2012, p.7). Moravian communities were attentive to the commercial as well as the religious possibilities of transatlantic connections (Carte Engel, 2012, pp.10-11). This brought about the creation of a commercial society, based on profit and missionary work (Carte Engel, 2012, pp.11-12). Furthermore, she argues that the downturn in this enterprise was brought about by conflict in the Moravian Church in Europe (Carte Engel, 2012, p.13). Herrnhut wanted centralised control over the missions whereas the Moravians in America wanted local management of the missions (Carte Engel, 2012, p.14). Carte Engel states that the leaders at Herrnhut recognised this. Therefore, the North American mission fields ‘all but dropped’ from their attention (Carte Engel, 2012, p.17). Carte Engel concludes that the Moravians were the eighteenth century’s most successful missionaries (Carte Engel, 2012, p.18).

Unlike the previous pieces of literature which were written by academics independent from the Moravian Church, Geoffrey, and Margaret Stead’s The Exotic Plant: A History of the Moravian Church in Great Britain 1742 – 2000 (Stead and Stead, 2003) is a publication officially sanctioned by the Moravian Church. This of course has its own problems, as it has to present

---

3 This topic was discussed in a meeting between me and Colin Podmore 9th May 2018
the image that the church desires, leading perhaps to a selective reading of some aspects of the church’s history. Podmore is critical of certain gaps in the Steads’ work, especially the glossing over of the importance of Benjamin La Trobe (leader of the British Province) to the English Moravians and ignoring the role of missionary work so well documented by Mason (conversation with Colin Podmore 9th May 2018). Furthermore, he argues that there is an over-reliance on Hutton’s 1909 *A History of the Moravian Church* (conversation with Colin Podmore 9th May 2018). The text of Hutton’s book is somewhat dated. However, the footnotes provide information and supporting evidence. Stead and Stead view the founding of the renewed church at Herrnhut in 1722 as a result of ‘the enthusiasm of a small group of Protestant religious exiles with a strong sense of identity and an urge to recreate the pre-Reformation Unity of the Brethren’ (2003, preface p.xi). This viewpoint is challenged by other academics, especially Podmore who argued that the Moravian Church was less an agent of revival than a refuge of the awoken (2005, pp. 400 – 401). However, Stead and Stead note the early desire for more autonomy from Germany citing the Viney affair of 1743 as a culture clash between the German leadership and the English who were seeking more independence (2003, p.61).

Stead and Stead draw on information from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries that has not been published by independent scholars such as Mason and Podmore. Stead and Stead see the period 1780 to 1883 as one where the English Moravians further developed their own identity. They argue that as they became less dependent on the Continental Province, the thinking and practices of the English Moravian communities deviated from the original traditions. This led to the evolution of a new hybrid ‘provincial character’ which remained distinct from other non-conformist denominations (Stead and Stead, 2003, p.78). Stead and Stead say that the period of transition to an indigenous system and the diminishing use of the lot also brought about other changes to the church. They state that the church expanded very slowly during this
period and that the congregations were rural, poor, and less educated (Stead and Stead, 2003, p.79).

Stead and Stead make a distinctive contribution to the literature on the development of British Moravian identity. They argue that the development of a British Moravian identity can be seen through the evolving editions of hymn books and that the successive issues provide an insight into the changing styles of worship in the British Province from the mid-eighteenth century onwards (Stead and Stead, 2003, p. 268). They point out that initially, there was a lack of hymns in English, some were translated from German, and some were written in English but set to the original German music. Stead and Stead argue that this ensured that the Moravians evolved differently from other British Protestant denominations (Stead and Stead, 2003, p.267). An official British hymnal was not published until the furore of the ‘blood and wounds’ controversy had died down after Zinzendorf’s death in 1760. This edition reflecting changing trends rejected the ‘blood and wounds’ symbolism setting the Moravian Church in England on a very different course from that which Zinzendorf envisaged (Podmore, 1998, p. 289). However, the 1757 hymnal laid the foundation for the subsequent British Province hymnal which was published in 1769. It was a smaller version of the 1757 and had been carefully edited to remove any hymn that could cause offence (Stead and Stead, 2003, pp.267-298).4

These publications form the historical point of departure for the sections in my thesis that deal with the earlier years of the Moravian Church in England. They cover its formative years, its recognition by the British government, its rapid decline, and its struggle to regain respect. They provide an understanding of how the Moravian Church developed in England and offer a window on the everyday life of English Moravians. Furthermore, there is detailed coverage of the development of Moravian mission work and how this work helped in the recovery of respect

4 Zinzendorf’s blood and wounds theology is discussed in chapter three ‘The Moravian Church in England, a short history’
for the Moravian Church. Finally, we are brought up to date with the further development of the Moravian Church. In my view the Steads’ work is the only one that brings the history of the Moravian Church in Great Britain into the twenty-first century.

1.4 Literature exploring the relationship with the ancient church of the United Brethren

The question of continuity and discontinuity between the ancient church and the renewed church is of interest to both ‘insider’ Moravian historians, for example Craig Atwood, Paul Peucker and Peter Vogt and ‘outsider’ historians such as Colin Podmore and Maciej Ptaszynski.

Paul Peucker’s article ‘The Ideal of Primitive Christianity as a Source of Moravian Liturgical Practice’ (2009) throws a new light on the historiography of the Moravian Church regarding the link to the ancient church. Peucker argues that before Zinzendorf thought about the ancient church and the Unity of Brethren, he was greatly influenced by the work of Gottfried Arnold (1666-1714) on the early Christians (Peucker, 2009, p.7). ‘Arnold depicted the Christians of the first centuries as ideal, almost perfect believers and held them as an example for Christians of his own time’ (Peucker, 2009, p.14). Peucker argues that Arnold’s aim was to show his contemporaries how far the established Protestant church was removed from primitive Christianity (2009, p.14). For Arnold, the primitive church was the ‘true’ church, his book Erste Liebe (First Love) published in 1696 portrayed the early Christians as if they were seventeenth century Pietists, so the book found an eager market in Pietist circles. Several groups separating from the established churches to restore apostolic ideals looked to Arnold for guidance. Zinzendorf read the work in the early months of 1722 (Peucker, 2009, p.14). Peucker claims that Zinzendorf had the opportunity to implement his ideals of the apostolic church with the arrival of refugees at Herrnhut (2009, p.15). On the one hand, Peucker thinks it is surprising
given how important a role the early Christians played in the self-identity of the renewed church how little it is mentioned in their (the Moravian Church) later texts. On the other hand, he argues that as Moravian self-confidence grew, they ‘had found a new identity in the belief that God had renewed the ancient Unity of Brethren in their midst’ (Peucker, 2009, p.23). Peucker adds that after taking initial guidance from Arnold the Moravians developed their customs and moved away from Arnold’s ideal (2009, p.24). According to Peucker, Zinzendorf discovered the similarities between the Herrnhut community and the ancient Unity of the Brethren while he was researching the history of the Unity of Brethren (2009, pp. 26-28). When these findings were revealed to the Herrnhut community, they ‘considered it “miraculous” how they had unknowingly adopted the constitution of their ancestors’ (2009, p. 28). This cemented the notion for the early members of Herrnhut that the renewed church of Zinzendorf was a continuation of the Unity of Brethren.

However, Ptaszynski views the Unity of the Brethren from an outsider’s perspective, Ptaszynski’s article on ‘Between Marginalization and Orthodoxy: The Unitas Fratrum in Poland in the Sixteenth Century’ examines how the Unity of Brethren, who emigrated to Poland developed their image in the eyes of the Polish nobility from ‘a radical and marginal religious group to one of the main churches and important players in the political arena’ (Ptaszynski, 2014, p.2). He states that the Brethren came to a Poland that ‘had celebrated the Reformation’s first triumphs’ and that they were ‘admired for their work ethic and church discipline’ (Ptaszynski, 2014, pp. 5-10). Along with the Calvinists and the Lutherans the Brethren were the officially recognised Protestant confessions in Poland and their ideas about co-operation and union between the different confessions form a part of the chain as to why Zinzendorf wanted to link the renewed church with the ancient Unity of Brethren (Ptaszynski, 2014, pp. 15-16). Ptaszynski states the first union was initiated by the Calvinists who approached the Brethren asking, ‘to join with you and form a union’ (Ptaszynski, 2014, p.15). After much negotiation, the union was
sealed by communion on 15th September 1555 at Kozminek, but the Union of Kozminek broke down after a few months (Ptaszynski, 2014, p.16). The second significant attempt at a union was made at Sandomierz in 1570. Here the Brethren, Calvinists and Lutherans signed the Consensus of Sandomierz; a mutual acknowledgement of the three confessions of Poland, where each confession should preserve its specific ceremonies (Ptaszynski, 2014, p.23).

Atwood argues in 'The Use of the Ancient Unity in the Historiography of the Moravian Church' (Atwood, 2013) that the Consensus of Sandomierz excited Zinzendorf’s imagination and that he saw the idea as a way forward for the renewed church (Atwood, 2013, p.115). Atwood states that Zinzendorf saw the Consensus as such an important part of his diplomacy that he had it included in a painting he commissioned by Johann Valentin Haidt depicting the most important moments in the history of the Moravians (Atwood, 2013, p.115). Atwood claims that Zinzendorf tried to use the Consensus to convince the Lutherans of the legitimacy of the renewed church being the continuation of the United Brethren (Atwood, 2013, p. 115).

Perceptions of the relationship between the ancient church of the United Brethren and the renewed church of 1722 form an integral part of my thesis. Examining the historical aspect of this relationship and the various methods employed to promote different understandings of that relationship is important. Such study provides a platform from which to view the varied contemporary opinions of this relationship that are explored in my fieldwork.

1.5 Literature exploring Moravian influence on John Wesley and the Methodists

The determination of the extent of the influence that the Moravian Church had on Wesley and the Methodists has been more of a preoccupation for historians who are not affiliated to the Moravian Church. Indeed, non-Moravians are generally more interested in the wider impact of
Moravians on other denominations. This is where my approach differs: I am a non-Moravian interested in how the Moravians themselves understand their identity, which is generally the preoccupation of ‘insider’ Moravian historians. There is also an important wider point about how the identity of a small religious group may be viewed very differently by ‘insiders’ and ‘outsiders’.

In his journal article ‘A Missional Spirituality: Moravian Brethren and eighteenth-century English evangelicalism’, Ian Randall (2006) looks at two aspects of the influence the Moravians had firstly on John Wesley and secondly on Methodist missionary work. Spangenberg was the Moravian that had most influence on Wesley. Returning to England after a meeting with him in Georgia, Wesley was ready to ‘embrace the Moravian message of assurance of salvation’ (Randall, 2006, p.206). Randall argues that it was this readiness that helped to ignite the Methodist revival (2006, p.206). Like Mason, Randall sees the importance of Moravian missionary work, stating that their early missions of 1732 ‘caught the Protestant imagination’ (2006, p.210). It seems that it was the enthusiasm of Moravian missionaries that impressed Anglican Thomas Haweis who singled out their ‘fervent zeal’ (Randall, 2006, p.211) and for many Baptists it was the ‘zeal of the Moravians [...] that ought to provoke in all denominations of Christians a godly emulation’ (Randall, 2006, p.211).

Watson’s ‘Forerunners of the Early Methodist Band Meeting’ (Watson, 2010) looks at the influence the Moravian bands, small groups who could discuss issues of faith with total frankness, had on Wesley and the Methodists. The first bands were formed in Herrnhut and were organised by gender and marital status. The first consisted of married men and was formed in 1727, then married women in 1728, then in the same year single women and single men (Schmidt, G. in Watson, 2010, p.12). Membership was voluntary and within these groups ‘a strict form of mutual examination was practiced’ (Schmidt, M. in Watson, 2010, p.12). Watson cites Podmore on the function of the bands who argued that they were ‘marked by total
frankness on the part both of the member describing the state of his soul and of his fellow members in their criticism of him. Thus, they had something of the function of the confessional and anticipated to some degree modern group therapy’ (Podmore in Watson, 2010, pp.12-13). Watson sees the Moravian bands as the ‘closest forerunner’ of the Wesleyan bands (Watson, 2010, p.16). He concludes that the *Rules of the Band Societies* that Wesley wrote ‘combine the structure of the Anglican Religious Societies with the practice of the Moravian Bands’ (Watson, 2010, p.29).

Geordan Hammond’s article ‘Versions of Primitive Christianity: John Wesley’s Relations with the Moravians in Georgia, 1735-1737’ covers the period that Wesley spent with the Moravians. Wesley believed the primitive church could be restored in Georgia through renewing the precise liturgical practice of the early Christians (2009, p.32). Hammond argues that the eighteenth-century Moravians saw themselves as direct descendants of John Huss’ early fifteenth-century movement to purify the Bohemian Church and in turn the whole Catholic Church by restoring Primitive Christianity (2009, p.35). Agreeing with Peucker, Hammond continues saying that the Moravians sought to revive ‘true Christianity’ by restoring the piety and general liturgical forms of Primitive Christianity (Hammond, 2009, p.36). Hammond states that while in Georgia Wesley observed the Moravian way of life first-hand and confirmed his view of them as representing a model of the type of Primitive Christianity that Wesley hoped to cultivate in the colony (Hammond, 2009, p.43). However, Hammond asks the question ‘did the admirers of the Moravians idealise them?’ With the language barriers between them did the admirers see in the Moravians what they wanted to see? (Hammond, 2009, p.38).
Mark Olson’s short article ‘The Stillness Controversy of 1740: Tradition Shaping Scripture Reading’ (2011) examines how opposing ‘views regarding the spiritual standing of recent converts’ divided John Wesley and the Moravians (2011, p.120). He explains that when Philipp Molther returned to the Fetter Lane Society in November 1739 having left it in the care of the Wesley brothers he was shocked by the displays of emotion, grunting, and groaning as converts attempted ‘to receive the gift of justifying faith’ (Olson, 2011, p.121). Molther saw the spiritual standing of these converts as ‘pre-new birth, since they were not yet justified, they were seekers, not regenerate believers’. John Wesley disagreed, he saw the spiritual standing of the converts as ‘already justified and born again and had the gift of faith’ (Olson, 2011, pp. 121-122). Wesley blamed Molther for creating the division at Fetter Lane when he began to preach ‘the gospel of stillness’ (Olson, 2011, p.123). The idea of stillness was that ‘those who did not yet have faith should be still, that is, abstain from communion and from excessive prayer’ and should be seen as an attempt to ‘put a brake on the noisy excesses of unreflecting enthusiasm’ (Podmore, 1998, p.60). In addition, Colin Podmore notes that while Molther is often credited with introducing the doctrine, it was Spangenberg who introduced it the first time that he attended a Lovefeast at Fetter Lane and that he had a long conversation with John Wesley about it (Podmore, 1998, p.60). Olson sees the reason behind the conflict as ‘two faith traditions with their competing hermeneutics on how to read scriptures’ (Olson, 2011, p.123). The conflict between Wesley and the Moravian Church continued with each appealing to biblical texts that supported their views (Olson, 2011, pp.126-129). Olson concludes that both sides in the stillness controversy ‘became so entrenched in their respective positions that eventually neither side would, nor even could, hear what the other side was trying to say’ (Olson, 2011, p.132).

David Hempton’s book Methodism Empire of the Spirit charts the rise of Methodism from its origins in England and its rapid growth in Britain and America. While it is primarily a history of the development of Methodism it also helps contextualise the position of the Moravian Church in
the rise of evangelicalism. Hempton sees that one of Protestantism’s post-Reformation
deficiencies was its lack of religious orders (Hempton, 2005, p.13). He states that this was
‘partly redeemed by the international mobility of Protestants from central Europe’, the catalysts
being the Moravians (Hempton, 2005, p.13). He argues that the Moravians ‘brought Wesley’s
hard-schooled, High Church piety face to face with a heart-warming variety of European pietism’
(Hempton, 2005, p.14). Throughout the book Hempton refers to the influence that the Moravians
had upon Wesley, for example how Moravian practices such as, band meetings and Lovefeasts
were introduced to Methodism (Hempton, 2005, p.58 and p.79). The importance of hymns and
hymn singing, something that Hempton recognises as a distinctive characteristic of Methodism
has its roots in the influence of the Moravian Singstunde (singing hour) that Wesley experienced
while in Georgia (Hempton, 2005, p.68). Like Mason, Hempton sees how influential the
Moravian mission work was, stating that although the Moravians did not make a great
impression on the British Caribbean islands ‘they served as inspirational models for the
Methodists who came after them (Hempton, 2005, p.132).

1.6 Literature exploring the role of music in Moravian communities

Having examined literature looking at the influence that the Moravians had upon the Methodists,
I will turn to literature on Moravian music. The development of music in the British Province sits
alongside that of hymnals in providing an insight into the formation of English Moravian identity.
Karl Kroeger’s article ‘A Preliminary Survey of Musical Life in the English Moravian Settlements
of Fulneck, Fairfield and Ockbrook during the 18th and 19th Centuries’ explores early music at
England’s three largest Moravian settlements. This is of particular interest to me as Fulneck and
Fairfield are involved in my contemporary research. He states that while extensive research
exists for early American and European Moravian music, very little has been done in England.
His aim was to see whether the English communities had a similar musical life to those in America and Europe (Kroeger, 1984, p.20). Unlike many Moravian communities in America and Europe whose music libraries survive virtually intact only remnants of English Moravian communities’ music collections remain. However, enough survives to show the repertoire, the type of ensembles and other aspects of Moravian musical life (Kroeger, 1984, p.21). Little remains of the original manuscripts at Fulnekk though Kroeger notes that the diaries show an active musical life (Kroeger, 1984, p.22). Fairfield has the largest collection of early Moravian music of any English Moravian community, but none remains at Ockbrook (Kroeger, 1984, pp.23-24).

In his book *The Trombone* (2006) Trevor Herbert states that the basis of the Moravian musical tradition is choral, however, musical instruments especially the trombone have been used since the eighteenth century, Herrnhut received its first set of trombones in 1731 and their use has continued to this day, especially at funerals and the Easter graveyard service (Herbert, 2006, p.1). In 1764 the Synod of the Moravian Church at Herrnhut gave official status to the use of trombones at funerals (van den Bosch, 1990, in Herbert, 2006, p.2). As more Moravian settlements were established in Europe, the tradition for brass ensembles grew. The role of the brass ensembles was to play at burial services, special services such as Christmas, New Year Watchnight service, the Easter Sunday Graveyard service and sometimes at Lovefeasts (Herbert, 2006, pp. 3-4). Herbert argues that the endurance of this tradition shows that musicians and music were seen as ‘key participants in Moravian ritual practices’ (Herbert, 2006, p. 6).

Nola Reed Knouse (Director of the Moravian Music Federation, Winston-Salem USA) looks at the development of early Moravian music and the important place it held in Moravian life in her article ‘Moravian Music: Introduction, Theme and Variations’. When asked what Moravian music
is, she states ‘Moravian music past and present is grounded and rooted, grows and bears fruit, within and for the worship of the Saviour’ (Reed Knouse, 2007, p.40). Moravian life was not separated into sacred and secular. For them all of life was ‘an act of worship and a means of remaining in intimate contact and identification with Christ’ (Reed Knouse, 2007, p.40). Zinzendorf saw music as the most effective means of communication to the heart, and music therefore became an ever-present part of life – the liturgical life, indissolubly connected with worship (Reed Knouse, 2007, p.40).

In his article ‘Spirituality and Practicality: John Wesley’s visit to America and Moravian Influences on Methodist Music and Worship’ Martin Clarke agrees with Geordan Hammond about the voyage to Georgia in 1735-36 when John Wesley met and was greatly impressed by the Moravians. Indeed, ‘from the Moravians Wesley was to learn much about church organisation, structure, worship, and hymnody; elements that were to leave a lasting impression on the Methodist Movement’ (Clarke, 2008, p.3). Clarke states that from the early days of the Church of the United Brethren there was an emphasis placed on the importance of hymn singing. Wesley’s admiration of things Moravian covered more than hymns, he ‘borrowed’ the idea of band meetings from the Moravians (Clarke, 2008, p. 6). Another Moravian tradition that impressed Wesley was the Lovefeast, a simple shared meal of plain cake and water. Hymn singing and the performance of music and singing were yet another influence on John Wesley and the Methodists.

This evidence for the role of music in the early history of the Moravian Church raises questions about its ongoing significance in the present-day church. This thesis will show that it was and still is an integral part of both religious and day to day life in the Moravian communities, as
substantiated by my fieldwork. It looks at the development of different presentation and forms of music and how these influenced other denominations.

While Simon Frith does not specifically mention the Moravians his views support the role of music and singing has in forming an integral part of Moravian collective life. Frith looks at music as a key to identity, in this case through the medium of Punk, Heavy Metal and African music (Frith, 1996, pp.108-110, in Hall and du Gay, ed. 1996). Frith argues that ‘the issue is not how a piece of music, or a performance reflects the people, but how it produces them, how it constructs an experience – a musical experience’ and for this to work you take on a collective identity (Frith, 1996, p.109, in Hall and du Gay, ed. 1996). However, the argument that music ‘stands for, symbolizes and offers the immediate experience of collective identity’ (Frith, 1996, p.121, in Hall and du Gay, ed. 1996) is just as relevant to the music and hymns of the Moravian Church.

1.7 Periods of Crisis and Change – Publications exploring the ‘Sifting Time’ and changing perceptions of Zinzendorf’s Theology

This section considers publications that explore the teaching and beliefs of Zinzendorf and as such can help understand the roots of the crisis of the 1750s and the reasons why the Moravian Church distanced itself from Zinzendorf. Zinzendorf is an important figure in the Moravian Church both historically and today. He was responsible for renewing the Moravian Church in 1722 and his vision and leadership drove the expansion of the church from Europe to the Americas and beyond. My fieldwork will examine contemporary opinions of Zinzendorf held by members of the Moravian communities at Fulneck and Fairfield. Questions about Zinzendorf’s theology and his dealing with the crisis are generally the preoccupation of Moravian insiders and
that is the case for the literature here with three Moravian historians; Atwood, Miller, and Peucker, and one outsider historian Yonan.

Peucker’s 2007 article ‘The Songs of the Sifting. Understanding the Role of Bridal Mysticism in Moravian Piety in the late 1740’s’ looks at the same period as Atwood does and shows how the Blood and Wounds Theology of Zinzendorf created its own hymns (as mentioned in Atwood, 1997 above) and how at the end of the crisis the Moravian Church sought to control its image. Peucker argues that the new hymns were ‘an expression of their new understanding of the nature of God’ (Peucker, 2007, p.52) and continues that during the Sifting Time the Moravians engaged in a ‘new direction characterised by radical mysticism’ (Peucker, 2007, p.52). This new direction came to an end in 1748 when Zinzendorf’s son Christian Renatus ‘declared all the single brothers to be absolved from their past and future sin’ (Peucker, 2007, p.52). At this point the leadership of the church stepped in to try and end the excesses of Christian Renatus (Peucker, 2007, p.52).

Paul Peucker’s 2015 book A Time of Sifting: Mystical Marriage and the Crisis of Moravian Piety in the Eighteenth Century expands upon his 2007 article. Peucker argues that The Sifting Time was the ‘culmination of Moravian theology of the 1730’s and 1740’s’, this comprised ‘justification by faith alone, bridal mysticism, traditional passion symbolism and the belief that union with Christ could be experienced during marital intercourse’ (Peucker, 2015, p.2). Peucker states that the actual Sifting began when ‘Moravians began to believe that the union with Christ could be experienced not only during marital intercourse but during extramarital sex as well’ (Peucker, 2015, p.2). Peucker argues that this move undermined the sanctity of marriage, a central core of
Moravian theology and one that at the end of the crisis the Moravian Church was desperate to move away from (Peucker, 2015, p.2).

Peucker sees the developments of the 1740’s as the logical consequence of Zinzendorf’s own teaching and again criticises Zinzendorf for blaming others to protect himself and his family (Peucker, 2015, p.59). However, it was the actions of Zinzendorf’s son Christian Renatus that drew attention to the practices of the Moravian church while he was at Herrnhaag a Moravian settlement not far from Frankfurt am Main on the 2nd May 1748. Finally, Peucker states the consequence of the Sifting Time ‘changed the Moravian Church from a radical, controversial religious group to a more mainstream, conventional denomination (Peucker, 2015, p.171).

This work also shows that Peucker is more attentive to and open about the events around the crisis than that of earlier historians of the Moravian Church. This was an observation I discussed with Colin Podmore in May 2018.5 We noted that the crisis period had been somewhat of a taboo subject in Moravian literature - something mentioned, but not in too much detail - and we agreed that there were signs indicating that the Moravian Church was perhaps now approaching a period of greater openness (London, 9th May 2018). I would argue that Paul Peucker probably started this new approach with his journal article on the subject (Peucker, 2007), followed by Craig Atwood’s publication of 2010 and culminating in his book.

Derrick Miller’s article ‘Alexander Volck’s Anti-Moravian Polemics as Enlightenment Anxieties’ closely examines an influential anti-Moravian text The Revealed Secret of the Malice of the Herrnhuter Sect published in seven volumes from 1748 to 1751 (Miller, 2014, pp. 104-105). Volck a former Moravian, was a prolific writer of anti-Moravian texts and pamphlets and The

5 Meeting with Colin Podmore at Gordon Square London on 9th May 2018
Revealed Secret is considered his major work. Peucker states that over the space of ten years Volck went from being one of the Moravians greatest supporters, a leading member of the Moravian group in Budingen, to one of their fiercest public opponents (Peucker, 2015, p. 181). Miller argues that Volck’s former status as a Moravian placed him in a very strong position to be able to reveal damaging comments about the church and its members (Miller, 2014, p. 109). Peucker adds that Volck was kept well informed about Moravian activities at Herrnhaag long after he had left the Moravian Church, and further that the accuracy of his allegations against the Moravians was confirmed by Lutheran minister Friedrich Christof Steinhofer who had close ties to the Moravians. Steinhofer stated, ‘that individuals mentioned in Volck’s book had admitted that the activities were four times worse than the book’ (Peucker, 2015, p. 182). Volck made personal attacks on Zinzendorf calling his marital theology ‘against scripture, against reason, against nature’ (Miller, 2014, p. 110), made repeated criticisms of Zinzendorf’s translation of the bible, and claimed that the Moravians valued the lot, their hymnal and Zinzendorf’s blood and wounds theology higher than the Bible (Miller, 2014, p.112). Finally, Miller states that the attacks tell us about ‘how the Moravians could be portrayed and what fears their unique form of devotion could activate’ (Miller, 2014, p. 118).

In his article ‘Archbishop Herring, Anti-Catholicism and the Moravian Church’ Jonathan Yonan examines a different charge against the Moravians, that they are crypto-Catholics. He builds on Colin Podmore’s argument that the anti-Moravian campaign in England by Henry Rimius was actually controlled by the Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Herring (Podmore, 1998, p. 276). Yonan argues that Herring ran a smear campaign against the Moravians implicating them with popery (Yonan, 2008, p. 32). Yonan states in his article that he would fortify Podmore’s argument, showing that ‘the Archbishop of Canterbury himself inspired, designed, initiated and directed the anti-Moravian campaign’ (Yonan, 2008, p. 30), and further that he would ‘explore
the historical significance of that campaign by assessing the archbishop’s motives in authorising and executing his attack’ (Yonan, 2008, p. 30).

Yonan notes that Rimius is the best known of the anti-Moravian pamphleteers, responsible for four publications himself and numerous other texts where he is cited as a source or the principal source (Yonan, 2008, p. 32). However, he argues that Archbishop Herring’s role in the anti-Moravian campaign deserves examining. What drove Herring to dislike the Moravians so much? Yonan argues that it was driven by Herring’s ‘unmitigated revulsion of Catholics’ that he held in his support of Locke’s view on papists (Yonan, 2008, pp. 39-40). With the strength of anti-Catholicism running high at the time, Herring knew if he could get Rimius to accuse the Moravians of popery it would inflame public distrust of them. Furthermore, if the issue was well presented to the English public Herring knew they could be expected to follow an argument of ‘No Popery’ even against the Moravians (Yonan, 2008, p. 41).

Yonan concludes that the Archbishop of Canterbury ran a carefully planned campaign against the Moravians with the intention of inflaming public outrage at the church and quite possibly bring about the repealing of the 1749 Moravian Act (Yonan, 2008, p. 43).

1.8 Periods of Crisis and Change – Literature exploring the ‘Long Sixties’

Another area of literature that has been of great significance to my thesis has been literature exploring the ‘long 1960s’, which could be considered as a further crisis point in the development of the Moravian Church in England, and Christianity in England more broadly. At this point I need to make a brief explanation about the rather sudden jump from the 1750s to the 1960s. Firstly, the focus of my research is on the origins of the Moravian Church and how these
are understood in the present and recent (post 1960s) past. Secondly, there is little secondary literature on the intervening two centuries. Indeed, Craig Atwood points out that there has been little research on the modern history of the Moravian Church especially the period after the Second World War. Atwood (Director of the Centre for Moravian Studies Bethlehem USA) states that he finds this ‘disappointing as the contemporary church is quite different from what it was in the past’ (Atwood, 2020, p.31). Citing Gisela Mettele ‘that during the nineteenth century Moravians became less interested in building the Kingdom of God and more interested in their businesses and trades’ Atwood suggests that the Moravians became less innovative and proactive (Mettele, 2009 in Atwood, 2020, p.31). He also added that the practice of sealing records for fifty to seventy-five years made contemporary research harder (Atwood, 2020, p.31).

Atwood states that the past fifty years have seen important changes for the Moravian Church in a period that saw the greatest numerical growth in the Moravian Church’s history. Today the majority of Moravians reside in Africa. The contemporary church has changed greatly with the ordination of women and the appointing of women bishops, and the provinces of the church are self-governing. Yet these changes have hardly been noted in Moravian historiography (Atwood, 2020, p.31).

‘The long sixties’ is a period defined by Arthur Marwick as roughly 1958 to 1974 (2000, p. 213). It saw a decline in membership and participation in Christian churches in Western Europe. The focus here is on England in particular, so the work of Brown and McLeod (below) forms a useful tool with which to compare their findings on the wider decline of Christian practice with that of the Moravian Churches at Fulneck and Fairfield in the same period. The results are discussed fully in Chapter 4 ‘The Two Settlements’, section 4.14.

In his book The Death of Christian Britain (Brown 2001) Brown argues that the 1950s witnessed the greatest church growth since the mid-nineteenth century, noting that the period also marked
the return to home and domesticity for women who yielded up their wartime jobs to the returning men (Brown, 2001, pp. 170-171). He states that traditional values of family, home and piety were back on the agenda with a concentration on women’s domestic role and the twin goals of finding a husband and raising a family and that the churches benefited greatly from this (Brown, 2001, p. 172). However, it should be noted that not all agree with Brown’s argument. Clive Field believes that the 1950s did not witness the greatest church growth since the mid-nineteenth century but should instead be ‘understood in the context of a progressive and protracted secularization of the role of religion in British life, a process which had already started before that decade and which continued long afterwards’ (Field, 2015, pp. 9-10).

Brown sees the 1960s as a sudden and culturally violent decade that saw a dramatic decline in support for the Christian church (Brown, 2001, p. 176). Brown’s argument is that Christianity was the immediate victim of the recrafting of femininity citing the introduction of new teen magazines and a change to the format of traditional women’s magazines (Brown, 2001, pp. 176-177). Furthermore, he claims that it ended the ‘hearth and home’ traditional values of the 1950s and that this was quickly followed by the growth in pop music and magazines, radical fashion and pop art which created an ‘integrated cultural system which swept the young people of Britain’ (Brown, 2001, p. 178).

Brown notes that though new forms of religious worship were tried in an attempt to mimic youth culture there continued to be a decline in attendance at Sunday schools and youth movements such as the Boys’ Brigade, Girls’ Brigade, Scouts, and Guides (Brown, 2001, p. 180). In addition, he argues that this period witnessed an unprecedented rapid fall in Christian practice
in Britain. Across the land people started to ‘reject the role of religion in their lives in marriage and baptism (Brown, 2001, p. 189-190).

In Brown’s subsequent book Religion and Society in Twentieth Century Britain (Brown, 2006), Brown revisits the sixties stating that it was ‘the most important decade for the decline of religion in British history’ (Brown, 2006, p. 224). He argues that every area of religion was in crisis, citing the influences of pop music, student revolt, a sea change in sexual attitudes and the cultural revolution (Brown, 2006, p. 224).

Brown states that there were two crucial years in the impact on the decline of religion, 1963 and 1967. The first saw the publication of John Robinson’s book Honest to God that cast doubt on the traditional image and reality of God. Its publication caused widespread furore and deep personal anguish to many Christians (Brown, 2006, p. 225). The second saw a shift in the cultural revolution: 1967 was the year of the ‘summer of love’, proclamations of sexual freedom, and an interest in Eastern mysticism (Brown, 2006, p. 225). Mumm’s summary of the shift in the cultural revolution explains that by 1967 popular attention was turning to what ‘the counterculture was perceived to be advocating: equality, non-violence, experimentation and spontaneity and tolerance of alternative lifestyles’ (Mumm, 2000, p.123).

According to Brown, other issues that were problematic for mainstream Christianity were the arrival of immigrants bringing different faiths with them (Hinduism, Islam, and Sikhism) (Brown, 2006, p. 255) and the growth of New Religious Movements (NRM)s) (Brown, 2006, p. 259). However, not everyone would agree competition was bad for Christianity. Competition can work both ways, and a religious free market can be seen as beneficial. Brown argues that the
development of these new styles offered ‘radically different types of religious experience to those leaving the orbit of conventional Christian culture […] religion emerged as having open and affirmative connection with the rest of popular culture and not something essentially hostile and alien to it’ (Brown, 2006, p. 259).

In his article ‘The Religious Crisis of the 1960s’ (2005) and his book of the same name (2007) McLeod sees the process of decline in four aspects. First, the decline in church membership and attendance and also the drop in the number of clergy and other religious professionals affected nearly every Western country. Second, the long sixties saw a decline in children attending Sunday school thus weakening the process of passing on Christian identity and knowledge to the younger generation. Third, the growth in the number of world views available, for example, new forms of Christianity, non-Christian religions, and alternative spirituality. Fourth, there were changes in the law relating to such issues as abortion and divorce. (McLeod, 2005, pp. 205-206).

McLeod disagrees with Brown’s notion of a sudden and drastic downturn: he states that ‘the religious revolution of the Sixties did not come as a bolt out of the blue’ (McLeod, 2005, p. 210). He argues that the events of the 1960s were dependent on both long-term trends going back decades and more immediate factors (McLeod, 2005, p.210). McLeod breaks the long sixties into three phases; early 1958-1962, mid 1963-1966 and late 1967-1974, arguing that the pace of change accelerated as the decade progressed (McLeod, 2005, p.221). Into these phases are slotted the separate events that brought about the changes of the long sixties. The early phase saw the gradual decline of younger people attending church, the calling of the Second Vatican Council and the publication of D. H. Lawrence’s *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* with its subsequent
obscenity trial (McLeod, 2005, p.222). The mid phase saw the growth in popular culture especially The Beatles and the publication of Robinson’s *Honest to God*. For Roman Catholics, the central event was the Second Vatican Council (McLeod, 2005, p.223-224). In the late phase, political and religious debate was at boiling point, and there was the growth of the counterculture and anti-authoritarian movement and massive decline in church attendance (McLeod, 2005, p.224-225).

Though the event took place just before the accepted start of the Long Sixties, Atwood’s (2020) article ‘General Synod of 1957 and the Creation of the Modern Moravian Unity’ is also relevant in this context as it provides important insights into how the decisions taken at the 1957 synod shaped the Moravian Church as we know it today. Atwood states it was a synod of many firsts; the first held since the Second World War as the previous one was in 1931, the first held outside Europe at Bethlehem Pennsylvania, the first to be conducted in English rather than German, and the first to authorise the ordination of women ministers (Atwood, 2020, p. 32). Atwood likens the importance of the 1957 Synod to that of the Second Vatican Council of 1962 (Atwood, 2020, p. 32). Atwood argues that now there are three periods in Moravian history, the era of the ancient Unity of the Brethren, the era of the renewed church and Zinzendorf, and the era of the modern Global Unity starting in 1957 (Atwood, 2020, p. 32). Atwood states that the big issue at the synod was the form of church government (Atwood, 2020, p. 34). The division of Germany made it impossible for the Moravian Church to function as before so some form of change to church government was needed (Atwood, 2020, p. 48). Atwood argues that the 1953 Christmas broadcast by the Queen and its vision for the Commonwealth was a great influence on the development of the unity of the Moravian Church (Atwood, 2020, p. 50). Atwood states that one of the most important decisions on the 1957 synod was the adoption of the Ground of the Unity, the new doctrinal statement for the Unitas Fratrum (Atwood, 2020, p. 63). The Ground of the
Unity brought about a move to self-determination for the provinces of the Moravian Church and a commitment to the Global Unity (Atwood, 2020, p. 67).

While Atwood’s analysis shows how decisions taken at the 1957 Synod set the future direction of the Global Unity of the Moravian Church, the majority of the literature reviewed here is mainly concerned with the decline of the number of Christians practicing their religion. This is why, as part of my archival research, I examined the impact of the long sixties period on the two Moravian communities, analysing the congregation lists of both Fulneck and Fairfield in order to see if these two Moravian Churches followed the decline or ‘bucked the trend’ (see Chapter 4, subsection 4.15 The Long Sixties, church membership at Fulneck and Fairfield).

1.9 Image, Identity and the invention of tradition

The relationship between the English Moravian Church and its past, its traditions and practices play an important role in the formation of an English Moravian identity. My research looks at how contemporary Moravians use such events to link the present with the past and what it is that makes them feel Moravian. This section considers literature that explores different approaches to the relationship of the present with the past. My research will investigate how today’s Moravians use the celebration of anniversaries and reflect on how the places where these celebrations take place can become sites of memory.

The following literature examines notions of traditions, the ‘reinvention’ of traditions, and of identity creation. This literature is all about how history is used today and how it is relevant today. It is a wide subject; in my thesis I apply these wider debates to my two specific case studies of Fulneck and Fairfield.
The Invention of Tradition edited by Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger (Hobsbawm and Ranger, ed. 1983) is a collection of essays linked to Hobsbawm’s notion that relatively new traditions are made to appear longstanding (Hobsbawm, 1983, pp. 1-14). It has become a seminal text in both historical and sociological study of notions of traditions. It shows that many traditions and practices that are generally held to be historic ones are either comparatively new inventions or are a reworking of older traditions to fit the needs of current requirements. Hobsbawm and Ranger see these ‘invented’ traditions falling into three groups: a) those establishing or symbolising social cohesion or the membership of groups, real or artificial communities, b) those establishing or legitimising institutions, status or relations of authority, and c) those whose main purpose was socialisation, the inculcation of beliefs, value systems and conventions of behavior (Hobsbawm, 1983, p. 9).

Hugh Trevor-Roper examines the Highland Tradition of Scotland and reveals that supposedly traditional cultural symbols such as the kilt and tartan were largely invented in the eighteenth century. Welsh historian Prys Morgan explains the attempt to save the rapidly declining Welsh culture with the revitalisation of the eisteddfod (Morgan, 1983, p. 56) and Druidic history (Morgan, 1983, pp. 62-66). Bernard Cohn and Terence Ranger in their respective essays show how new traditions were made out of old ones in order to create authority and control in the British colonies in India and Africa. The collection concludes with Hobsbawm who explores how traditions were mass produced in Europe by states and were often introduced after the event. For example, Bastille Day was established in 1880 (Hobsbawm, 1983, p.271).

There are other scholars who do not agree with Hobsbawm’s understanding of tradition. Hizky Shohan specifically makes a point about the international football games played between the nation states of the United Kingdom in the 1870s (Shohan, 2011, p. 325). Arguing that while the games became a tradition a few years after they started, it was because they were popular,
rather than due to a perception that football had a long past (Shohan, 2011, p. 325). Of course, Hobsbawm still has supporters. Alexander argues there is no complete theory, and in his article ‘A Systemic Theory of Tradition’, he attempts to consider rival views, including Hobsbawm (whom he considers to be influential on the subject), and combine them in a complete theory (Alexander, 2016, p. 5).

How does Hobsbawm’s notion that many traditions and practices that are generally held to be historic ones are either comparatively new inventions or are a reworking of older traditions relate to understanding the Moravian approach to the past? These notions of tradition underpin my approach to exploring how Moravians past and present have used their history to construct their identity, moulding together selected aspects of their traditions and practices.

In his ‘Introduction’ to Questions of Cultural Identity, Stuart Hall argues that though this idea seems to ‘invoke an origin in a historical past with which they continue to correspond, actually identities are about questions of using the resources of history, language and culture in the process of becoming rather than being not who we are or where we come from, so much as what we might become’ (Hall, 1996, p.4). His idea that ‘people with a shared history and ancestry […] can stabilise, fix, or guarantee an unchanging oneness’ (Hall, 1996, p.4) is pertinent to my research. I see this as being in line with my research into the construction of an English Moravian identity. The notion of a shared history that today’s Moravians use to create their identity by linking the present to the past forms a central part of my research.

An important factor in the formation of Moravian identity are the settlements. The British Moravian religious communities were planned settlements modelled on the first planned settlement of Herrnhaag north of Frankfurt am Main (Podmore, 1998, p. 137). Podmore argues that it was the communal life in the settlements coupled with the strict rules and regulations and
the difficulty of becoming a member that attracted people to them (Podmore, 1998, p. 122). In his article ‘Religion and the Persistence of Identity’ Phillip Hammond explores the changing role religious communities play in the creation and maintenance of people’s identities. Hammond states that ‘the church was one of the ways people knew who they were’ (Hammond, 1988, p. 2). Hammond sees people involved in a series of segmented relationships and suggests that now for most people the church is but one of the segmented relationships that make up our lives (Hammond, 1988, p. 2). Furthermore, he argues that this is a voluntary relationship, ‘one that can be entered and left with little impact on other relationships’ (Hammond, 1988, p. 2). This however differs for the Moravians, since leaving the church could also mean leaving the community and therefore your home. Hammond raises the question ‘does this mean religion is decreasingly involved with people’s identity?’ (Hammond, 1988, p. 2). My research findings will show that for members of the Moravian communities their religion is a significant part of their identity.

Hammond looks at the varying strengths and meaning notions of ethnicity can have on religious identity (Hammond, 1988, p. 3). Hammond argues that, for example, the Greek Orthodox and Dutch Reformed are denominations with a unique territorial origin and a distinctive language. Furthermore, he states that for Irish, Italian and French Catholicism the link between national identity and religion is real, but the religion is not definitive (Hammond, 1988, p. 3). I will argue that the Moravian Church does not sit in any of these categories. Hammond states that we must recognise that in modern society that for some church may be an intense expression of identity whereas for others it is an association that can switched on and off (Hammond, 1988, p. 5). Hammond suggests that the stronger a members ties are to the community the more likely that they will remain loyal to the groups’ religion and can be regarded as collective identity (Hammond, 1988, pp. 7-8).
Peter Vogt (2012) considers the different connotations of the term ‘Moravian’. In particular, Vogt looks at how members of the Moravian Church in the United States perceive themselves as Moravian. Turning to Britain with a different perspective on the subject, Jessica Jacobson helps to understand issues of identity in her article ‘Perceptions of Britishness’ which explores ‘the complex case of British national identity or Britishness’ (Jacobson, 1997, p.181). The focus of her study is ‘what can be learnt about Britishness from the views of young British Pakistanis, i.e., those of Pakistani descent born in Britain’ (Jacobson, 1997, p.182).

How then do British Pakistanis see their Britishness and what parallels if any can be made with how the members of the two Moravian communities identify themselves? There may be parallels of religious factors coupled with the Moravians fear of often being thought of as foreign (Vogt, 2012). However, on the one hand, in the case of British Pakistanis both religious and ethnic factors come into play. Jacobson’s research highlights issues of race and the feeling of not belonging to or being accepted by British society (Jacobson, 1997, p. 192). Members of the Moravian community, on the other hand, may be thought of as foreign because of the name of their church, but not their ethnic identity.

My thesis will investigate how through the selective use of different aspects of its past the Moravian Church set out to change the publics’ negative perception of its image. *Fabricating Origins* edited by Russell T McCutcheon (McCutcheon, Ed. 2015) examines the way origins are formed, the way these ideas are sold, and the way people buy into them. The contributions to this edited volume discuss how people are selective about particular pasts that we want to be identified with and how we recall certain memories of those pasts that are deemed worthy of commemoration. It explores different examples of how people seek a past that was better than the now. Leslie Dorrough-Smith and Kat Daley-Bailey look at the way origin narrative is used to give authority to something, to give an idea of uniqueness (Dorrough-Smith 2015b pp. 9-11 and
Daley-Bailey, 2015, pp.12-14). This notion of narrative origin could be relevant to understanding the ways in which the then leader of the Moravian Church felt it necessary to set about editing and rewriting its past as Atwood (2010) and Peucker (2012) explain above. In her chapter ‘The Good Old Days, The Way We Were...?’ Simmons explores the way people look back on an idealised past where everything was brighter, cheaper, better etc (Simmons, 2015, pp. 53-55). She points out how only the good things are remembered often from childhood. In addition, Dorrough-Smith examines the way the dissemination of information is controlled (in her example to children at varying ages) so ‘that the narrative can be engineered to mean whatever we need it to mean’ (Dorrough-Smith, 2015a, pp.60-62 ). With the terms ‘the way we were’ and, ‘engineered to mean’ in mind I will argue that when the Moravian leadership went about reshaping its past it was more an issue of ‘how we wanted to be’. I will explore this notion of wanting to present a softer image without the rough edges in detail later in my thesis.

In *Imagined Communities* Benedict Anderson defines a nation as ‘an imagined political community [...] it is imagined because even members of the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow members, meet them or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion’ (Anderson, 1983, p.6). I will argue that this definition concisely describes the notion of the Global Unity of the Moravian Church.

Anderson explores the notion that nationalism has to be understood ‘by aligning it with the large cultural systems that preceded it, out of which – as well as against which – it came into being’ (Anderson, 1983, p.12). He identifies these as the ‘religious community’ and a ‘dynastic realm’ (Anderson, 1983, p.12). Anderson states that the religious community was held together by the use of sacred language, i.e., Arabic for the Islamic world and Latin for the Christian world (Anderson, 1983, p.17), and that the decline of use of sacred language and increase of the vernacular weakened the hold of the religious community (Anderson, 1983, p.17).
He explores the rise of the use of the vernacular, especially in print form and as the administrative language of nation states (Anderson, 1983, pp. 38-40). He argues that these new publications brought a new reading public and at the same time mobilised them for political and religious purposes (Anderson, 1983, p.40). Anderson furthers his argument for the importance of the use of vernacular language stating that the realisation that other languages ‘were on an equal footing’ with the old sacred languages of Latin, Greek and Hebrew (Anderson, 1983, p. 70). Furthermore, this led to the expression of nationality via language (Anderson, 1983, p. 74).

Finally, Anderson looks at the transformation from ‘Old’ to ‘New’ with the migration from Europe to the Americas and the notion of prefixing the place you migrated from with ‘New’ (Anderson, 1983, p. 187). History is then used to promote the version of collective memories that binds together members of a nation (Anderson, 1983, pp.201-203). Anderson’s notions of the transformation of ‘Old’ to ‘New’ and the use of history to bring people together helped in the framing of my thesis. These are parallels that run through my thesis, the transition from the Unity of Brethren to Zinzendorf’s renewed church and then the post 1957 Modern Moravian Unity. These transitions along with the use of the history of the Moravian Church create the common story that unites the international Moravian Church.

1.10 Heritage

It is important to stress the difference between history and heritage as there is a tendency to confuse them or re-label history as heritage (Marsden, 1992, p. 6). History is the study of the past, heritage refers to valued objects, places and practices passed down from previous generations (Harrison, 2010, p. 9). Lowenthal describes it as ‘not history at all: it is not an inquiry into the past, but a celebration of it […] a profession of faith in a past tailored to present-day purposes’ (Lowenthal, 1997, p. x, in Harrison, 2010, p. 10). Both history and heritage play
important roles in the way contemporary English Moravians create identities. My research explores the historical past of the Moravian Church and looks at the interpretations and representations of it. It engages with the way members of the two Moravian communities use their heritage, the settlements themselves, their traditions, and practices to present a public facing identity. The following literature explores debates around notions of history and heritage. Questions raised about notions of heritage will aid in the understanding of the way the two Moravian settlements present, understand and identify with their history and traditions.

Harrison in *Understanding the Politics of Heritage* (Harrison, 2010, p. 9) explores different understandings and interpretations of notions of ‘heritage’. Harrison notes that while heritage might be understood as physical objects, there are practices of heritage, such as language, culture etc., that are as important in helping us understand who we are (Harrison, 2010, p. 9). As Harrison states, we use both objects of heritage and practices of heritage to shape our ideas about the past, present, and future (Harrison, 2010, p. 9). Harrison argues that heritage is a difficult concept to define and while most people will have an idea what it is and recognise official heritage, for example UNESCO sites, it may be different from their own idea of heritage (Harrison, 2010, pp. 11-12).

To help define heritage in *The debate on heritage reviewed*, Lumley refers to a description by Cormack of an idyllic picture of England: a Turner painting, medieval stained glass, or the sound of the harvest. Each scene can be regarded as an aspect of heritage (Cormack, 1976, p.14 in Lumley, 2005, p. 16). Lumley examines three aspects of heritage. The first of these is heritage and decline. Lumley cites Hewison here who sees heritage as a culture ‘fearful of the present and therefore escapist’. Lumley links the idea of escapism from the present to the popularity of historical re-enactment groups who have a ‘nostalgia for a “glorious” past’ (Lumley, 2005, p. 18).
The second aspect is heritage as enterprise, such as the regeneration of a city centre after years of decline as a means of attracting tourism (Lumley, 2005, p. 20). A good example of this is The Auckland Project, a regeneration charity working to establish Bishop Auckland as a 'heritage visitor destination'. Their aim is to regenerate Bishop Auckland, once a thriving market town, now due to the collapse of the mining industry a forgotten, post-industrial town. The rich story of Bishop Auckland is brought to life through the town’s historic attractions. These include Auckland Castle with its collection of sixteenth and seventeenth century Spanish art. A more recent addition is a gallery dedicated to the life of miners and mining, the town’s former industry. The profits of this enterprise will be reinvested in the town to create a bright future filled with hope and opportunities.

However, there is a clash between those who support the new brand of heritage, where the stress is on the third aspect, entertainment. It does not matter if the historical reconstructions are accurate as ‘immediate visitor enjoyment is paramount’ (Lumley, 2005, p. 23). This contrasts with an older tradition for example those associated with the work of the National Trust in which ‘unity of the house and its preservation for future generations’ are its main concerns (Lumley, 2005, p. 23). Finally, Lumley considers who visits heritage sites and what the relationship is between heritage and the visitor (Lumley, 2005, p. 24). Lumley notes curators have shown a greater interest in how visitors perceive displays, exhibits, etc. as visitors to the new style heritage sites where history is brought to life in 3D are now seen as consumers (Lumley, 2005, p. 25). My research will show how contemporary Moravians through the use of a
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6 The Auckland Project [https://aucklandproject.org/](https://aucklandproject.org/) accessed 12th April 2022
7 The Auckland Project [https://aucklandproject.org/](https://aucklandproject.org/) accessed 12th April 2022
combination of history and heritage present a public facing identity. This is, for example, achieved through Heritage Open Days, on-site museums, and guided tours of the settlements.

‘The uses and abuses of heritage’ (Graham et al., 2005) define heritage as the use of the past as a resource for the present. They point out that not everything is as it seems when looking at some heritage sites. That over the years repair and restoration work has been carried out changing the structure from the original. This raises the question of preservation versus restoration, as Graham et al. argue much of European architectural heritage owes its present appearance to nineteenth century tastes in restoration (Graham et al. 2005, p. 31, in Corsane, ed, 2005). Like Lumley, Graham et al. see the duality of heritage, the entertainment of the theme park style and the more informative National Trust format, referred to as ‘high heritage’ (Graham et al. 2005, p. 35). Graham et al. also stress that it is important to remember that people can interpret representations of heritage very differently. The perspectives of tourists or of an academic researcher might, for example, differ considerably. Furthermore, it is important to bear in mind which story is being told and whose heritage is being represented (Graham et al. 2005, p. 37).

1.11 Memory

While Hobsbawm and Anderson, focus on nations and nationalism from the perspective of the political elites, there are other academics who examine the role memory plays in identity. In his article ‘Between Memory and History’ Pierre Nora, a French historian of memory, describes sites of memory as being ‘where memory crystalises and secretes itself at a particular historical moment’ (Nora, 1989, p. 7). Contrasting memory and history, he views ‘memory’ as being borne by living societies open to both remembering and forgetting and being vulnerable to
manipulation and appropriation (Nora, 1989, p. 7), whereas he regards history as a ‘problematic and incomplete’ reconstruction of what is no longer there (Nora, 1989, p. 8), Nora argues that ‘Sites of Memory or Memorial places are material, symbolic and functional’ (Nora, 1989, p.19). Using the example of the French Revolutionary calendar, he explains that the function of this calendar ‘would be to halt history at the hour of the Revolution by indexing future months, days, centuries, and years to the Revolutionary epic’ (Nora, 1989, p.19). However, what qualifies the revolutionary calendar as a site of memory is its ‘apparently inevitable failure to have become what its founders hoped’ (Nora, 1989, p.20). If it were still in use today, it would be as familiar to us as the Gregorian calendar and would therefore have lost its interest as a site of memory (Nora, 1989, p.20).

In their ‘Introduction’ to the edited volume Transnational Memory: Circulation, Articulation, Scales, De Cesari and Rigney argue that there is now a growing interest in memory and the emergence of memory studies in the past decades which has most often been explained by a crisis of remembrance occasioned by the horrors of World War Two, decolonisation, and the growth of identity politics (De Cesari and Rigney, 2014, p. 1). The notion of a transnational memory brought about by globalised communication, large scale migration, and regional integration create the idea of a global memory culture (De Cesari and Rigney, 2014, pp. 2-3). They argue that a transnational approach directs attention to all kinds of sustained cross-border relationships spanning nation-states (De Cesari and Rigney, 2014, p. 5). De Cesari and Rigney stress the effect of modern globalised communication and the issue of how stories and models of remembrance shape what is remembered.
Members of the Moravian Church remember their past through many means, the use of anniversaries to remember key dates or events, which in turn can become sites of memory. My analysis will investigate how ideas of a shared pool of memories and a shared history are associated with the identity of the members of the two Moravian settlements, Fulneck and Fairfield. These identities are formed on three levels: international (the Global Unity of the church), national (the Moravian Church in the British Province), and local (the settlement in which they live).

1.12 Moravians, History, and Image

Following the notion of the Global Unity of the Moravian Church is Hedwig Richter’s article ‘De-Nazification, Socialism and Solidarity: Re-Establishing International Relations in the Moravian Church after 1945’. In her article, Richter looks at the way the historical notion of a united Moravian Church was used to establish new traditions (2001, p.7). Citing Hobsbawm on the subject of invented traditions, Richter shows that historical facts (of the war) were rationalised to fit in with their belief system, providing a religious interpretation of history and that this helped cement a feeling of belonging to a united international community for the Moravians in the GDR (Richter, 2007, pp.9-11). Richter states that the international tradition of the Moravian Church was re-established by the involvement of Moravian Churches from around the world. Richter sees this as being aided by a growth in the attraction of internationalism citing the formation of the United Nations in 1945 and the World Council of Churches in 1948 as examples of the attraction (Richter, 2007, pp.16-17).

In his article ‘How Moravian are the Moravians? The Paradox of Moravian Identity’ Peter Vogt (2012) explores what he thinks makes the Moravian identity. The paradox is that on the one
hand ‘since we are the Moravian Church, we are by definition 100% Moravian; it is simply who we are’ while on the other hand some may argue ‘that if one looks carefully at the historical facts, it turns out that the modern Moravian Church … is not very Moravian after all’. He argues that both opinions are at some point are true (Vogt, 2012, p.3).

Vogt asks how the modern Moravian Church is linked with the ancient Unity (Vogt, 2012, p.7). He argues that the community at Herrnhut was shaped not just by Moravian tradition but by other factors, such as Zinzendorf’s influence shaped by his experiences in Halle. Vogt claims that over a thirty-year period ‘the Moravian tradition was transformed into a marker of denominational identity’ (Vogt, 2012, p.9). He states that knowledge of the Bohemian Brethren was brought to Herrnhut in 1724 with the arrival of group of exiles from Zauchtental bringing with them a living memory of the ways of the ancient United Brethren (Vogt, 2012, p.10).

He argues that you can see ‘both connection and difference in the relation between the ancient, united Brethren and the renewed Moravian Church’, so that while the renewed Moravian Church has some continuity with the ancient United Brethren it also represents in some ways a completely new denomination (Vogt, 2012, p.13). Vogt concludes that he sees the name Moravian not as a location but as standing for a story and that Moravians are bound together by a common story (Vogt, 2012, p.19). This is a story that is part historical fact and part myth that over the years has melded together.

Notions of history and tradition play an important role in how Moravians see themselves and influences how those on the outside see them, as Craig Atwood explains in his article ‘The use of the “Ancient Unity” in the Historiography of the Moravian Church’ (2013) which follows on
from that of Vogt. Atwood looks at how eighteenth and nineteenth century Moravians interpreted the (Bohemian) Unity of the Brethren and the relationship between that church and the Moravian Church founded in Herrnhut Germany in 1722. In this article, Atwood examines how English and American Moravians used the concept of the ‘Ancient Unity’ to create a Moravian Church independent of German control (Atwood, 2013, p.109).

Atwood argues that the Moravian Church has difficulty in telling its history, citing how the different names used for the church over the years reflect a different understanding of the history of the church. He sets out three names with distinct definitions adding how Zinzendorf used them to show a continuity from the ancient church to the renewed one of 1722. Firstly, there was Bohemian Brethren or the United Brethren – the name used when referring to the ancient church (Atwood, 2013, p.113). Secondly there was Unitas Fratrum – when referring to the ecumenical views of the Moravians (Atwood, 2013, p.114). Finally, the Hidden Seed is the term used to denote the period when the church went underground between the Bohemian Brethren and its renewal in 1722. Jan Amos Comenius’s (last bishop of Bohemian Brethren) dream was that the church would be renewed (Atwood, 2013, p.116) Atwood argues that the links of the modern Moravian Church reformed in Herrnhut to the Ancient Unity are very tenuous citing the work of Grandin, Zinzendorf’s ambassador to the Greek Orthodox Church and Cranz Zinzendorf’s secretary. He states that Cranz’s 1771 *Ancient and Modern History of the Brethren* was a highly selective history that codified Zinzendorf’s community at Herrnhut as ‘the renewed Bohemian-Moravian Church of the Brethren’ (Atwood, 2013, pp.120-138). Atwood shows how the history of the church relied on the works of Comenius, Grandin and Cranz with each new history relying on the same sources. Muller’s history of 1883 was the first to acknowledge that ‘the church’s claim to apostolic episcopal succession was unfounded’ (Atwood, 2013, p.138). Atwood states that after Muller’s history interest in the Bohemian Brethren declined in Germany
where historical writing became focused on Zinzendorf and the Moravian missions. (Atwood, 2013, p139).

In England, the interest in the Bohemian Brethren continued into the twentieth century. Atwood argues that this was because in England the Bohemian Brethren had been identified as Moravian Brethren very early on (Atwood, 2013, p.139). In addition to this, Atwood states that many of the English Moravian Church’s leaders wanted to reduce the amount of control that the leadership of the Moravian Church in Germany had over the Moravian Church in England. He cites the main publication of the English Moravian Church The Messenger as being in support of autonomy from Germany in 1855, talking of ‘forced Germanisation’ calling for English Moravians “to throw off the yoke of Germanism” (Atwood, 2013, p.141). Atwood, like Podmore, argues that the English wanted to define the church as a Moravian Church not a German Church (Atwood, 2013, p.143). He concludes, in agreement with Podmore, that the English Moravians aligned themselves with the Ancient Unity and the Bohemian Brethren as opposed to the Germans who identified themselves with Zinzendorf and the reformed church of 1722 in Herrnhut, Germany (Atwood, 2013, pp.156-157 and Podmore, 2007, p.33 above).

Peucker explores the different roles history plays in the development of Moravian identity in his article ‘Beyond Beeswax Candles and Lovefeast Buns: The Role of History in Finding a Moravian Identity’. He argues that perceptions of history played a defining role from the beginning of the renewed Moravian Church, that Moravians have consciously used history to create a common identity and that they have cultivated their Moravian identity by pursuing a culture of remembrance (Peucker, 2010, p.7). In fact, history is so much part of the identity of the Moravian Church that it comes naturally to a Moravian. When asked about the present they
talk about the past (Peucker, 2010, p. 6). Peucker thinks that Zinzendorf modelled the Herrnhut community on the ideal of the early Christian Church and that when the early inhabitants of Herrnhut discovered that their community was similar to the ideals of the Unity of Brethren, they added another historical identity (Peucker, 2010, p.8). Peucker argues that the Moravian identity was created by looking at their history, encouraged to do so by Zinzendorf and combining it with rituals, traditions, and events from their recent past (Peucker, 2010, p.9). From this point the Moravians at Herrnhut believed that God had renewed the ancient United Brethren in their midst (Peucker, 2010, p. 8). Peucker adds that the question of continuity or discontinuity between the United Brethren and the Moravian Church is a fascinating subject (Peucker, 2010, p. 8). However, this continuity helped develop the notion that for the English and Americans the Moravian Church was not a new church but a renewed old one (Peucker, 2010, p.11).

Like Podmore and Atwood, Peucker claims that after Zinzendorf’s death, English Moravians reinvented themselves, distancing themselves from Zinzendorf and, like Moravians elsewhere, toning down the more extreme parts of his theology (Peucker, 2010, p.11). Peucker argues that this placed a greater importance on their history and traditions as a means of affirming Moravian identity and led to the development of ‘the culture of remembrance’. The settlements were seen as ‘sites of memory’, and this culture was promoted by annual celebrations of historical events of the church (Peucker, 2010, p11). My own research includes the analysis of sources in the Moravian archives at Bradford and Fulneck, which document the details of these type of events, pageants and festivals celebrating Moravian history taking place at the Yorkshire churches right up to the 1960s. The role of annual celebrations of important historical dates in processes of Moravian identity formation is a subject that will be covered in detail in a later chapter.

The literature I discussed in this section has played an important role in framing my research exploring the reaction of the Moravian Church in the aftermath of the crisis and post-
Zinzendorf’s death. Notions of invented tradition, collective memory and heritage have been introduced and linked to processes of reshaping of Moravian history that took place after Zinzendorf’s death. In subsequent chapters I will build upon this literature to further explore these links and show how the introduction of new traditions based on old ones brought together members of the Moravian communities in the post Second World War period. My interaction with contemporary members of the Moravian community will explore what it means to be a Moravian today.

1.13 Conclusion

The literature reviewed covers a range of themes relevant to the exploration of what it means to be a Moravian today. It examines the role of history and tradition, its reinterpretation and reinvention in the formation and development of an English Moravian identity. It is not just the role of history that is important but also which history is important or rather the control of history. There are three distinct groups of academic literature on the Moravian Church, including publications by academics independent from the Moravian Church; work that has been officially sanctioned by the church; and work of academics who have personal links to the Moravian Church but are not writing official histories.

The literature from the academics independent from the Moravian Church covers a wide range of topics, detailed history of the early years of the church in England and the development of its missionary work. There is contribution to the study of the relationship between the Moravian Church and the Methodist church and the development of trade with the Moravian communities in the New World. Furthermore, there is literature on the formation of identity and notions of tradition and community. The single work officially sanctioned by the church gives a history of the Moravian Church in Great Britain from 1742 to 2000 (Stead and Stead, 2003). Finally, for
the academics that are affiliated to the Moravian Church, what stands out amongst them is their willingness to take on difficult issues. Paul Peucker (2015) tackles an issue that was at the cause of the crisis of 1750. He has written about ‘The Sifting Time’ and the actions that took place in this period that brought ridicule upon the Moravian Church. In these publications he is critical about not only Zinzendorf’s son Christian Renatus but also of Zinzendorf himself. His work also covers the aftermath of the crisis and the attempts to cover up and gloss over what had happened and again he was open to discuss these sensitive issues. Craig Atwood (1997, 2006, 2010, 2013), another member of the Moravian Church is open with his discussion about how the church used its history to promote its image. He is also willing to approach some of the more controversial parts of Zinzendorf’s theology. Finally, Peter Vogt (2012) also looks at how history was controlled and reshaped and argues that current day members of the Moravian communities should be made aware of this. These three writers are not constrained by their association with the Moravian Church and criticise what was once seen as the official line. In addition, their work is acknowledged by academics not related to the Moravian Church and vice-versa.

Miller (2014) and Yonan (2008) both investigate how attacks upon the credibility of the Moravian Church were organised and how people who had once been their supporters turned against them. A different period of crisis ‘the long sixties’ is explored, the impact that this period had on the wider scope of the Christian Church. Through the work of Brown (2001 and 2006) and McLeod (2005 and 2007) the different viewpoints on the decline of church membership are examined. This is contrasted with Atwood’s (2020) argument that the events of the 1957 Synod developed the Moravian Church to be what it is today.
The role of music and singing forms an integral part of Moravian collective life and the literature supports its importance. Kroeger’s (1984) research at Fairfield, Fulneck and Ockbrook shows a wide-ranging repertoire of hymns. Herbert (2006) explores the instrumental support, in this case the trombone which was introduced to the Herrnhut congregation in 1731 and is still in use today. Reed Knouse (2007) covers the development of Moravian music and how it encompasses Moravian life.

The notions of traditions, the ‘reinvention’ of traditions, and of identity creation are explored. Looking at the ways in which the leaders of the Moravian Church controlled its history. Examining the way members of the Moravian communities use their past to form their current identity. Asking what role do the physical settlements, the actual bricks and buildings play in creating Moravian identity? How does the notion that many traditions and practices that are generally held to be historic ones are either comparatively new inventions or are a reworking of older traditions relate to understanding the Moravian approach to the past?

This links to the debate on heritage and how choices have to be made to decide what to include as ‘heritage’. How traditions and practices that form part of the collective Moravian memory or become what Nora describes as sites of memory, is something Peucker (2010) draws on, seeing the settlements and burial grounds as sites of memory. Vogt (2012) explores the way traditions and practices are part of Moravian identity and what it means to be a Moravian and asks actually how Moravian are the Moravians? Richter (2007) comments on how the history of the tradition of an international church was revitalised post-1945 using the past to create the present.
The literature under review covers a broad spectrum that gives an insight into Moravian history and how it is used to create Moravian identity. The rise of the popularity of the Moravian Church in England is examined as is the success of Moravian mission work. Alongside this the dramatic crisis that almost ended the Moravian Church in England is discussed as is the aftermath and the road to recovery. It shows how traditions and practices are held dear to members of the Moravian communities and how performance of them brings those communities together.
Chapter 2. Methodology

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter I outline and discuss my mixed methods approach to collecting and analysing data about the history of the Moravian Church in England and its use by contemporary members of the settlements of Fulneck and Fairfield in the construction of their identity and their community’s public facing history. I examine how traditions and practices have been used to support the development of notions of English Moravian identity. I clarify the rationale behind my choice of sites to undertake my research. I explain the approach I took to my archival research at both Moravian and secular archives as well as the methods I adopted to conduct my contemporary fieldwork at the Moravian settlements of Fulneck and Fairfield. This includes participant observation at a range of events held at both settlements, the use of questionnaires and interviews as well as the analysis of museum displays at the two on-site museums. Furthermore, I reflect on the impact of COVID-19 on my research and the challenges I faced as a researcher during the pandemic.

2.2 Choice of Sites

The aim of my research was to find out more about the Moravian Church’s history, its traditions and practices and to see how present-day members relate to and identify with those traditions and practices. There are four Moravian settlements in the United Kingdom, of which three are in England; one in Derbyshire, one in Greater Manchester and one in Yorkshire, the fourth is at Gracehill in Northern Ireland. In addition, there are twenty-eight stand-alone Moravian Churches in the United Kingdom. I decided that I needed to focus on two separate sites to enable comparisons between them. In the end, I decided that settlements would work better for my fieldwork as church members live within the settlement community and interact with each other
every day rather than being spread around the outlying area of a stand-alone church. I decided to focus on the planned settlements of Fulneck and Fairfield as they represent the type of lived-in religious communities that Zinzendorf started when he founded Herrnhut in 1722. To this end, I chose Fulneck in Yorkshire, and Fairfield in Greater Manchester. Fulneck is the oldest Moravian settlement in England founded in 1746, and Fairfield is the newest founded in 1785. Not only do these settlements have a lived-in community, but they also have the advantage of each having their own archive and archivist as well as their own museum and curator. They are also the two Moravian settlements in England with the largest number of members. I ruled out Ockbrook, the other Moravian settlement in England, as this is smaller than both Fulneck and Fairfield and does not have a museum, and Gracehill in Northern Ireland was excluded for logistical reasons (although Gracehill does have an on-site museum). Furthermore, its inclusion would complicate the focus and scale of the thesis, for example by pushing me into engaging with the distinctive Ulster context.

2.3 Archival Research

The starting point of my research into the Moravian Church was archival research. Record keeping and care of archives has a long history within the Moravian Church ‘starting 13th August 1727 at Herrnhut’ (Peucker, 2012, p.171). As Podmore points out, ‘the Moravians believed that in them God was acting just as much as He had through people in New Testament times. If this were so then what happened deserved to be recorded day by day in diaries, reported at length in letters and set down in the minutes of synods and committees’ (Podmore, 1998, p.2). Both Fulneck and Fairfield settlements have their own archives dating back to their foundation. These contain not only diaries, minute books and letters, but also records of the school and the types of commerce undertaken at the settlements. The main archive for the Moravian Church in England is at Church House, Muswell Hill, London. In addition, there are the West Yorkshire
Archives at Bradford which holds material on loan from Moravian Churches near to Fulneck as they have no facilities to store and care for them. Finally, there is the Libbey collection at John Rylands Library in Manchester. John Libbey was the principal of the Moravian College at Fairfield and a Moravian historian whose collection of notes, diaries, transcriptions, and translations were donated to the library after his death. I used the two settlements’ on-site archives when searching for site-relevant material especially when wanting to make comparisons between the two sites at various stages of their development. Muswell Hill not only holds diaries letters etc. but the back catalogue of the church publication ‘The Messenger’ and other church publications and library. The West Yorkshire Archives were an excellent source of newsletters and bulletins, especially for research relating to both the First and Second World Wars when those posted overseas could receive news from home. Another archive I accessed for this research is held at the Nazarene Theological College based in Didsbury, Manchester. This is a college belonging to the World Methodist Council. While this is primarily a Methodist archive, the Moravian Church was admired by and had influence upon many outside the church, most especially John Wesley who first met with the Moravians on the voyage to Georgia in 1735-1736.

The selection of relevant sources from these archives was relatively easy as I had copies of both the Fulneck and Fairfield catalogues. However, the identification of relevant sources at Muswell Hill was more problematic given that the archive is not yet digitised, and the catalogue is not available to visitors. This meant that I was very reliant on the archivist in the selection and access to sources.
My archival research was threefold. Documents were sourced to establish how the Moravian Church developed globally, in England, and in the two settlements. Rather than attempting to cover the whole history of the church, my intention was to focus on specific key historical periods. I wanted to establish the relationship between English Moravians and their history and explore the way in which the residents of the two communities use their perceptions of the Moravian Church’s historical past in order to shape their identity. What role do the traditions of their church, and the physicality of the settlements play in shaping their ‘ideas about the past, the present, and the future’ (Harrison, 2010, p. 9)? What is the relationship between the community residents to the objects, places and memories that form the basis of their local unofficial form of heritage (The Open University, 2012)?

I see the history of the Moravian Church divided into three distinct stages: the first stage started in 1457 with the foundation of the United Brethren. The second stage begins in 1722, with Zinzendorf’s formation of the renewed church and includes the independence from Germany and the World Wars and reconciliation, and the third stage is from the 1957 synod onwards, the Moravian Church as it is today. I broke down my archival research into historical periods that matched the three stages of the church. The first focused on the distant past, on looking at how that past is perceived in the present-day Moravian Church. The second covered the renewal of the church in 1722 by Zinzendorf and his efforts and reasons to link the two churches as being continuous. Furthermore, it covered the expansion of the church and its development in England, including the damaging period of crisis and the church’s efforts to recover from it. All of this research involved the use of the archives at Muswell Hill, John Rylands Library and at both Fulneck and Fairfield. Also included in this period were the two World Wars where the collections at both Muswell Hill and the West Yorkshire Archive at Bradford provided a wealth of information on Moravian responses to the two conflicts (See Chapter 1 subsection 1.8 Periods of Crisis and Change – Literature exploring the Long Sixties regarding gap in the period
covered). The third covered the more recent past from 1957 onwards, the ‘Long Sixties’ (Marwick, 2000, p. 8) and their impact on church membership. Here the archives at both Fulneck and Fairfield were able to provide a rich seam of information on the mid-1950s to the early-1970s.

My approach to the archives started with asking myself what information I wanted in order to discuss the topics in my thesis. A decision had to be made on which archive to use and which form of media diary, minute books, letters etc. would be best at providing the information I required. While the Church House archives provided a wide range of information on the Moravian Church in The British Province, the settlement archives were best for Fulneck and Fairfield. In addition, West Yorkshire Archives provided additional information on Fulneck and John Rylands Library on Fairfield. My first archive visits started with background material at Church House, before moving to focus on Fulneck and then Fairfield. The ease of access differed depending on which archive I was using. John Rylands’ catalogue is online; Fulneck, Fairfield, and West Yorkshire are available on-site. So, with these archives I could search the catalogues myself and, when booking a visit to the archive, also give reference numbers of what I wanted to view to the archivist. However, Muswell Hill was problematic, as I had no access to a catalogue.

2.4 Contemporary Fieldwork

The research methods for my contemporary fieldwork for this thesis included the use of questionnaires, informal interviews, a number of more formal interviews with both current and former ministers, impromptu conversations with settlement members at events such as coffee mornings, as well as various forms of participant observation. Before I started with the rollout of the questionnaires and other aspects of contemporary data collection, I applied for ethical
approval for research, which was granted by the Open University’s Human Research Ethics Committee in January 2015 (Ref: HREC/2015/2019/Rollo/1).

My research also involved an analysis of the current exhibitions at the two on-site museums. I chose this combination of methods because I felt they offered more opportunities to collect data at different stages of my ‘research journey’. I already had a footprint at both settlements as I had previously made numerous visits to the on-site archives and museums. However, in order to further increase it, I also attended events held at both settlements. This enabled me to not only build trust with the residents, but also to undertake participant observation. It also provided opportunities to interact with people and helped in setting up interviews with residents. At each stage, in addition to collecting data, I was also increasing my ‘footprint’ at the settlement sites as more community members became aware of me and the nature of my research. Graham Harvey states that the collection of data and information in the field requires researchers to attempt to get as close as they can to the doing of religion and the establishment of rapport with those involved (Harvey, 2011, p.218). This is what I was trying to achieve during the various stages of my research visits to the settlements. Due to the constraints of me being employed full-time, I was unable to spend longer periods of time on site. By contrast, Colin Podmore was able to spend ten consecutive days at Herrnhut (interview with Colin Podmore 9th May 2018), and David Clark undertook an intense period of fieldwork at Staithes, living there between April 1975 and June 1976 (Clark, 1982, p.35).

However, although my site visits were usually restricted to single days, they accumulated to a total of twenty-nine days over a seven-year period, including archive visits, observations, attendance at events, as well as informal interviews combined with the distribution and collection of questionnaires. In addition to visiting Fulneck and Fairfield a further eighteen days were spent at the archives at Church House, John Rylands and West Yorkshire. While I was
envious of researchers like Colin Podmore and David Clark (1982) who had the opportunity to spend longer periods of time on-site, it is, according to Harvey, quite rare to stay long-term with those you are researching (Harvey, 2011, p.219).

My first point of contact with the communities of the two settlements were the ministers, the archivists, and the museum curators of each of these settlements. I first visited Fulneck on the 20th March 2015, followed by nine visits between May 2015 and July 2018. Then there was one in February 2019 and three between July and September 2021 and one in July 2022. My first visit to Fairfield was the 3rd April 2017. I then conducted a further five visits between April and November 2017, one in July 2018, one in April 2019, five between September and December 2021, and finally one on the 17th February 2022. I chose to approach the ministers, archivists, and museum curators first, not only because I saw them as community ‘gatekeepers’, i.e. authoritative and well known by the rest of the communities who would be able to verify who I was and what I was doing, but also because they were probably the people with whom I was going to have the most interaction. The development of good relations, combined with meetings with community ‘gatekeepers’ opened further opportunities to meet other members of the congregations through a variety of activities and to further build a rapport with them. Initially, the number of on-site visits I could manage at Fulneck was limited due to my full-time employment. So, the scheduling of my site visits had to be tied in with my holiday entitlement as the majority of events were also held on weekdays. This time constraint also applied to visits to both the on-site and off-site archives which also tended to be limited to weekdays. Even so, I was able to establish a good relationship with settlement residents, which was made easier by their interest in the project and their approachability. The interest in my research was apparent from the first meeting with the archivist at the café at Fulneck who arrived with a group of friends. They all wanted to know who I was and what I was interested in. I took an open approach to explaining
who I was and why I was there to prevent any misconceptions of my intentions. Looking back at the time spent at both settlements, I can see similarities and differences between Clarks’ approach to fieldwork and my own (Clark, 1982). Indeed, David Clark’s work has had a particular resonance with me in that his topic covered contemporary research in a small religious community. In Clark’s case, this was Methodism, also with a historical perspective. David Clark conducted his fieldwork in North Yorkshire over the period April 1975 to July 1976 and details his experience in *Between pulpit and pew: Folk religion in a North Yorkshire fishing village* (Clark, 1982). This study attempts to uncover religious belief and practice in a single community ‘where religious rites, symbols, beliefs, attitudes and meaning punctuate a considerable range of human activity and experience’ (Clark, 1982, pp. 9-10). Despite undertaking my fieldwork some forty years after Clark’s, my results show the same resilience of religious traditions and practices in Fulneck and Fairfield that he observed in Staithes and the importance to the residents of living in a community. Indeed, there are many similarities with life in small religious communities such as calendar events often marked by concerts or special teas. However, my insights into life in the two Moravian settlements sits alongside Clark’s showing a continuity in community life, further enhanced by the time gap separating them. We were both researching religious communities with which we had had little or no contact with before our research, and we were both outsiders. Clark had prior memories of Staithes when he visited it as a child and I had visited one of the settlements, Fairfield, as a place of historical and architectural interest when I first moved to Manchester in 1988. Perhaps the biggest difference is that Clark lived in the village between April 1975 and July 1976, whereas my research was conducted in day visits over a longer period. However, we both faced the challenges of being a participant observer. Clark refers to the curiosity of the locals wanting to know who he was and why he was there. While he had no intention of hiding his research, he was worried about the best way to say what his interests were. In the end he decided to explain that he was a student from Newcastle University and would be living in Staithes for a few months to do research.
(Clark, 1982, p. 38). As he acquainted himself with the village’s churches and chapels Clark explained the varying misconceptions the villagers held about him and how that influenced what they said to him, especially those that thought he was training for the Methodist ministry (Clark, 1982, p. 39). However, that misconception was ‘both a hindrance and a help’ (Clark, 1982, p. 39); I suffered no such misconceptions, but still had to explain who I was and why I was there.

Being on site for a long continuous period Clark faced difficulties maintaining his role as a participant observer. He felt the pressure of keeping sight of his objectives and at some point, it tested his own religious beliefs. Like Clark, I tried to attend as many events as possible. However, I admit at times I too found the position of ‘outside, scientific observer difficult to maintain’ (Clark, 1982, p. 39). Clark points out how being immersed in data collection you can lose the ends to which the research is going (Clark, 1982, p. 44), both these observations rang true for me. I was able to increase my presence at the settlements when I dropped to a four-day working week in 2016. This gave me greater flexibility to organise visits, observe and participate in community events. However, it required careful planning, for example booking an archive visit so it would coincide with an organ recital, a coffee morning, or a lunch. This served to increase my footprint in the communities, enabled me to meet and converse with settlement residents and develop rapport and trust with the community members. A good example of this development of trust was me being granted access to Fairfield archives on Saturdays when they were normally closed. This action by the archivist made me think of Harvey’s concept of ‘guesthood’ based on Māori protocols ‘in which strangers are turned, by careful stages, into guests rather than enemies’ (Harvey, 2003, p. 126). At this point I felt I was more than just a researcher from the Open University, I had ‘been invited by the hosts’ (Harvey, 2003, p. 138).

Unlike Clark I was not mistaken for someone studying for the ministry or other such misconceptions. However, I still felt it important that it was clear to the settlement residents as to why I was there. As mentioned above, the participant observation went well and as I got to know
community residents, it became easier to talk to them. By being able to be close to the community members I was able to see how the community functioned, who was involved in the different groups that were attached to the church, all the more so at Fairfield which seemed a more active community. I also found at Fairfield that members were more open to speak to me about their daily lives, particularly those who were of a similar age to me. While most of my visits were limited to a single day at a time, I managed one two-day visit at Fulneck. Visits to the Fairfield site were easier for several reasons. It helped that I had previously met the steward as part of the work for my MA, plus the settlement itself is only twenty minutes’ drive from my home.

The COVID-19 restrictions had a major impact on both my research and my mindset. I lost access to the settlement archives and museums, and to members of the two communities as the settlements themselves were effectively closed. While I had completed the main bulk of my research, I had planned some additional archival work and had hoped to conduct a limited number of follow-up interviews and reach out to a younger age group (20-30). I did my best to work around these problems and was still in contact with the archivists at both settlements via email and text. However, with the easing of restrictions, it meant that by September 2021, I was able to visit the museums at both settlements and attend their Heritage Open Days. The trust and acceptance that had developed between myself and the Fairfield community was again extended to me after further easing of the COVID restrictions when I enquired when the archives might reopen. The archivist assured me that she would submit my request to the congregation committee but did not see any problems as they knew me. So, I was granted special access to the Fairfield archives in October 2021 in spite of ongoing COVID restrictions. Fulneck were planning to reopen their archives in January 2022. However, due to the high COVID infection rate after the New Year’s Eve Watchnight service, Fulneck’s archives remained
closed until they reopened in July 2022. Being able to have some form of access to the settlements helped rekindle my motivation to continue my research. Looking back, I feel that I was able to cover a wide range of different forms of participant observations at both sites that provided valuable insights into not only the traditions and customs of Moravian life but aspects of normal day to day life too.

2.5 Questionnaires

The questionnaires functioned as a ‘gateway’ to the two communities and as a way of recruiting participants for more in-depth interviews, given that questionnaires allowed participants the opportunity to indicate their willingness to be contacted for one-to-one follow-up interviews. The questionnaires for Fulneck were distributed on the 23rd of April 2016 and collected on the 31st of May 2016, and those at Fairfield were distributed on the 12th of April 2017 and collected on the 14th May 2017. However, not all my interviewees had completed a questionnaire, so my second group were those who I approached directly. For example, neither the archivist nor either of the two museum curators at Fulneck wanted to complete questionnaire, but all were happy to be interviewed. I also had impromptu conversations with community members at events like the Lent lunches or when I was having a break at the on-site café. The first stage was to run through the questionnaires that I wanted to distribute with the two ministers, neither of whom had any objections to the questions or format of them. Both ministers were interested in the project and drew awareness of it to their congregations at the end of the Sunday service. The next stage was the distribution of questionnaire packs. Each pack consisted of a letter of introduction explaining who I was, what my research involved, that their participation was voluntary and at any time they could withdraw from my research and that no data collected from them would be used if they chose to withdraw, my contact details and those of my two supervisors, a consent form, and the questionnaire itself. The ministers played an important role
in distributing the questionnaires and recruiting participants. Fifty questionnaires complete with the accompanying information were delivered to each of the two ministers who promoted them on church notice boards and again at the end of services. The ministers made sure the questionnaire packs were made available at the two churches as were ‘post boxes’ for the completed ones. A deadline of one month was set for the return of completed questionnaires and in the third week both ministers made their congregations aware that there was only one week left before the deadline. The response rate at Fulneck was low, though it was slightly higher at Fairfield. Of a total of one hundred questionnaires sent out only twenty-eight were returned fully completed, ten for Fulneck and eighteen for Fairfield. The adult population of the Fulneck settlement is sixty-eight and Fairfield is ninety-eight, which means that 14.7% of the Fulneck population and 18.4% of the Fairfield population responded. Children have been omitted from the population totals as they were not approached or eligible for participation in the survey. At the time I thought the involvement of the two ministers in promotion and distribution of the questionnaires was a good way forward. However, in retrospect I feel that more involvement on my part, showing a higher profile earlier on in my fieldwork, may have increased the uptake.

In addition to gathering data, the distribution of questionnaires also made community members aware of my research activities at the two settlements. This meant that some members who had heard about my project through the questionnaire, but had chosen not to complete a questionnaire, approached me at a later point to speak to me about my research. I also felt that my presence at various events at the communities made it easier to have informal chats with members, for example at a coffee morning. The coffee mornings, which followed the same format at both communities fell into two categories. Firstly, informal ones, which would take place after morning prayers and were simply people gathering for a coffee and a chat, and
secondly ones that were organised to help raise funds for church activities or for charities that the church was supporting.

A questionnaire was chosen as one of the initial methods of data collection acting also as a first step of access to the communities, a means of introducing myself as a researcher, making it easier for participant observation and talking to and interviewing community members. Questionnaires are simple to complete and far less time consuming than interviews and they can be completed when the respondent chooses. I formatted the questionnaire in a way that allowed me to obtain both quantitative and qualitative data, a style I had used previously as part of my research for my MA (Bowman, 2010, pp. 53-63).

2.6 Interviews and Informal Conversations

The first group I spoke to were questionnaire respondents who had indicated that they would be willing to be interviewed. Initially I contacted them by email to arrange an interview with questions designed to draw additional detail from answers they included on the questionnaires. We either met at the relevant settlement or continued corresponding by email.

I found that those who had a defined role in the church organisation e.g., minister, archivist, museum curator and such like were happy to meet face-to-face, whereas some of the older members preferred email. I successfully used this method with four members of the Fulneck community. The disadvantage of corresponding by email was the time lag between question and answer and the lack of spontaneity. The face-to-face meetings were informal and low key, more of a conversation rather than a formal interview, and I found that the relaxed atmosphere
worked well. Usually, these meetings would be myself and the community member. As a matter of politeness, I would always check that it was alright to take notes rather than record what we talked about, even though they had already consented to being interviewed. Occasionally more than one participant would be present, this usually would be at Muswell Hill where I could be talking to the assistant archivist and then the archivist would join us as well. Interviews with the ministers, the archivists and museum curators were more formal than others and in general lasted twenty to thirty minutes and were usually held in their offices with a prepared set of questions. By contrast, the interviews with ordinary community members were often shorter, more like fifteen to twenty minutes, usually over a coffee. The one exception was my conversation with a former minister of the Moravian Church in Birmingham while at Muswell Hill which lasted over an hour. In the interview David Howarth gave me the full history of the Moravian Church in Birmingham and how it developed into the church it is today. We had a lot of common areas; he is from Manchester and lives and works in Birmingham; and I am from Birmingham and live and work in Manchester. I think for these reasons the rapport developed to a level Harvey refers to as a ‘conversation partner’, when there is a good relationship with the people being researched and the researcher ‘comes to treat such people not only as reliable informants but also as conversation partners and even as co-researchers in some respects’ (Harvey, 2011, p.221). All in all, I interviewed / conversed with the ministers, archivists, and museum curators from both settlements, two elders, six ordinary community members, the archivist and assistant archivist from Muswell Hill and both the former and current ministers of Birmingham Moravian Church. Not all of those interviewed who belonged to either of the two communities had first completed a questionnaire. For those that had, the interviews were semi-structured, and the questions followed on from their questionnaire responses, and I felt this method worked well. For those who I had approached, I had a set of questions based on those in the questionnaires. However, in retrospect I feel I could have used a better approach to engage with a wider range of members who had not completed questionnaires as my approach.
tended to rely quite heavily on speaking to ministers, archivists, and curators as they were more confident in talking to me. On reflection, a better approach might have been to try to recruit a wider group of ordinary members, for example, finding a way of asking for volunteers to be interviewed without having to fill in a questionnaire. Those I spoke to at Muswell Hill had not filled in a questionnaire although, as mentioned above, I interviewed the former minister of the Birmingham Moravian Church: this was a more structured interview and worked very well. When speaking with the archivist and assistant archivist, there were two different approaches, neither of which could be called an ‘interview’. Sometimes I would ask a direct question and receive an answer and another time it was more spontaneous, a comment could start a flow of conversation and could produce really useful information, especially when both archivist and assistant archivist were in attendance. For some reason, this approach worked well with them, though I could not see it working at the two settlements. When I was at Muswell Hill, it would be two six-hour days so there were plenty of opportunities. The downside of the use of the questionnaire to generate interviews was that a low response rate to the questionnaires led to an even lower number of interviewees as not all respondents agreed to be interviewed. If I were starting this research again, I would still use a questionnaire to obtain interviewees, but I would change the method of distribution to increase the number of questionnaires being sent out. In retrospect I think in my eagerness to get things going, I introduced the questionnaires too early before members of the settlements really knew who I was. While I would still have the initial questionnaires distributed via the minister, I would have it done later. In addition, I would have made sure I always had some additional copies on my site visits that I could hand out.
2.7 Participant Observation

Both settlements’ host coffee / cake sale mornings which were a good way to meet people in an informal environment. These informal events led to invitations to attend more formal events and religious practices, including church services, though these were often attached to another event. Music and singing have been an integral part of Moravian life since the renewal of the church and encompasses both organ and brass band music (Reed-Khouse 2007, p.46) - a tradition that is still alive at Fulneck with monthly organ recitals. During the period May 2015 to September 2019, I attended several of these recitals performed by City of Leeds organist Simon Lindley. Not only were they enjoyable, but my attendance at these events also helped build a relationship with members of the Fulneck community. Throughout visits I always identified myself and would often be introduced as ‘James the researcher’. At the organ recitals I felt I was sharing the experience with all the other attendees; it was more of a social event with a program of fairly well-known pieces and after the event we would talk about the content as you would after any concert. On the other hand at the church services I attended I would describe myself as being on the outside, even though I was participating to some extent simply by being there and joining in with singing the hymns. However, I was not really sharing the experience with the other participants, the most obvious reason being I am neither a member of the Moravian Church nor a resident of Fulneck or Fairfield communities. This of course is my personal feeling as the church is open to all to come and join the worship. This is probably more evident at Fairfield as it draws people from the outlying area, especially since the closure of the nearby Wheler Street Moravian Church in 2009. Also, I felt I was there to observe, so I focused on what took place, the structure, the order and what was said. On a more personal note, I was brought up a Baptist and so the hymns and their tunes were often unfamiliar or unknown to me, what Harvey refers to as the potential incompatibility between the researcher and the researched (Harvey, 2011, p.226), though I would say unfamiliarity, rather than incompatibility in this case.
However, the unfamiliarity of music and hymns shows that they are distinctly Moravian and form an important part of Moravian identity. Indeed, while a lot of hymns are common across evangelical traditions the Moravian hymnal still contains hymns that were translated from German and many by English Moravian hymn writers such as James Montgomery.

While I am neither a member of the Moravian Church nor a member of either of the two communities, I saw myself as a neutral observer as participant (Knott, 2010, pp. 266-267). However, I felt that as I spent more time with the two communities and we got to know more about each other I bridged ‘the alleged gulf between ‘insiders’ and ‘outsiders’’ (Harvey, 2011, p.226). I never felt uncomfortable with the community members. Participant observation was quite a big learning curve for me: how to behave, what to ask and of whom, balancing, on the one hand, ‘questions of privacy and belonging while on the other questions about empathy, completeness and ‘getting it right” (Harvey, 2011, p.230).

One event especially stood out to me because it revealed contrasts between Fulneck and Fairfield particularly clearly. This event was a service that took place at the end of ‘My Heart Strangely Warmed’, a conference by the Lutheran, Moravian and Methodist Churches commemorating the 500th anniversary in 2017 of Luther’s 95 Theses held at Fulneck. On this occasion, I joined two members of the Fairfield community, who had also attended the conference. We chose to sit in the church’s gallery rather than the ground floor. Not only did the gallery provide an excellent place to observe the service, but my presence there also allowed me to observe the Fairfield member’s reaction to the Fulneck service too. On the drive back to Manchester from this event (as I had to pass close by Fairfield on the way to Fulneck, I shared my car with community members) the Fairfield members also talked to me about their impressions of this service, which provided me with important insights into their views of differences and similarities between services held at both communities. Another event that
particulary stood out to me was an afternoon choir workshop that I participated in. This even
ted at the Fulneck church to promote interest in the choir and consisted of choir members,
singers, and non-singers (by non-singers I mean those who do not sing on a regular basis who
would normally only sing when the need arose, this group included myself) - about thirty people
in total. This event is discussed in detail in section 6.3 ‘Perceptions of the contemporary church’
of Chapter 6 ‘Perceptions of Moravian identity in Fulneck and Fairfield today: contemporary
fieldwork findings’.

2.8 Conclusion

My approach of combining archival research with contemporary fieldwork will not only provide a
window to the Moravian past, but also open a door that reveals how today’s Moravians use their
past to create their identity. I used archival research to source people, places, and events and
contemporary fieldwork to find how members of the two communities identify with them. I visited
the two settlements observing and participating in events, communicating with the residents,
talking to them about community life, exploring the settlements, examining the museums to see
what it tells us about English Moravian identity, in essence what it means to be a Moravian.

The next chapter will focus on the results of my archival research and engagement with relevant
primary and secondary literature to explore the historical roots of the Moravian Church and its
historical development in England.
Chapter 3. The English Moravian Church in historical context

3.1 Introduction

Notions of the community’s history have played a defining role in establishing a distinct sense of Moravian identity. Paul Peucker, Director of the Moravian Archives in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, argues that Moravians have consciously used particular understandings of history to create a common sense of identity and have cultivated this sense of identity by pursuing a culture of remembrance (Peucker, 2010, p. 7). This view is also supported by the findings of my own archival research and contemporary fieldwork conducted in the Fulneck and Fairfield Moravian settlements, which will be discussed in detail in later chapters. However, different understandings of the history of the Moravian Church have long been the source of controversy among its members. In particular, there are different views on whether the history of the Moravian Church can be seen as a continuous development since the foundation of the Unity of Brethren in 1457, or whether the formation of the renewed church in the eighteenth century should, in fact, be regarded as the creation of a separate church with a distinct history and identity. Drawing on archival evidence and the analysis of relevant primary and secondary sources, this chapter investigates the historical background to these debates, with a special focus on developments that have played a particularly significant role in shaping processes of identity formation in Moravian communities in England in the context of international developments.

The chapter will begin by examining the links between the church of 1457 and the renewed church of 1722 and the debate regarding continuity between the two. The early development of the Moravian Church in England is discussed as is the influence it had on the Wesleys and Methodism. The period of anti-Moravian feeling that emerged in England in 1750 and the issues in England and Germany that brought this about are examined as are the efforts that the
church undertook to regain their status and respect. The pressures that the two World Wars placed upon the global unity of the Moravian Church are considered from both British and German perspectives, followed by the efforts for reconciliation in the post war period. The state of the English Moravian Church in the 1960s is examined from the perspective of two Yorkshire Moravian Church newspapers. Finally, staying with the 1960s, the impact of the arrival of African Caribbean immigrants on the emergence of a new style of English Moravianism is considered.

3.2 The Unity of Brethren

The roots of the Moravian Church go back to the reforming efforts of John Huss (1369-1415), a Catholic theologian who challenged the corruption of the medieval Roman Catholic Church. The timeline on display at the museum of the Moravian settlement in Fairfield in Greater Manchester sees its history starting in 1415 with John Huss being burned at the stake by the Council of Constance as a heretic (see Appendix 4 for a copy of the timeline). This timeline was compiled by Anthony Torkington the original archivist at Fairfield (conversation with Anthony Torkington, Fairfield, 13 January 2011).

Huss wanted the laity to be actively involved in the church, preaching in the vernacular, rather than Latin, and arguing that scripture and plain reason are the final authority in the church. Amongst some later followers of Huss, there was dissatisfaction with the worldliness and corruption of the Hussite Church. There was a desire for a radical reform of the church based on the New Testament alone, which led to the formation of a small community in Kunwald by Gregory the Patriarch in 1457. This community was called ‘the Unity of Brethren’ (Unitas Fratrum in Latin). In 1467, the Unity of Brethren established a separate priesthood and episcopacy from the Roman Catholic Church (Hutton, 2006, p. 50). In 1592, Jan Amos
Comenius, perhaps one of the most important names in the early Unity, was born. Comenius was the minister at Fulnek in Bohemia when in 1627, the Unity of Brethren were exiled from both Bohemia and Moravia and had to find refuge in Poland. Jan Amos Comenius, who would be the last Bishop of the Unity of Brethren in Moravia, referred to the subsequent period as the ‘Hidden Seed’. Hutton states that as the refugees left their homeland, Comenius prayed ‘that in the old land God would preserve a Hidden Seed which one day would grow’ (Hutton, 2006, p.146). A more dramatic version of this account that I found in the archives at Fulneck in Yorkshire states ‘that at the top of the mountains that separate Bohemia from Poland just before they quit Bohemia Comenius offers up a prayer that God would preserve a Hidden Seed of their ancient church’.

3.3 The Renewed Church of 1722

The next milestone in the church’s history came in 1722 when Count Nikolaus Ludwig von Zinzendorf (1700-1760) allowed refugees from Moravia and Bohemia, many of them descendants of members of the Unity of Brethren, to stay on one of his estates in Saxony. This led to the formation of the settlement at Herrnhut. Craig Atwood argues that these refugees knew little, if anything, about the Unity of Brethren until Zinzendorf introduced them to Comenius’s *Ratio disciplinae* and Comenius’s notion of the ‘Hidden Seed’ that God would preserve a Hidden Seed from which one day the ancient church would grow (Atwood, 2013, p.113). The refugees from the areas around Fulnek and Kunwald, where the Unity of Brethren was strongest during the 1620s, ‘were familiar with the old churches’ catechism and hymnal but had no access to historical doctrinal works of the church until coming to Germany since such texts were banned in Moravia and Bohemia’ (Atwood, 2013, p.113). Furthermore, Colin
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8 Our Church’s Story Parts 1 and 2, The Hidden Seed, pamphlet published by the Moravian Church, no date Fulneck Archives FUL/29/1319
Podmore found evidence that in 1727, a small group from the German speaking part of Moravia arrived at Herrnhut. Among this group were five who had studied the traditions of the Unity of Brethren and understood themselves as its heirs (Podmore, 1998 p. 6). Exiles continued to arrive at Herrnhut and by April 1727 the number had reached two hundred and twenty. At this point Zinzendorf obtained leave from his position at the Saxon court and returned to his estate (Podmore, 1990, p.624). In May 1727, Zinzendorf noticed similarities between the system he had put in place in Herrnhut with that established by Comenius. Podmore argues that this discovery, combined with the exiles’ zeal, allegedly ‘culminated in an outpouring of the Spirit on the 13th August 1727 when the congregation gathered for Holy Communion […] this quasi-Pentecostal experience, which completed and sealed the inauguration of the new community at Herrnhut can be taken as the birthday of the Moravian Church’ (Podmore, 1998, p. 6). Driven by a youthful Zinzendorf, the Moravian Church was ‘to produce a religious explosion which would soon reverberate throughout the world, and not least in England’ (Podmore, 1998, p. 6). Atwood agrees stating that not only was Zinzendorf the primary theologian of the new church, but also the founder of the global mission effort (Atwood, 2013, p. 111). In 1729, Zinzendorf became acquainted with Daniel Ernst Jablonski, who was one of two bishops of the Polish branch of the Unity of Brethren and the grandson of Jan Amos Comenius. Jablonski was also aware of Comenius’s hope that a Hidden Seed of the Brethren would one day be revived. Zinzendorf was able to convince Jablonski that the Moravian settlers at Herrnhut were the fulfilment of Comenius’s dream (Atwood, 2013, p.116). In March 1735, Jablonski, and the other remaining bishop of the Unity of Brethren, Christian Sitkovius, passed on its episcopal succession to the renewed church at Herrnhut by consecrating one of the exiles, David Nitschmann, as a bishop of the Moravian branch of the Unity of Brethren (Podmore, 1990, p.625 and Atwood, 2013, p.116). Then, in 1737, Jablonski and Sitkovius consecrated Zinzendorf as the second Moravian bishop (Atwood, 2013, p.117). Atwood argues that Zinzendorf found it increasingly difficult to insist that the Moravians at Herrnhut were not a separate church, given that it had its own
bishops, clergy, and discipline. Furthermore, Zinzendorf had to convince ecclesiastical officials and the public that the Moravians were in fact the successors to the old Unity of Brethren (Atwood, 2013, p.117).

In July 1728, the first members of the renewed Moravian Church to visit England were Johann Toltschig, David Nitschmann and Wenzel Neißer. All three were exiles from Moravia, who went as messengers ‘to bear witness to God’s wondrous power and to seek to become acquainted with all children of God’ (Nitschmann to Zinzendorf 15/7 1728 in Podmore, 1998, p. 9). Podmore stresses that the purpose of this visit was an attempt to establish interconfessional contact and solidarity and not any type of mission seeking to convert the English (Podmore, 1998, p. 9). The group had hoped to meet with the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge and the recently formed and intensely devotional religious society the Oxford Holy Club, based at Oxford University (at the time arguably England’s chief religious centre). However, they were unable to do so due to neither of them sitting in the summer (Podmore, 1998, pp. 7-10). After this visit Moravians from Herrnhut had no contact with England until December 1734, when due to the growing numbers arriving at Herrnhut Zinzendorf feared that the government of Saxony would stop the arrival of further exiles and refugees (Podmore, 1998, pp. 10-11). To this end, Spangenberg (who, after Zinzendorf’s death, would become leader of the Moravian Church) went to London to seek permission to establish a Moravian settlement in the colony of Georgia (the trustees for the colony being in London) (Podmore, 1998, p. 11). The expansion of the Moravian Church had started, and within twenty-five years of the founding of the settlement at Herrnhut in 1722, the Moravian Church had established a further eight settlements across western Europe and beyond (see Appendix 3 for details of the early Moravian churches and settlements). There was one in Germany, one in the United Kingdom, three in the Netherlands (though one of those was abandoned within a year and moved to a more suitable place), and one in Switzerland. Outside of Western Europe two were established in the United States. Over
the next forty years the expansion continued with three more settlements in the UK, and three in Germany, one each in Denmark and Russia, and six in the United States (Kohls, 1971, p. 47; Podmore, 1998, pp. 137-140).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Founded</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1746</td>
<td>Fulneck</td>
<td>Yorkshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750</td>
<td>Ockbrook</td>
<td>Derbyshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1755</td>
<td>Dukinfield</td>
<td>Greater Manchester*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1765</td>
<td>Gracehill</td>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1785</td>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>Greater Manchester</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Became a stand-alone church after 1785

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Founded</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1722</td>
<td>Herrnhut</td>
<td>Saxony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1738</td>
<td>Herrnhaag</td>
<td>Hesse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1742</td>
<td>Niesky</td>
<td>215Saxony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1746</td>
<td>Ebersdorf</td>
<td>Thuringia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1767</td>
<td>Gnadau</td>
<td>Saxony</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Founded</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1741</td>
<td>Bethlehem</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1743</td>
<td>Nazareth</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1753</td>
<td>Bethabara</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1753</td>
<td>Salem</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1759</td>
<td>Bethania</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1769</td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>Indiana*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1771</td>
<td>Friedland</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1772</td>
<td>Friedberg</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Hope settlement was abandoned in 1808
3.4 The Development of the Settlements in the American Colonies

The Moravian settlements in the American colonies were founded and populated differently from those in England. Although the Moravian Settlements at Dukinfield, Fairfield and Fulneck were visited by Brethren from Herrnhut, and members of the Moravian Church from central Europe, they were founded by and populated by English converts to the Moravian Church. However, my research points to significant continental involvement at Fulneck which is discussed later (see Chapter 4 section 4.3 Settlers at Fulneck from Continental Europe). As far as the English settlements were concerned, there was no concept of a Czech or Moravian diaspora. However, a different picture emerges in the development of the Moravian settlements in the American colonies. As opposed to the Moravian settlements in England, which mainly attracted English converts, settlers in the Moravian communities in North America were predominantly immigrants from what is now the Czech Republic and Germany. Indeed, it has been claimed that Zinzendorf’s desire to gain permission to settle in the American colonies was based on his fear that no more migrants would be allowed to move to Herrnhut. Ziegenbein agrees with this, arguing that migrants from of the Moravian Churches in Germany came to North Carolina to establish new settlements. The first settlement was established in Salem in 1753. This was quickly followed by a second settlement in Bethania also in 1753. The final two North Carolina settlements were Friedland in 1771 and Friedberg in 1772 creating a considerable German diaspora (Ziegenbein, 2002, pp.10-11 and Table 3). The earliest Moravian settlers established settlements in Pennsylvania at Bethlehem in 1741 and Nazareth in 1743 (Table 3).

As I will argue in more depth and detail later, the fact that the English settlements were predominantly populated by English natives has played an important role in the development of their identity and continues to do so. As the findings of my contemporary fieldwork (discussed in
chapter six) will show, concerns about being thought of as ‘foreign’ continue to worry members of Moravian communities in England.

3.5 Continuity of the Renewed Church

There is evidence to suggest that Zinzendorf was keen to persuade both theologians and politicians that the Unity of Brethren had been an independent Protestant church, and that the renewed church was its continuation, in order to avoid being understood as a new non-conformist church. Zinzendorf wanted the renewed church to be accepted as belonging to the Lutheran Confession and as conforming to the Augsburg Confession (Podmore, 1998, p. 237). This was brought about as a consequence of the Prussian concession of December 1742 where Moravians (renewed church) were allowed to settle anywhere throughout Prussia (Podmore, 1998, p. 163). However, Zinzendorf was worried about references to the Moravian confession used in the terms of the Prussian concession and feared that the Moravians (renewed church) were rejecting Lutheran doctrine (Atwood, 2013, p.121). In fact, theology professor Siegmund Jakob Baumgarten argued that the Moravians ‘must be reckoned as a fourth religion in the Empire and be excluded from the toleration provided for in the Peace of Westphalia’ (Podmore, 1998, p. 163). Zinzendorf therefore went to great lengths to avoid this via the efforts of Grandin, his ambassador to the Greek Orthodox Church. Central to Grandin’s argument ‘was the identity of the Bohemian Brethren as the Moravian Church, which he claimed was an episcopal church that traced its history back to the ninth century’ (Atwood, 2013, p.122). Thus, Grandin established two claims that became part of traditional Moravian historiography, i.e. (1) the claim that the essence of the Czech Reformation was opposition to the papacy, communion of both kinds (bread and wine), and use of the vernacular in worship, and (2) the claim that the bishops of the Unity of Brethren were in apostolic succession independent of Rome, just like the Greek Orthodox bishops (Atwood, 2013, p.122). In addition, Cranz’s (Zinzendorf’s secretary) work
‘provided a highly selective history of the Unity of Brethren that drew heavily on Comenius’s accounts of the persecutions in Bohemia’ (Atwood, 2013, p.129). Atwood shows how the history of the church relied on the works of Comenius, Grandin and Cranz, with each subsequent historical account relying on the same sources that they had used.

There has been and there still is a lot of debate, between both members inside the church and academics on the outside, about the nature of the links between of the Unity of Brethren and Zinzendorf’s renewed church. Atwood argues that Muller’s history of 1883 was the first to acknowledge that ‘the church’s claim to apostolic episcopal succession was unfounded’ (Atwood, 2013, p.138). Atwood states that the Czech historians had found little or no connection between the Unity of Brethren and Zinzendorf’s renewed church at Herrnhut (Atwood, 2013, p.138). Joseph Müller, a German historian, and a member of the Moravian Church, who later became the archivist at Herrnhut, was tasked by the church’s synod to examine the history of the Brethren in Czechoslovakia (Atwood, 2013, p.138). Muller ‘examined the question of Zinzendorf as the renewer of the Brethren’s church, the only common element he could find between the old and new Brethren was the importance of community’ (Atwood, 2013, p.139).

Atwood states that after Muller’s study, interest in the history of the Bohemian Brethren declined in Germany where historical writing became focused on Zinzendorf and the Moravian missions. (Atwood, 2013, p. 139).

The situation in Britain was different, as was highlighted in the April 1939 edition of The Moravian Messenger (the official magazine of the Moravian Church in the British province). Cyril Forster, an English Moravian minister (settlement location not mentioned), asked, ‘Where do we stand as Moravians?’ questioning whether the Moravian Church could indeed draw on a continuous history from 1457. He stated that the present Moravian Church could not be placed in the same category as the 1457 church, and no one comparing attitudes and practice would
dream that they were the same church (*Moravian Messenger*, 1939, p. 42). His opinion is that the church should do one of two things, ‘1. Drop all this ancient church founded in 1457 and define the Moravian Church as that which was founded in 1722 by Zinzendorf’ and 2. ‘To act as if we really are the true survival of the Ancient church’ (*Moravian Messenger*, 1939, p. 42).

Ockbrook resident retired minister Fred Lanyard suspects that the emphasis that the American and British provinces placed upon the ancient church was partly to do with the wish to move away from German influence (Lanyard in Peucker, 2010, p. 23). Moravian historian Peter Vogt takes a similar view stating that ‘it is critical for the Moravian Church leadership to acknowledge the fact that Moravian history is made up of two parts, two distinct periods’ (Vogt, 2013, p. 17).

In his analysis of the history of Moravians in England, historian Colin Podmore concludes that what is known as the Moravian Church today, is essentially the creation of Zinzendorf (Podmore, 2007, p.31). As we will see later, my own archival research on this subject as well as the findings of my contemporary fieldwork in the English Moravian settlements of Fulneck and Fairfield lead me to agree with Colin Podmore on this point. However, as I will demonstrate later in chapter six section 6.4 Perceptions of Moravian history and its relevance today, which discusses my fieldwork findings, this issue continues to be the subject of lively debate today.

Another aspect of the continuity / discontinuity issue is the various names adopted by the international church. Shawe laments the loss of the name United Brethren and its links to the church of 1457 when it was ‘unhappily displaced in common use in England and America by the name ‘Moravians’ (Shawe, 1957, p. 21). Shawe makes it clear that he feels the name ‘Moravian’ lacks the notion of a united brotherhood that the original ‘Unitas Fratrum’ (United Brethren) provided. He states that while both the Czechs and Germans used vernacular versions ‘only in English have we failed, and it seems irreparably, to find a suitable title’ (Shawe, 1957, p. 21). It should be remembered that while Shawe was writing in 1957, the year that the Moravian Church was celebrating its 500th anniversary, the discussion over the use of names continues. It
is true that the name Moravian is often linked to the English-speaking world of the British and North American provinces. However, as Peter Vogt points out, it is also used in the Spanish speaking provinces of Honduras and Nicaragua – Iglesia Morava, and French speaking Switzerland – Eglise Morave (Vogt, 2013, p. 5). Like Shawe, Vogt notes that in the main, in continental Europe vernacular versions of the original ‘Unitas Fratrum’ are used. In the Czech Republic it is Jednota Bratrská, in the Netherlands Broedergemeente, and in Denmark Brodremenigheden. There are then some anomalies, in the Netherlands the name Herrnhutters (double ‘t’ is also used and in German speaking Switzerland Herrnhuter (single ‘t’). In both cases they are references to the birthplace of the reformed church of 1722. In South Africa it is slightly confusing, in English it is the Moravian Church but in Afrikaans it is Broederkerk (Vogt, 2013, p. 5). Finally, there are five different variations in use in Germany depending on the context: (1) when referring to the Ancient Unity of 1457 it is Böhmische Brüder (Bohemian Brothers), (2) when referring to the original group of Moravian exiles it is ‘Mährische Brüder’, (3) when referring to the Herrnhut congregation, it is Herrnhuter, (4) when referring to the present-day Moravian Church, it is Brüdergemeinde, and (5) when referring to the international Moravian Unity, it is Unitas Fratrum (Vogt, 2013, p. 5).

Zinzendorf wanted the Moravian congregations at home and their missions abroad to have a legal standing and protection in the British Empire (Podmore, 1998, p. 231). Zinzendorf had discussions with Oglethorpe, the agent of Thomas Penn. Oglethorpe conceived the idea of promoting a bill, the Naturalisation Bill for the naturalisation of foreign Protestants settled in the American colonies for more than seven years (Podmore, 1998, p. 230). Oglethorpe undertook this unprompted by Zinzendorf or other Moravians, after Zinzendorf had returned to Herrnhut in Germany (Podmore, 1998, p. 231). Podmore argues that because of his actions it was Ogelthorpe’s plan rather than Zinzendorf’s (Podmore, 1998, p. 231). This Bill was passed in
April 1747. Podmore points out that ‘the 1747 Act related only to the naturalization of long-term residents in America’ and that Zinzendorf had no interest in the naturalisation of members of the Moravian Church in England (Podmore, 1998, p. 231).

Moravian communities had a group of supporters in England and the colonies in America. As already mentioned, they had the aid of Oglethorpe, but they also had the support of Thomas Penn the proprietor of Pennsylvania where Moravians predominantly settled in America. In addition, they also had the support of the proprietors of both South Carolina and Maryland (Podmore, 1998, pp. 243-45). The rest of the support for Moravians consisted of the Scottish representative peers, a small number of bishops and the Leicester House group, centred round the Prince of Wales with whom Zinzendorf had managed to cultivate links (Podmore, 1998, p. 249). Podmore states that while the Moravian communities relied on their lawyer and supporters Oglethorpe and the Bishop of Worcester for technical and political advice about parliamentary procedure, much else showed ‘the sure hand of Zinzendorf’ (Podmore, 1998, p. 253). Podmore argues that Moravian success in forming a group of supporters and running a strong campaign combined with the evidence supplied by Zinzendorf allowed them to overcome opposition to the Moravian Bill (Podmore, 1998, p. 256). In May 1749, the Moravian Bill was passed as an Act that ‘allowed Moravians in America to make payment in lieu of military service and Moravians in Great Britain and Ireland as well as America to affirm rather than take the oath on all occasions’ (Podmore, 1998, p. 233).
3.6 Moravian influence on Wesley and the Methodists

In its early years, the Moravian Church was admired by and had influence upon many outside the church, most especially John Wesley. Both Charles and John Wesley first met with the Moravians on a voyage to Georgia in 1735-1736 and it was during the time of the voyage and the time John Wesley spent with Moravians in Georgia that he became aware of the spiritual strength of the Moravians. Firstly, on the voyage, which is a much-quoted event was the powerful storm that struck the ship. While all the English passengers cried out in fear, the Moravians calmly sang hymns together, ‘John Wesley was profoundly impressed by this illustration of spiritual resilience under pressure’ (Randall, 2006 p. 206). The second aspect of Moravian spirituality that deeply impressed Wesley was biblicism, ‘the stress not only on biblical doctrine but also on the practical application of biblical teaching’ (Randall, 2006 pp. 206-207).

For John Wesley, the most influential Moravian was Spangenberg who he met during his stay in Georgia. While there Wesley observed the Moravian way of life first-hand and confirmed his view of them as representing a model of the type of Primitive Christianity that Wesley hoped to cultivate in the colony (Hammond, 2009, p.43). Upon his return to England, he was ready to ‘embrace the Moravian message of assurance of salvation’ (Randall, 2006, p.206). Randall argues that it was this readiness that helped to ignite the Methodist revival (2006, p.206).

Wesley had an admiration of things Moravian. While visiting Herrnhut he was influenced by how hymn singing formed such a large part of Moravian devotional life, most especially ‘Singstunde’ an idea introduced by Zinzendorf to strengthen the congregation via hymn singing (Clarke, 2008, p. 8). Clarke argues that Zinzendorf’s use of hymns and ‘Singstunde’ which was an integral part of Moravian worship and spiritual life ‘was to determine Wesley’s approach to hymnody and its use within the Methodist movement (Clarke, 2008, p. 9).
Other areas of Moravian tradition that Wesley took onboard were the Lovefeast and Band Meetings. The Lovefeast is a simple shared meal of plain cake and water. Clarke states that Wesley’s attraction to this practice ‘lay in the deeply spiritual experience it engendered in many of the participants […] and took inspiration from each other’ (Clarke, 2008, p. 7). The first bands were formed in Herrnhut and were organised by gender and marital status, the first consisted of married men and was formed in 1727, then married women in 1728, then in the same year single women and single men (Schmidt, M. in Watson, 2010, p.12). Membership was voluntary and each band consisted of a small group of people who could discuss issues of faith with total frankness. Within these groups ‘a strict form of mutual examination was practiced’ (Schmidt, M. in Watson, 2010, p.12). Podmore states that the function of the bands had something of the confessional about them and anticipated to some degree modern group therapy” (Podmore in Watson, 2010, pp.12-13).

3.7 The Crisis

Podmore sees the passing of The Moravian Act in 1749 by the British Parliament, which declared the Moravian Church ‘an Ancient Protestant Episcopal Church’, as ‘the climax of the initial period of the Moravians’ history in England’ (Podmore, 1998, p.266). However, 1750 saw the start of a period of anti-Moravian feeling emerging in Britain, and different aspects of Moravian belief and practices were used against them by their various detractors. This was to change how those outside the church perceived them and impacted on the outward facing image that the Moravian Church wished to present. For some, it was the suggestion of sexual promiscuity amongst the Brothers and Sisters (Peucker, 2015, pp. 122-123), while others attacked the use of Zinzendorf’s blood and wounds imagery in Moravian hymns (Peucker, 2007, p. 61). For example, the fixation with the side wound of Christ portrayed as a place where the believer is at home and can go to sleep was an image that often came under attack (Peucker,
Initially, these feelings were expressed via pamphlets attacking the Moravians and other non-conformist churches (Podmore, 1998, p.266). The first serious attack came from The Contents of a Folio History of the Moravians, published by a Methodist in 1750, though definitely not Wesley (Podmore, 1998, p. 266). However, when Bishop Sherlock of London read it in January 1751, he said it contained nothing new to him, ‘and that such tracts would do little harm to the Moravians in England’ (Podmore, 1998, p.267). After this, the attacks became more direct with the publication of John Roche’s Moravian Heresy in 1751 in Dublin. Podmore concludes that Roche’s publication was used by the Irish Church establishment as a tool to condemn Moravian practices and beliefs, given that the book was supported by two of the Irish archbishops, nine other bishops, nine deans, and six archdeacons (Podmore, 1998, p.268 and Roche, 1751, book subscribers list). Podmore agrees with Stead and Stead that Henry Rimius’s 1753 publication Candid Narrative of the Rise and Progress of the Herrnhuters was the most damning (Podmore, 1998, p.269, Stead and Stead 2003, p.70). Rimius’s attacks on the Moravian Church had the financial support of bishops Lavington and Sherlock, and nine other bishops, and the Lord Chancellor (Podmore, 1998, p. 285). In addition, former supporters Wesley and Whitefield supplied copies of documents to Rimius as did one of Wesley’s itinerant preachers Charles Perronet (Podmore, 1998, pp. 285 - 286). Rimius argued that Zinzendorf had borrowed a denomination for his own purposes (Rimius, 1753, p.70). The aim of Rimius’s attack was to get the 1749 Moravian Act repealed. He argued that parliament had been deceived, thus the Act had been passed under false pretences, and that Zinzendorf and the Elders of the church posed a danger to the State (Podmore, 1998, p. 269). Sources suggest that the Moravian leadership did not grasp the severity of the attacks. While the attacks were discussed at the Provincial Conference at Lyndsey House (Zinzendorf’s London residence) in May 1754, the Moravian leadership felt the ‘attacks in the press are best left unanswered.’\footnote{Minutes of the Provincial Conferences and Synods of the Moravian Brethren in England, May 1754, page 25, John Rylands library MS1054.} Even though
charges that they were ‘not genuine Moravians [...] and had deceived Parliament’ had been laid against them by Whitefield, (Methodist and former supporter of the Moravians), the leadership of the English Moravian Church chose to take no action.\(^\text{10}\) Peucker examines the series of events that culminated in the fall in the popularity of the Moravian Church.

Members of the Moravian Church referred to this crisis as the ‘Sifting Time’, ‘a time when Satan tried to sift the church’ (Peucker, 2007, p. 52). While this ‘Sifting Time’ started in 1750, Peucker argues that its seeds were sown in the hymns ‘the songs of The Sifting’ earlier in the mid 1740’s (Peucker, 2007, pp. 55-56). Peucker claims that Moravians saw these hymns as a representation of their relationship with God, an expression of The Sifting Time and in a way The Sifting Time itself (Peucker, 2015, p. 93). He notes that all references to the hymns of the Sifting were blanked out from the diary of the Moravian Theological Seminary in Marienborn (Peucker, 2007, p.57). He could not find references to these hymns in the printed hymnals, and sources to the Sifting hymns were from outside the Moravian Church. In a letter to Zinzendorf, Steinhofer, a Lutheran minister, described them as ‘songs and tunes that are derived from carnal merrymaking and secular disgrace and are invented by Satan’ (Peucker, 2007, p.57).

Peucker notes that during the crisis of 1750, many of the anti-Moravian pamphlets contained the texts of hymns supposedly sung by the Moravians. Until recently, there was no reason to believe that they were genuine. A small hand-written hymn book was found at the Moravian archives in Herrnhut, proving them to be authentic Moravian hymns from the Sifting Time (Peucker, 2007, p.58). However, Peucker is rather vague about who and when, simply stating it was found ‘a few years ago’ (Peucker, 2007, p.58), though the time of the writing of the hymn book was between 9\(^{th}\) July – 23\(^{rd}\) August 1749 (Peucker, 2007, p.58).

\(^{10}\) Minutes of the Provincial Conferences and Synods of the Moravian Brethren in England May 1754, page 20, John Rylands library MS1054, page 20
It was the words and actions of Zinzendorf’s son, Christian Renatus, that drew particular attention to the practices of members of the Moravian Church. At Herrnhaag (a Moravian settlement north of Frankfurt am Main) on the 2nd of May 1748, Christian Renatus introduced the wearing of a white robe for men. Peucker states that this was the male equivalent of a wedding dress. This and other ‘special garments’ were worn during the activities of the Sifting (Peucker, 2015, p.61). In addition, Christian Renatus allegedly encouraged ‘childlike behaviour, playfulness, silliness and anti-intellectualism’ among the congregation. Peucker argues that these were crucial aspects of the Sifting Time and would eventually lead to sexually related incidents (Peucker, 2015, p. 61). The ceremony at Herrnhaag on the 6th of December 1748 opened the door to these incidents when Christian Renatus declared ‘the single brothers at Herrnhaag were no longer to consider themselves men, but from then on all would be sisters’ (Peucker, 2015, p.107). Peucker sums up the consequences of this – ‘The differences between the genders ceased to exist. The strict division of a Moravian congregation into choirs based on gender and marital status became obsolete’ (Peucker, 2015, p.118). This problem was further heightened when at the same ceremony Christian Renatus absolved all the single brothers from sins both past and future and thus they could ‘engage in any act previously considered sinful’ (Peucker, 2015, p.128). After the crisis of 1753 members of the Moravian Church were regarded as ‘fraudulent’, ‘immoral’, ‘unorthodox’, and ‘dangerous’ by former supporters like Whitefield (Podmore, 1998, p.289, Stead and Stead, 2003, p. 71). On 23rd March 1755 Zinzendorf left England for the last time, having lived there continuously since August 1751 (Podmore, 1998, p. 283). Zinzendorf played a significant role in the development of the Moravian Church in England. He was involved in the choice of site and design of Fulneck (Stead, 1999, pp. 8-10). In July 1749 he used Fulneck as his English base (Stead, 1999, p. 15). Podmore argues that his departure marked ‘a more complete break in the Moravians’ history in England even more than the crisis of 1753’ (Podmore, 1998, p. 283). This move changed the way the Moravian Church as an international organisation would develop, with Zinzendorf no longer in England. Lyndsey
House would not as intended become the international headquarters for the church and England would not be the Moravian Church’s centre (Podmore, 1998, p. 283).

3.8 Rebuilding and New Identity

The traumatic effects of the Sifting Time gave Moravians time to reflect on the teachings and identity of the Moravian Church. After Zinzendorf’s death in 1760, the Moravian Church as a whole underwent a process of change where they were willing to abandon anything that connected them to ‘radical’ religion (Peucker, 2015, p. 168). August Gottlieb Spangenberg (1704-1792), Zinzendorf’s successor, brought about a new period apologising for Zinzendorf’s actions and changing or destroying that which did not agree with the reinvented image of the Moravian Church post Zinzendorf (Peucker, 2012, p.170). While Christian Renatus was a major actor in the Sifting Time, Peucker argues that Zinzendorf’s fault was his failure to see the consequences of his earlier radical teachings, defending his theology and blaming others for its misinterpretation or abuse (Peucker, 2015, p. 163). Atwood states that Spangenberg wanted to reassure people, especially those that were sympathetic to the Moravian Church or supported the Moravian missions, that the Moravian Church was an orthodox Protestant church rather than a Zinzendorfian sect. To do this, he set about to ‘define or redefine Moravian doctrine … by blunting the radical edge of Moravian thought and practice’ (Atwood, 2010, p.55). Peucker claims that the guiding principle for Spangenberg’s biography of Zinzendorf was that it may contain ‘nothing but the truth but certainly not the whole truth’ (Peucker, 2012, p.176). Furthermore, anything controversial or embarrassing was left out, so that the result ‘was not objective rendering of the life of the controversial count’ (Atwood, 2010, p.63). In addition to this, Peucker notes that after Spangenberg’s completion of Zinzendorf’s biography, all notes, diaries, copies of diaries and other working papers used for the biography were destroyed by David Nitschmann, leaving nothing that could contradict the image of Zinzendorf that Spangenberg
had created (Peucker, 2012, p.184 and p.197). The destruction of documents was not just limited to Spangenberg’s biography of Zinzendorf. Peucker argues that there was a systematic removal and destruction of material, documents that did not fit the reinvented image of the Moravian Church of the post Zinzendorf era (Peucker 2012, p.170). This started with Zinzendorf’s and his wife, Anna Nitschmann’s, papers and the removal and destruction of anything that could be deemed controversial or damaging to the church (Peucker, 2012, pp.177-178). Through its ‘specially appointed revisers’ (Peucker, 2012, p.170) the church continued the destruction of papers in a conscious effort to distance itself from Zinzendorf. The synod of 1764 decided that the revisers should continue their work, and a further destruction of archives took place from 1764 to 1796, such was the fear of anything embarrassing becoming public knowledge. This purge covered letters, diaries, confessions and testaments, which were either destroyed or heavily censored (Peucker, 2012, pp.181-184). A final purge was undertaken by Suter (archivist at the Unity Archives) between 1801 and 1811. This was retrospectively considered a disaster at the Unity Elders Council of 1818 when it was realised that Suter had no real interest in the archives and made decisions himself on what was to be destroyed (Peucker, 2012, pp. 192-195). Peucker sees this period of destruction as the way in which Zinzendorf’s successors shaped the future by controlling the past through the destruction of a selection of historical sources and the management of archives. Peucker states after the destruction ‘the transformation of the church was comprehensive and covered most aspects of the church’ (Peucker, 2015, p. 158), there was nothing left that did not fit with or contradict the new public image of the Moravian Church (Peucker, 2015, p. 158).

As a means of bringing Moravian communities together, the church set about introducing special services to the congregations throughout all the Moravian communities that eventually developed into established traditions. One of the earlier examples of this was the introduction of
a service held in the graveyard to remember those who died that year (Peucker, 2010, p.11). Peucker argues that this service linked the present to the past and helped to develop the settlements into ‘sites of memory’ (Peucker, 2010, p.11). Mason agrees that the promotion, change or invention of ceremonies celebrating landmarks in the history of the Moravian Church on so-called ‘memorial days’ played a “vital role in cementing a sense of solidarity between members throughout the world” (Mason, 2001, p.8). The role of celebrations, pageants, and other methods of projecting ideas of being Moravian will be discussed further in the analysis of my contemporary fieldwork and archival research.

Such special services helped to reunite the church’s congregations, British Moravians ‘saw themselves as a select family especially chosen by their saviour’11. However, something else other than the control of the past was needed to change public perception of the Moravian Church, and perhaps more importantly for the Moravian Church, how other Christians perceived the effect of the reforms which the church had adopted. Mason argues that the difficulty of recruiting members for the Moravian Church in England led it to focus on foreign missions ‘converting the heathen overseas’ (Mason, 2001, p.27). This new missionary zeal was driven from Herrnhut, whereas the English Moravians in London were reluctant to promote these overseas activities (Mason, 2001, p. 28). In order to bring their missionary work to the attention of a wider audience, a history of the Greenland mission was published in 1767. However, Moravians were at this time still often seen as objects of ridicule. So, reviews in London magazines such as Gentleman’s Magazine and Critical Review often took a satirical swipe at them (Mason, 2001, p.43). Mason shows the growing sphere of influence that Moravian missionary work had on others, for example the formation of Baptist mission societies in 1792

---

11 Excerpt from Memorabilia 1777, Muswell Hill archives FLF-21 in Mason, 2001, p. 8
and the involvement of people such as John Newton and William Wilberforce. Mason argues that this influence on the missionary work of others was an “indication of the steady improvement of the church’s standing” (Mason, 2001, p.62). This influence was not lost on the leaders of the Church of England who were aware of the Moravian missionary work in the West Indies and regarded their approach as the way forward (Mason, 2001, p.90). The London Missionary Society and The Baptist Missionary Society credited the Moravians with “making real converts to Christianity” (Mason, 2001, p.145). Both societies followed the Moravian approach to setting up missions and made sure that their missionaries read the Moravian works on missionary teaching (Mason, 2001, p.141 and p.172). Mason states that between 1760 and 1792 the Moravian Church became “the generally recognised authority in the field of foreign missions” (Mason, 2001, p.193) and that they had a real influence on the English missionary awakening (Mason, 2001, p.196).

3.9 The Moravian communities in England’s move to independence

Another step on the road to recovery was the realisation by the Moravian Church’s leadership in Germany of the need for an English leader for the Moravian communities in England. So, in 1768, Spangenberg appointed Benjamin La Trobe as leader of the British Province (Mason, 2001, p. 45). This appointment was a positive change in Herrnhut’s attitude towards the Moravian communities in England as the relationship had not always been a good one. Indeed, there had been tension between the English Moravians and their German leaders from the start. As early as 1743, Richard Viney, who along with James Hutton, were the first Englishmen entered on the Moravian Register at Fetter Lane in 1738 (Stead and Stead, 2003, p. 61), had a dispute with Friedrich Neißer, who was the (German) leader of the church in England. The subject of this dispute were the rules which govern the labourers (church workers) ‘under which
he cannot work [...] rules that crept in unannounced through a door into the church”\textsuperscript{12}. Neißer called Viney’s comments a rebellion and later commented ‘that only the mercy of God had prevented a complete breach between the English congregations and their German leadership’ (Podmore, 2002, p.38). A more serious fallout between Viney and Spangenberg occurred in October 1743 when Viney complained of ‘an ungodly use of the lot in church’, and the arbitrary church government which ‘lays a yoke upon them greater than the law of Moses’. The lot consisted of three slips of paper: one ‘Yes’, one ‘No’ and one blank. If a blank was drawn, the lot was retaken as the blank was seen as an indication that either the wrong question had been asked or that it was not the right time to ask the question. Viney objected to Zinzendorf’s proceedings and likened him to the Pope and claimed that ‘the Moravian Church is wicked’\textsuperscript{13}. Spangenberg replied to Viney listing all his objections and refuting them stating ‘the ways of our church are a hard yoke for some; those who wish to be something, or who covet riches, or like the ease of this life’ and finished the letter ‘and this is all I have to say to you at present’\textsuperscript{14} This attack on Zinzendorf and the church could not be tolerated (Podmore, 2007, p. 39) and Spangenberg, Toltschig, Holland, Hutton and Bell wrote to Viney saying he was against the church. Zinzendorf had asked him ‘not to come to any of their private church meetings’\textsuperscript{15} thus Viney was excommunicated from the church. Viney’s final letter in this exchange stated that while he would have happily served any punishment meted out to him, the excommunication was too much\textsuperscript{16}. However, this conflict did not end there, a lot was drawn condemning Viney as a Satan. The English members then had to choose submission to Zinzendorf and the German leadership or face expulsion from the church. They succumbed, and the rebellion was over

\textsuperscript{12} Letter, Viney to Neißer, John Rylands library MS1063/24
\textsuperscript{13} Letter, Viney to Spangenberg, John Rylands Library MS1063/31
\textsuperscript{14} Letter, Spangenberg to Viney, John Rylands Library MS1063/26
\textsuperscript{15} Letter Spangenberg, Toltschig, Holland, Hutton, and Bell to Viney, John Rylands Library MS1063/30
\textsuperscript{16} Letter Viney to Spangenberg, John Rylands Library MS1063/32
The final word, a step too far for some, came from Zinzendorf on 20th of February 1744:

‘I hereby declare [...] that I will have nothing more to do with all the so-called English Brethren who have become mixed up in Viney’s rebellion [...] I mock their national righteousness in matters relating to salvation [...] If the English can and will do without us, you German Brethren will be welcome [in Germany] if you all come back at once. Only when the English want to become entire servants of Christ [...] will we wish to find England again [...] These are my thoughts, and I wish my name to be erased from the list of English labourers [...] until all those who have been in complicit in the late rebellion, even those who only belonged to it in spirit acknowledge [...] in writing that they have been deceived by Satan’
(letter Zinzendorf to the English Moravians R13 A5 69 Herrnhut archives in Podmore, 2007, p. 39)

While many of the English Moravians sent letters of apology to Zinzendorf, others left the church. This included the high-profile William Holland, who was the first elder of the London congregation, Viney’s replacement as warden of the Yorkshire congregation and signatory to the excommunication letter. According to Podmore, there is evidence that the church continued ‘to lose English members unable to accept its authoritarianism’ (Podmore, 2007, p. 40).

Another source of controversy and conflict between Moravian Provinces in different countries was the extensive use of the lot as part of decision-making processes. The English Moravian communities were more critical of the use of the lot, and this set them apart from Moravian communities on the continent. Richard Viney was objecting to the use of the lot for decision making as early as October 1743. He sent a letter to Neißer where he complained that rules ‘under which he cannot work’ had been imposed on the labourers. Furthermore, he stated that
they had ‘crept in unawares through the church door’. Spangenberg replied calling him ‘a false brother’ and that he ‘had fled his flock’ (a reference to his senior position with the Yorkshire Moravians). Viney wrote to Spangenberg stating that his expulsion was too harsh and that he would seek the Saviour’s help in re-joining the church. While the use of the lot was not unusual in eighteenth century religious circles, it had a particularly dominant role within practices associated with the Moravian Church (Podmore, 1998, p.125). This dominance was further compounded when at the synod of 1741, Christ was elected by lot to be the chief elder of the Moravian Church. Thus, these decisions effectively became understood as the voice and true will of the Saviour (Sommer, 1998, pp.267-269). However, its use was to become one of the most contested practices within different national branches of the Moravian Church. The leadership as a whole feared that the lot was losing its legitimacy amongst the Brothers and Sisters (the term used by members of the Moravian community to refer to each other). Members of Moravian communities in England objected to the manner in which it was used, especially by its overuse in trivial matters (Podmore, 1998, p.125). However, the area in which its use was most questioned was regarding marriage. When a Brother declared a wish to marry and had not proposed a person, the Elders would propose one for him. This suggestion would then be put to the lot. If the result was ‘yes’, the Sister could decide for or against the marriage, so that the Sister would only marry if she wished. If the result was ‘no’, that was the end of it, no matter how much the two wanted to marry. A letter from Br. Dohna, congregation labourer and director of schools at Fulneck, to the Elders conference in 1773 reflects doubts in the legitimacy of this practice. In this letter, Dohna states that the use in marriage no longer completely suited their time and that people no longer gave themselves as simply to the will of the Saviour as before (Sommer, 1998, p.277). However, despite this critique, there is also evidence that its use in

17 Viney to Neißer, Richard Viney’s Letters, John Rylands Library, MS 1063/24
18 Spangenberg to Viney, Richard Viney’s Letters, John Rylands Library, MS 1063/26
19 Viney to Spangenberg, Richard Viney’s Letters, John Rylands Library, MS 1063/32
20 Display about the use of the Lot at Fairfield museum.
marriage continued in Moravian communities in England. For instance, Mellowes states that at Fairfield marriages were still arranged in this manner in the early nineteenth century (Mellowes, 1977, pp. 39-40). There was growing pressure from both the American and British Provinces put upon the governing body at Herrnhut regarding its use for decision making. Alongside this was internal pressure from the members of the different Moravian communities within the provinces. The American province removed the need to use it for marriage except for officials of the congregations in 1818 (Sommer, 1998, p.277). One year later at the Fulneck Elders Conference held on 24th September the resolution that the use of the lot in marriage was optional was passed.\textsuperscript{21} The 1847 Provincial Conference held at Fairfield still raised issues concerning its use, the conference agenda shows several items related to the use of the lot.\textsuperscript{22} The issues discussed at this conference indicate some weakening in the official position: it was no longer deemed necessary to authenticate the marriages of congregational members by lot and it was agreed only by a narrow majority to continue the practice for ordained members. It was not until 1856 and the independence from German control that the Moravian Church in England finally ended its use (Stead and Stead, 2003, p.87).

The Brotherly Agreement ‘was neither a creed nor a doctrinal thesis, it set a pattern for Christian living in everyday affairs as well as in relationship with the church’ (Fries, 1973, p. 57). It was a set of rules and regulations that governed settlement life, which was drawn up by Zinzendorf on May 12\textsuperscript{th}, 1727, at Herrnhut. However, its strict enforcement brought about issues other than the use of the lot. As society outside the settlements changed, beliefs about individual choice and human reason became increasingly influential within the settlements questioning ‘the willingness to subordinate individual desires to the good of the whole’ (Sommer, 1994, p.224).

\textsuperscript{21} Minute Book of Fulneck Elders Conference 6/5/1819-5/6/1823, Fulneck Archives FUL/10/43
\textsuperscript{22} Minutes of the Provincial Conferences and Synods of the Moravian Brethren in England 1802 – 1856, John Rylands library MS1078
For example, one of the requirements that was questioned and had a dramatic effect on daily and family life was the separation of the sexes. Living in a community was a key point of Moravian life. Planned settlements like Fulneck and Fairfield were based, not as one would expect on Herrnhut, which had grown haphazardly, but on Herrnhaga, the first planned settlement in Germany established in 1738 (Podmore, 1998, p. 137).

Table 1 (see section 3.2) shows the five planned settlements established over a period of forty-one years in the British Province, though only one, Gracehill is outside England. The English settlements are situated in the Midlands and North of the country. Though these communities may seem isolated from each other my archival research shows a considerable volume of movement / visiting between the settlements. This will be discussed in detail in the chapter on the two settlements of Fulneck and Fairfield.

The system for planned communal living was called the Choir System. In all the settlements community members were segregated by age, gender and marital status and housed in separate buildings where they worked, ate, and worshipped together (Sommer, 1994, p.225). Sommer explains the reason for this separation was two-fold: firstly spiritual, Zinzendorf believed that spiritual expression was different according to age and gender, thus separation into peer groups would promote spiritual growth; and secondly physical, separate living quarters removed the danger of temptation (Sommer, 1994, p.225). These groupings were called ‘choir houses’ and existed for children, youths, single men, single women, married couples and widows and widowers (Stead, 1999, p.34). The transition from one choir to another was marked by a ceremony. Each member wore a choir ribbon which identified the choir they belonged to.
Women wore them under their caps and men tied them to their shirt collars (Peucker, 2015 p. 22).

Reservations about these restrictions placed on relationships between the Brothers and Sisters surfaced at the provincial Conference of 1842, where they were regarded as inappropriate (Stead and Stead, 2003, p. 90). Members argued that ‘the entire system of division into choirs should be abandoned’ (Stead and Stead, 2003, p. 90). Sommer states that the communal ideal of the settlement system was threatened by ‘four basic elements of human nature and society: ties of family, ties of friendship, economic self-interest and last but certainly not least, sex’ (Sommer, 1994, p. 228).

However, the records of the 1847 Provincial Conference held at Fairfield clearly show that the Brotherly Agreement was still an important part of life in the settlement system. Discussions took place on subjects relating to life in the settlement, such as attendance at church services and meetings, and the morals and conduct of the members. The resolutions passed show how seriously the Elders viewed such issues. For example, for non-attendance without good reason - expulsion; the keeping of low morals and sexual misconduct – expulsion; owning a public house – expulsion23. However, Stead and Stead argue that ‘secularisation was corroding the original idea of the settlements and that the plan was no longer working as intended […] all the changes in the system were so well established they inevitably progressed towards an independent denominational character’ (Stead and Stead, 2003, p. 107-8).

---

23 Minutes of the Provincial Conferences and Synods of the Moravian Brethren in England 1802 – 1856, John Rylands library MS1078
Atwood states that many of the English Moravian Church’s leaders wanted to reduce the amount of control that the leadership of the Moravian Church in Germany had over the Moravian Church in England, and they worried about ‘forced Germanisation’ (Atwood, 2013, p.141). In my archival research, I found evidence that there was agitation amongst English Moravians for a move to independence. For example, an anonymous contributor to the 1855 edition of the official church magazine *The Moravian Messenger* called for English Moravians to ‘throw off the yoke of Germanism’ (*Moravian Messenger*, 1855, vol 3, p.439, Church House Muswell Hill). This was taken further when the 1856 Fulneck conference confirmed that the British province was from then onwards in reality a separate denomination (Stead and Stead, 2003, p. 108)\(^\text{24}\). The conference also proposed that the issue should be taken to the General Synod in Germany in 1857 where virtual autonomy was granted to the British province (Stead and Stead, 2003, p. 108-9). In 1908 the British Church officially changed its name to The Moravian Church. Until then it had been The Church of the United Brethren (Stead and Stead, 2003, pp. 126-127). *The Moravian Messenger* of 1912 stated on the 1908 change of name that ‘the British Province has become more British’ (*Moravian Messenger*, 25\(^\text{th}\) January 1912, p. 213, Church House Muswell Hill).

\section*{3.10 The World Wars}

It is ironic that six years after the change of name, Britain was at war with Germany and its ally, the Austro-Hungarian Empire of which Moravia was then a part. The new name was now an embarrassment and *The Moravian Messenger*, which is the official monthly news magazine for the Moravian Church in the British Province, went to great lengths to point out it was not a foreign church. *The Moravian Messenger* of 28\(^\text{th}\) November 1914 stated, ‘The Moravian Church

\[\text{\footnotesize\(^24\) Fulneck Elders Conference Minute Book 1847-1857, Fulneck Archives FUL/10/46}\]
is a thoroughly British Church’ and noted that many enrolling in the armed forces were stating Church of England as opposed to Moravian (Moravian Messenger, 28th November 1914, p.374). Again, the 12th December 1914 issue declared that ‘British Moravians are British to the backbone (Moravian Messenger, 12th December 1914, p.403).

The Moravian Messenger of 9th January 1915 reported a wave of anti-British feeling being whipped up by the German press. The American reporter, C. N. Wheeler, covering the war for his newspaper stated, ‘it is the essence of malignity and malevolence of a racial hate’ (Moravian Messenger. 1915. pp. 4-5). The Moravian Messenger's editorial worried how many German Moravians supported this hate and noted that some anti-English feeling had been printed in The Herrnhut. However, this worry was somewhat countered in the 23rd January edition that reported that the German paper Christliche Welt urged German Christians to think before yielding to the hate of England (Moravian Messenger. 1915. p. 28). However, by 1916 reports of anti-English sermons by Lutheran ministers reached The Moravian Messenger. According to The Moravian Messenger Pastor Zoebel preaching in the great Lutheran church in Leipzig stated that the war ‘is a Divine mission to punish a wicked world […] that a heart full of gratitude should be felt when our guns bear down on the children of Satan, there ought to be no compromise with Hell and no mercy for the servants of Satan’ (Moravian Messenger, 1916, p. 19). In the same year, The Messenger also reported that in Berlin, Pastor Philippi preached ‘as the Almighty allowed his son to be crucified, that the scheme of redemption might be accomplished, so Germany is destined to crucify humanity in order that its salvation be secured’ (Moravian Messenger, 1916, p. 20).
Alongside the fear of being viewed as foreign was the worry as to whether the international unity of the church would survive the war, and whether it could be rebuilt after the war. In July 1915, the British Moravian Church asked, ‘will the British and German Moravians be able to work together again?’ (Moravian Messenger, 1915, pp. 209-210). In November of the same year The Moravian Messenger reported that ‘the unity is close to breaking point and that Germany had lost the confidence of the British people’ (Moravian Messenger, 1915, p. 370). By 1916, the British Moravian Church was worried not only by the international unity of the church but also the continued existence of the Moravian Church in Britain. The major issues the leadership of the British Moravian Church envisaged for the post war period were the difficulties in working once again with the German Moravians and restarting mission work (Moravian Messenger, 1916, pp. 27-29). The issue published on the 26th of May 1917 included a debate on whether the name should be changed to International Church of the Brethren, which did not happen (Moravian Messenger, 26th May 1917, p.124).

After the war, there was a reticence on the part of the British Province (the Moravian Church in the United Kingdom) to reopen dialogue with the German Moravian Church as opposed to the Continental Province (the Moravian Church in Germany, Denmark, Netherlands, Sweden, and Switzerland) as a whole, due to ‘the deep-rooted anti-German feeling in Britain and its colonies’ (Moravian Messenger. 1919. pp. 47-48). On the other hand, an article in the German equivalent of The Messenger, The Herrnhut urged ‘don’t throw away the unity’ and wrote of ‘trying to have a friendly intercourse, after having for so long murdered, starved and harried one another and to try to love the brethren on either side as of old’ (The Herrnhut quoted in The Moravian Messenger, 1919, p. 43). The first post-war British provincial synod was held at Fulneck in August 1919 and there was a need for reassurance that the Moravian Church worldwide were of one mind regarding ‘the events that have made the civilised world shudder’ (Stead and Stead,
However, not all agreed on this point. In the June 1919 edition of *The Moravian Messenger*, Br. Robinson stated that his sole concern ‘was the survival of the Moravian Church in Britain as a completely independent denomination’ (*Moravian Messenger*, 1919, p. 76 cited in Stead and Stead, 2003, p. 145). Stead and Stead note that there were others who sympathised with the separatist point of view but did not gain much support at the synod (Stead and Stead, 2003, p. 145). Furthermore, in the July 1919 edition there was not much support for opening a discussion about the Unity with Germany thinking ‘the very fact of such discussions would be fatal’ (*Moravian Messenger*, July 1919, p. 63).

The church worked on reconciliation and communication between the British Province and the Continental Province. The Church Yearbook for 1921 reported that the Czechoslovakian congregations had reclaimed the use of the name Brethren’s Unity. There were nine congregations when an independent Czechoslovakia was founded in 1921, this grew to ten Czech and five German congregations by the 1930s. In May 1925 Bishop Shawe attended the Continental Provincial Synod and reported on the enthusiasm of the attendees from Germany, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Denmark (Stead and Stead, 2003, p. 150). During the 1930s the British church suggested interchange visits ‘so that British and German Moravians can really get to know and love each other’ (Stead and Stead, 2003, p. 151). There were signs that both British and German members of the Moravian Church were keen to keep the unity alive: in the February 1936 edition of *The Messenger* was a message from the church’s head office in Herrnhut to notify any British Moravian athletes or visitors to the Olympic Games in Berlin that they would receive a cordial welcome in any of the

---

25 Church Year Books 1895 – 1958, West Yorkshire archives WYB392/12/1
German congregations (*Moravian Messenger*, 1936, p. 15). *The Messenger* announced in March 1938 that a pilgrimage was being planned to Herrnhut and other important Moravian sites to take place in August of the same year (*Moravian Messenger*, 1938 pp. 20-21). Again, there was correspondence from Herrnhut welcoming the pilgrims and informing them that during their stay in Herrnhut they would be stopping with members of the Herrnhut congregation (*Moravian Messenger*, 1938, p. 32). The pilgrimage was a success: the British pilgrims reported favourably about their reception and pilgrimage in the October issue of *The Messenger* (*Moravian Messenger*, 1938, p. 113). Also, in the same edition a letter from Herrnhut was published saying they thought the pilgrimage was so successful that they intended to invite the American Moravians to undertake the same pilgrimage (*Moravian Messenger*, 1938, p. 117). These visits and pilgrimages speak more of Moravian global identity than national identity where individual Moravians see themselves part of an international church.

Attitudes to conflict had changed. During the First World War, *The Messenger*’s editorial comment had been pro-war, but this became more muted during the Second World War. As early as 1937, arguments against war were being aired, with the need for people and countries to work together. The January edition included an article by L. Weatherhead (Methodist, officer, and army chaplain in the First World War) stating that ‘the Church should oppose the government’s recruiting campaign’ (*Moravian Messenger*, 1937, p. 10), claiming that ‘in the last war the church became a recruiting platform’ (*Moravian Messenger*, 1937, p. 10). He continued arguing that if the church took the same stance again, it would lose its self-respect and influence completely. Furthermore, Weatherhead claimed that those joining the armed forces were not becoming members of an international police force, but were setting themselves up as judges, prosecutors, and executioners, all rolled into one (*Moravian Messenger*, 1937, p. 10). This article seemed to set the agenda as there followed many articles, both pro-war and anti-war. The October 1939 issue saw it as a moral war, a war of principle (*Moravian Messenger*, 1939.
There were many debates about pacifism and conscientious objectors and ways of serving without being part of the armed forces, for example in the ambulance service and as A.R.P. wardens (Moravian Messenger, 1940, p. 51). As the war progressed, these debates continued. The Moravian Messenger of July 1940 reported on the plight of conscientious objector W. J. Lee whose appeal failed and was told ‘to be ready to start his non-combatant service’. Lee refused, arguing ‘that any type of service as part of the war effort condones the war’. He was arrested and sent to prison (Moravian Messenger, 1940, pp. 79-81). As early as March 1941, The Moravian Messenger was asking what kind of post-war church the congregations wanted and a questionnaire was sent out (Moravian Messenger, 1941, p. 27). Debate about the shape of a post-war Moravian Church increased and in the September 1943 of The Messenger four pages were devoted to the future of the post-war church (Moravian Messenger, 1943, pp. 66-69).

In contrast to the attitudes of the men enlisting in the 1914-18 war, new recruits were complaining that ‘Moravian’ was not included as an option on the list specifying their religious identity (Moravian Messenger, 1939, p. 77). Even so, there was still controversy over the name ‘Moravian’ and its foreign sound. As in the First World War, there were demands that it should be changed. One correspondent suggested it be changed to ‘The Brethren’s Church’ or ‘The United Brethren’s Church’ (the use of ‘United’ was proposed to distinguish it from The Plymouth Brethren) (Moravian Messenger, 1943, p. 13). However, the editorial comment in the September 1943 edition argued that the problem over the name seemed only to concern the English, because for Moravians in other countries, the question of nationality did not come up (Moravian Messenger, 1943, p. 67). The same editorial endorsed the idea that The Moravian Church was an international church. It admitted that the chain of Brotherhood was weakened by the First
World War, but did not break, and acknowledged that the church’s internationalism had been wounded in some parts, but not mortally (Moravian Messenger, 1943, p. 67).

Reflecting on these two periods of conflict highlights how the relationship between the British and Continental Provinces of the Unity of the Moravian Church was tested. On both sides of the conflict there were fears that the Unity would not survive, yet there was a determination to make sure that it would. It shows the high esteem in which the unity of the church was held, and that as the results of my contemporary research will reveal is still held today.

3.11 Reconciliation

In November 1945, Bishop Shawe, president of the Moravian International Unity Board, wrote to the German Provincial Board saying that he found ‘everywhere the wish to explore means and ways how the Unity and its work can be maintained and respectively restored’ (Richter, 2007, p. 16). By October 1946, there was talk of a reconciliation of the unity of the church. Moravian communities in both Denmark and the Netherlands wanted to see the unity renewed (Moravian Messenger, 1946, p. 81), and a unity conference was planned to take place in Switzerland (Moravian Messenger, 1946, p. 85). Richter states that after the war ‘the majority of Moravian Church members developed a great sense of international fellowship’ (Richter, 2007, p. 16). He argues that this was owing to the growth of international organisations after the war, most of which were active in social, peacekeeping, or cultural fields and that for people weary of the turmoil of two world wars internationalism became attractive, especially among Christians (Richter, 2007, p. 16-7). There was extensive correspondence with Moravian communities in East Germany, especially from the U.S. and Britain that reflected ‘brotherly love […] no evident anger, criticism, or dissonance’ (Richter, 2007, p. 20). Richter argues that the awareness that
members of Moravian communities in East Germany had of being part of an international community helped them deal with the pressures of living in the newly formed German Democratic Republic (GDR) (Richter, 2007, p. 20). With Herrnhut being located in the German Democratic Republic, and the Herrnhut church and most of the eighteenth-century town centre destroyed by the Soviet army in 1945 (Richter, 2007, p. 10), a new headquarters for the continental province was needed. While the Herrnhut community were able to rebuild their church by 1956 (Atwood, 2020, p. 49), it was no longer possible for Herrnhut to carry out the various financial transactions involved in the running of an international organisation (Atwood, 2020, p. 49). It was fortunate for the Moravian Church that in the 1920s the son of a famous German evangelist named Johann Blumhardt had willed his father’s religious spa at Bad Boll to the Moravians. It was the perfect choice for the location for the new headquarters for the Continental Province. Situated in West Germany, it enabled German Moravians to remain in contact with the Unity and also to establish new Moravian congregations in West Germany (Atwood, 2020, p. 48).

The archives at Fulneck show that contact was maintained not only with Moravian communities in the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) and the GDR, but also with Moravian communities in other countries in the Soviet Bloc from the 1950s to the fall of Communism in 1989. A trip to Germany was organised in 1950 by Brother and Sister Harold Jones of Fulneck for members of the English Moravian Church.\textsuperscript{27} The Fulneck archive holds a collection of postcards that visitors to various Moravian sites had sent back or brought back to Fulneck. These include places like Herrnhut\textsuperscript{28} \textsuperscript{29}, Gnadau\textsuperscript{30} and Kleinwelker\textsuperscript{31} all of which were in the GDR, Fulnek\textsuperscript{32} from where

\textsuperscript{27} Fulneck trip to Germany, Fulneck Archives FUL/27/141
\textsuperscript{28} Collection of post cards and photographs – Herrnhut, Fulneck Archives FUL/27/124
\textsuperscript{29} Collection of post cards and photographs – Herrnhut, Fulneck Archives FUL/27/164
\textsuperscript{30} Collection of post cards and photographs – Gnadau, Fulneck Archives FUL/27/163
\textsuperscript{31} Collection of post cards and photographs – Kleinwelker, Fulneck Archives FUL/27/165
\textsuperscript{32} Collection of post cards and photographs – Fulnek, Fulneck Archives FUL/27/162
Fulneck takes its name and Kunwald,33 where in 1457 the Unity of Brethren were formed by Gregory the Patriarch, both now in the Czech Republic. Over the period 1978 to 1988 members of the Moravian communities in the British Province made such visits. This amount of contact and communication in testing times shows how determined many Moravians were to keep alive the international unity of the church.

3.12 Divided Europe and The Cold War

The process of communication between the different Moravian Churches and settlements in the new post war Europe was a difficult and time-consuming process. In September 1946 Bishop Shawe travelled to Germany (British-occupied zone see figure 1) where he commented on the difficulty of preserving the Moravian Church in Germany (The Moravian Messenger November 1946, p. 99). His journey continued to the British-occupied zone in Berlin (see figure 2) where he reported that all Moravian churches in that zone had been destroyed (The Moravian Messenger, December 1946, p. 109). Bishop Shawe had been able to contact members of the Herrnhut and Niesky settlements both in the Soviet-occupied zone of Germany who were able to travel to Berlin (Soviet-occupied zone see figure 2) and meet with Bishop Shawe who was able to get permission to enter the Soviet Zone (The Moravian Messenger, December 1946, pp. 109-110).

33 Collection of post cards and photographs – Fulnek, Fulneck Archives FUL/27/167
The European church rebuilding project continued. The same issue of *The Moravian Messenger* reports the founding of a new Moravian settlement, Neugnadenfeld, in April 1946 which was a conversion of the former Alexisdorf Prisoner of War Camp on the edge of the Bourtangermoor, a desolate moor landscape in Lower Saxony (*The Moravian Messenger*, December 1946, p110). There are parallels with the founding of Herrnhut, with the first arrivals being refugees and expellees from Western Poland, West Prussia and East Prussia.\(^{34}\) The rehabilitation of Moravian settlements and churches in Germany continued with additional support coming from Sweden and Switzerland (*The Moravian Messenger*, December 1946, p111).

At the beginning of 1947 there was a change in the coverage of the situation of the Moravian church in Continental Europe. From then onwards *The Moravian Messenger* started to focus on the Moravian Church in Czechoslovakia and the disagreement within the church caused by the expulsion of Sudeten Germans (*The Moravian Messenger*, January 1947, p. 8). In a plan to

\(^{34}\) https://neugnadenfeld.ebu.de/
strengthen the relations between the British Province and the Czech Province a series of exchange visits for children were planned (The Moravian Messenger, May 1947, pp. 65-66). The Moravian Messenger continued with its coverage of the difficulties for the Moravian church in the now Soviet controlled sectors of Europe with the loss of the majority of the Silesian congregations due to not only the destruction of the war but also with the expulsion of ethnic German Silesians (The Moravian Messenger, August 1947, pp. 115-116). However, many in the British Province still had a strong desire for continued support for the struggling German (both East and West) and Czech Moravian communities, and the issue was raised at the Provincial Synod held in Bedford with calls for closer links and more meeting with the Continental Province (The Moravian Messenger, September 1949, p. 132).

The difficulties faced by members of Moravian communities in the Soviet Satellite States is highlighted in reports from Moravian churches in the German Democratic Republic. They perceived a lack of spirit amongst the congregation, with not enough ministers, a need for more pastoral care and a lack of finance (The Moravian Messenger, March 1952, pp. 39-42). In contrast to this was the visit to the Konigsfeld Moravian settlement in 1953 organised by Fulneck Moravian Church. A party of seventy left Fulneck on 2nd August 1953 for a two-week trip to the Black Forest area in West Germany. During the tour of the settlement the visitors commented on the similarities of the church to the one at Fulneck, though the Konigsfeld church was all white in colour and much larger. Br La Trobe commented on the Sunday service that ‘it was a great pleasure to see such a large church crowded to capacity, and to learn that this particular Sunday was no exception’ (The Moravian Messenger, October 1953, p. 154). All the visitors agreed that there was a true feeling of Christian fellowship in both the church and settlement (The Moravian Messenger, October 1953, p. 155).

While The Moravian Messenger continued to report on the changing situation in Czechoslovakia throughout the 1950s there was a noticeable decline in the coverage of Germany both East and
West after 1953. The editorial style also changed with reporting becoming less in depth with no opinions on the situation as there had been during both wars and there was an increasing focus on the Moravian church in America. Indeed, stronger links were formed with the American Moravian Church with an exchange of female students from the UK going to the Salem Academy for Girls and Young Women to study and teachers from Bethlehem Pennsylvania coming to Fulneck School (The Moravian Messenger, September 1957, p. 27).

The change in the viewpoint the British Province held for the German Moravian churches is reflected in the view that by 1969 Britain was ‘more than ever, being carried in the wake of American culture’ (Hastings, 1991, p. 517). The impact of the ‘Cold War’ saw the United States as guardian of the ‘Free World’ and Britain’s sphere of influence contracted so much ‘that the coming generation found it difficult to grasp the world that had framed the lives of their parents’ (Robbins, 2008, p.320). The largesse of North America was important to British Christianity, in 1953 Westminster Abbey received an anonymous donation of 100,000 Canadian Dollars and in the same year the Minister of the City Temple, Leslie Weatherhead, set off to America on a speaking tour to raise money for the rebuilding fund. He returned with promises of over half a million US Dollars, of which a major part came from the Rockefellers (Robbins, 2008, pp. 322-323). In July 1954 the British Province purchased numbers 5 and 7 Muswell Hill to convert them into their new headquarters and archives (The Moravian Messenger, March 1955, p. 19). Thus, on a much smaller scale, but equally important the American Province paid for the extension to Church House to house the archives (conversation with archivist, 29th November 2022).
3.13 The Long Sixties

The 1960s were a turning point for Christianity in Britain when church attendance declined and attitudes to religion changed. With Marwick’s notion of the ‘long sixties’ in mind, a period he defines as roughly 1958 to 1974 (Marwick, 2000), how do the arguments of Brown and McLeod regarding the decline in Christianity (Brown, 2001 and 2006 and McLeod, 2005, discussed in the literature review Chapter 1 pp. 32-35) impact upon the Moravian Church? Did the Moravian Church experience significant church growth during the 1950s as Brown argues (Brown 2001, p. 170), followed by a dramatic decline in the 1960s (Brown 2001, p. 170)? At this point I should add that Brown’s argument referred to Christian churches across all denominations, whereas my focus here is on the Moravian Church. Brown explores the decline of women attending church, arguing that during the 1960s many women secularised the construction of their identity and moved away from the church. This started with the decline of girls and young women (12 to 18) being confirmed. Brown states that while confirmation to the Church of England remained strong throughout the 1950s and even into 1960, but 1961 to 1963 saw a steep fall in the numbers of confirmations (Brown, 2001, p. 192). Furthermore, Brown notes that women were still the majority of church goers, however, these were predominantly older, what were missing are girls and young women (Brown, 2001, p. 196). The issue of gender imbalance will be examined in detail in Chapter 4 section 4.15 The Long Sixties, church membership at Fulneck and Fairfield.

How did Moravian communities in England weather the 1960s? The Horton Moravian Reporter (from 1952 to 1956) and The Beacon (from 1963 to 1976) were newspapers that regularly commented on the state of church attendance in the Horton Moravian Church, located six miles from the settlement at Fulneck. The Horton Moravian Recorder reported as early as July 1952
about the decline in church attendance.\textsuperscript{35} Again, in April 1954 it carried an article about how few people attended both the morning and evening services and that many church members worshipped only once a month.\textsuperscript{36} Both reports are contrary to Brown’s argument that the 1950s were some of the best years for the Christian church (Brown, 2001, p.170). From its start, The Beacon spoke out about declining attendance and what should be done about it. In August 1963, the editorial questioned televised religion, including TV programmes like Songs of Praise, ‘as they were drawing people away from church’\textsuperscript{37}, a phenomenon that both McLeod and Brown refer to (Brown, 2006, p. 228 and McLeod, 2005, p. 209). By August 1965 there was a desire for a stronger union with other Christian churches and ‘a need to get together’\textsuperscript{38}. In September of the same year a campaign was launched called ‘Youth and how to keep it and attract it to the church’\textsuperscript{39} due to the decline in attendance at Sunday school, youth clubs and youth organisations such as the Boy’s Brigade and Girl’s Brigade. A further idea to encourage church attendance was to look back to the Moravian past, dispense with so called ‘modern’ religious ideas and regain Moravian identity to go forward and ‘teach the word of Christ again’\textsuperscript{40}. Here, The Beacon commented on the church’s introduction of new forms of religious service to tap into pop and youth culture, a style of worship that earned the name ‘happy clappy’ (Brown, 2001, p. 180). These early reports of a decline in church attendance and involvement in church activities in the 1950s run contrary to Brown’s view of a sudden decline in the 1960s. The impact of this period specifically on Fulneck and Fairfield will be examined in detail in the chapter specific to these two settlements.

\textsuperscript{35} The Horton Moravian Messenger, July 1952, West Yorkshire Archives Bradford WYB75/16/5
\textsuperscript{36} The Horton Moravian Messenger, April 1954, West Yorkshire Archives Bradford WYB75/16/5
\textsuperscript{37} The Beacon, August 1963, West Yorkshire Archives Bradford WYB75/16/6
\textsuperscript{38} The Beacon, August 1965, West Yorkshire Archives Bradford WYB75/16/8
\textsuperscript{39} The Beacon, September 1965, West Yorkshire Archives Bradford WYB75/16/8
\textsuperscript{40} The Beacon, October 1966, West Yorkshire Archives Bradford WYB75/16/9
An area of growth that was initially neglected by many Christian churches was the arrival of African Caribbean immigrants in Britain. Brown argues that the African Caribbean immigration brought predominantly Christian immigrants to English cities (Brown, 2006, p. 255). However, Reverend Clifford Hill wrote in the *Church Times* that many of the London churches were failing the Christian immigrants. He argued that not only were their spiritual needs not being catered for, but also, their existence was being completely ignored (Brown, 2006, p. 255). Furthermore, this neglect brought about the development of Black Christian congregations which would become the most thriving sectors of British Christianity (Brown, 2006, p. 255). Stead and Stead agree with Brown that the Christian churches overlooked the arrival of Christian immigrants stating that the British Province was slow to recognise the significance to the Moravian Church of the influx of people from the area in which they had established missions 200 years previously (Stead and Stead, 2003 p. 214). It is as though the process of missionary work had come full circle, with eighteenth-century Moravian missionaries setting off to the Caribbean Islands and descendants of those they converted coming to Britain bringing a new style of Moravianism with them. This really underlines not only the diversity within the Moravian Church but also the global unity of the church.

There was however an awareness of the situation. The December 1955 edition of *The Moravian Messenger* reported that there was a pamphlet published by the British Council of Churches called ‘Your Neighbour from the West Indies’. The *Messenger* stated ‘we need this equipment of mind and spirit to think and act our own response to the visitors from overseas, some of whom might be our own Moravian Brothers and Sisters (*The Moravian Messenger*, December 1955, p. 91). Several years later Brother Paul Gubi was still asking why there was no Moravian church initiative to contact African / Caribbean Moravians. Furthermore, he stated that there should be a mission to London, Birmingham, Manchester and Liverpool to make contact (*The Moravian Messenger*, August 1958, p. 23). Brother John Berry in a letter to the editor
agreed with Brother Gubi, adding that he felt the Moravian church was ‘failing in its fraternal
duty to our Brothers and Sisters from Jamaica and the other West Indian Islands’ (The Moravian
Messenger, September 1958, p. 19).

The slowness of the British Province to react to the influx of immigrants can be seen in the work
of Br Kirby Spencer championing the African Caribbean Moravians. From the mid-1950s
immigrants from the Caribbean had been settling in Stoke Newington in North London, the
Moravians amongst them seeking out Hornsey Moravian Church where Br Spencer was
minister. While the Hornsey church was accessible for Sunday worship the constraints of work
and location made it difficult for those in Stoke Newington to take an active part in Hornsey
church life. Br Spencer became more and more convinced of the need for a regular meeting in
Stoke Newington. With the help of Br Edwards who lived in the area they set up Stoke
Newington Society and the first meeting was held on Wednesday, 9th November 1960 (Hornsey
Moravian Church, A Short History, 1977, p. 35). The society with the aid of Br Spencer reached
out to other known Moravians who were living, or had lived in the area, in time for the next
meeting. With the growth of the society there was a need for a more permanent space and an
agreement was made with the Methodists and on 14th June 1961, the first meeting was held in
the hall of the Stoke Newington Methodist Church, with 22 people present. The British Province
realised the need for a full-time ministry among overseas Moravians settling in England and Br
Spencer was called to take on this role on 29th July 1962 (Schooling, 1977, p. 36).

Another English city that experienced an influx of African Caribbean Moravians was
Birmingham. In May 2016, I interviewed David Howarth, a former minister at the Moravian
Church in Birmingham, who was able to provide me with some further background information
about the role of immigrants in the formation of the Moravian community in Birmingham.
Howarth told me about the experiences of Br Ashton McIntosh who arrived from Jamaica in
1959 who quickly discovered there was no Moravian Church in Birmingham and most people
had never heard of the Moravians. The nearest church was at Ockbrook in Derbyshire about fifty miles from Birmingham to which Br McIntosh travelled when he could. Br Spencer, now in his new role of working with overseas Moravians, felt more could be done for Moravians settling in the Birmingham area. Br Spencer and Br McIntosh began reaching out to the Moravians from the West Indies who had settled in Birmingham, one of these was Br Paul Gubi recently returned to England after serving in the West Indies.\(^{41}\) According to Howarth it was through Br Gubi’s friendship with Keith Beck the minister at Sparkhill Methodist church that the Birmingham Moravians were able to secure a place of worship. The Methodist congregation in Sparkhill was declining just as the West Indian Moravians were increasing. The Methodists wanted to relocate to somewhere smaller, so the Moravians rented the premises from them from 1963. In January 1964 Br Spencer set up The Moravians from Overseas Group in Birmingham. In addition, he acquired a large house to rent as a meeting hall and as a Moravian centre which was named Birmingham Moravian House. Later in the year he was able to enlist the help of Rev. Paul Misigalo and Br. Robert Nducha both from the Moravian church in Tanganyika who were on study leave in Birmingham (\textit{The Moravian Messenger}, April 1964, pp. 89-90). Br Spencer oversaw the events in Birmingham on a part time basis until 1965 when the Provincial Elders Council appointed Br Gubi as full-time resident minister (\textit{Moravian Messenger}, 2012, p. 26). Brown states that the church in the African / Caribbean community retained strength throughout the 1980s and 1990s (Brown, 2006, p. 292). This argument is also reflected in the Moravian church. Table 5 shows the six largest congregations in the British Province; this includes the four settlement churches of Gracehill, Fulneck, Fairfield and Ockbrook. However, the second largest congregation is the standalone church at Hornsey, London which is predominately African / Caribbean (see Table 5).\(^{42}\)

\(^{41}\) Interview with David Howarth former minister at Birmingham Moravian Church, 20\(^{th}\) May 2016 at Church House Muswell Hill. This interview provides the main source for the whole paragraph.

\(^{42}\) Figures from Moravian Church – British Province Statistics 2016, Church House, Muswell Hill
3.14 Conclusion: The Ongoing Debate

Drawing on evidence gathered through my archival research and my analysis of relevant primary and secondary sources, this chapter has provided an overview of different aspects and understandings of the history of the Moravian Church that have shaped processes of identity formation in English Moravian communities. It has highlighted the resilience of Moravian communities and their ability to recover from periods of crisis. It has become apparent how the leadership of the Moravian Church made considerable efforts to shape Moravian identity on various occasions and was able to unite members of Moravian communities, for example, through the establishment of festivals and traditions, such as the celebration of important dates in Moravian history.

Contemporary aspects of these processes of identity formation will be explored in greater detail in later chapters where I discuss the findings of my contemporary fieldwork.

The next chapter moves on from the general history and background of the Moravian Church in England to a specific focus on the Moravian settlements at Fulneck and Fairfield. This will
explore the foundation and development of the two settlements, their relationship with the Continental Province in general and with Zinzendorf in particular. Furthermore, it will look at the organisational structure of the settlements preparing the way for my contemporary research.

Focusing on the specific cases of the settlements in Fairfield and Fulneck, my archival research at these two settlements will examine the gradual move towards an independent Moravian Church in England from the viewpoints of both the English church and the church leadership at the headquarters in Herrnhut. Through the lens of these two settlements, it investigates how, after two World Wars, the Moravian Church was able to reconcile and preserve its unity that still represents the church today. My contemporary fieldwork conducted at these two communities (discussed in chapter six) will explore contemporary aspects of processes of identity formation among members of these Moravian communities in England, including the importance that members today place upon both Herrnhut and the unity of the church.
Chapter 4. The Two Settlements

4.1 Introduction

Drawing on both archival historical research and contemporary fieldwork, this chapter explores the similarities and differences of the two settlements my research is focusing on: Fulneck near Pudsey in West Yorkshire and Fairfield near Droylsden in Greater Manchester. It is important to understand these differences and similarities as they throw light upon not only the ways in which these two settlements developed, but also how their ‘styles’ of English Moravian identity were formed. This chapter will continue to examine the relationship between the leadership of the English Moravian Church and the governing body of the church at Herrnhut in Saxony, Germany, and how the two settlements were influenced differently by this relationship prior to the independence of the English Moravian Church in 1856. Furthermore, it will examine the contemporary organisation and governance of these two settlements today. In addition, it will look at the ways in which the actual internal layout of the church moved away from what can be described as the ‘European style’ to a style more common to churches in general throughout England.

The most obvious difference between the two is the age of the settlements. Fulneck, the oldest Moravian settlement in England, was founded in 1746 (Stead, 1999, p. 14) and Fairfield thirty-seven years later in 1783 (Mellowes, 1977, p.17). It will become apparent that the foundation dates of the two settlements played an important role in the way they developed and influenced their relationship with each other and with Herrnhut. I will examine how this relationship played a role in the demographic set-up of each settlement. Fulneck’s closer relationship with Moravian communities in continental Europe attracted more international migrants, whereas Fairfield consisted of a greater number of Moravians born in England. Furthermore, it will become...
apparent that the location of the settlements and the way the area around them developed also had an impact on who wanted to live there. This chapter will also examine the organisational structure of the settlements and how the members of the Moravian Church are involved in the decision-making processes not only in the past but also in the present-day.

4.2 The foundation of Fulneck

The story of the discovery of the location for the Fulneck settlement - as it is told by the settlement’s official website at the time of writing - has an air of romanticism about it. In the history of the settlement section legend has it that in 1743, Zinzendorf was on his way to meet with Benjamin Ingham, founder of one of the Yorkshire religious societies that had come under the stewardship of the Moravians. While passing through the Tong valley (near Pudsey) he ‘had such a sweet feeling and deep impression of the place, that he immediately determined it should be the site of the Moravian settlement, similar to that of Herrnhut’ (Fulneck Moravian Church and Museum, n.d.). The area was originally called ‘Fallneck’, Zinzendorf suggested it be called ‘Lambshill’ after the settlement at Herrnhut. However, the name chosen was ‘Fulneck’ an Anglicised version of ‘Fulnek’ where Comenius was a minister (Fulneck Moravian Church and Museum, n.d.). When trying to locate further supporting evidence for this, the archivist at Fulneck explained to me that the Fulneck archives held no documentary evidence of these early visits of Zinzendorf (Fulneck 20th March 2015), which leads one to suspect that this origin story may be a piece of folklore. I made further enquiries at Church House, Muswell Hill, and again, no evidence was found to support the claims this story is based on. However, there is documentary evidence that confirms Zinzendorf did visit Fulneck in 1743 and that the decision to open a settlement in that area was made then. At the Provincial conference held at Fetter

43 Fulneck Moravian Settlement website http://www.fulneck.org.uk/?page_id=20
44 Loose leaf notes re Zinzendorf’s visit to Fulneck 25th February 1743 inserted in List of English Labourers Vol 3. John Rylands Library, MS1067
Lane in London in August 1743 the conference chairman stated that ‘Yorkshire is the place our Saviour believes his church belongs […] Yorkshire is the place where the congregation will be settled’.45

The freehold estate of Fallneck was offered for sale and Zinzendorf authorised its purchase in October 1743. Ingham purchased it on behalf of the Moravian Church in January 1744 for £905 (Stead, 1999, p.10). The foundation stone for the church in Fulneck was laid by the first minister of the church at Fulneck, Johann Töltschig on 10th May 1746 (Stead, 1999, p.14). This event is celebrated each year at Fulneck.46 The first constructions in the building program were the congregation house and church modelled on the eighteenth-century German architectural style. Everything inside including the furniture was plain and white, in line with Zinzendorf’s regard for white as a symbol of purity (Stead, 1999, p.14).

45 Minutes of the Provincial Conferences and Synods of the Moravian Brethren in England 1743-1755, John Rylands Library, MS1054
46 Discussion with the archivist about celebrations at Fulneck 20th March 2015
Figure 3: Traditional interior of a European Moravian Church Fulneck Archives (FUL/ 27/159) Christiansfeld Moravian community, Denmark, postcard late 1980s/early 1990s

Figure 3 is a postcard of the church of the Christiansfeld Moravian community in Denmark, dating from the late 1980s, early 1990s (conversation with Fulneck archivist 7th April 2017). This image forms part of a large collection of postcards and photographs held by the Fulneck archives. This is how Fulneck’s interior would have originally been laid out, with the exception of the position of the organ gallery, which was to be found on the rear elevation, rather than the left elevation. The layout of plain floors, white walls and free-standing benches set out along the length of the rectangular floor plan facing the pulpit on the opposite length is the standard design for Moravian Churches in Europe. The benches were free-standing, so that the church could also function as an open hall. Figure 4 shows the current interior of Fulneck church. The
free-standing white benches have been replaced by traditional fixed dark wood pews and the floor has been carpeted. However, the white walls have been retained - as has the continental orientation - and its general simplicity gives an overall brightness to the interior. According to the archivist at Fulneck, the benches were replaced by pews when a separate meeting hall was built in 1912.

Figure 4: Fulneck Moravian Church (Gordon Hatton n.d.)

As Figures 4 and 5 illustrate, the layout of Fulneck and Gracehill retains the original continental orientation and in addition, Gracehill retains the traditional free-standing benches, though varnished instead of white.
During July 1749 Zinzendorf was in residence at the newly completed congregation house at Fulneck. Zinzendorf and his wife Anna Nitschmann laid the foundation stones for the Brothers and Sisters choir houses on 26th July after the consecration of the burial ground on 12th July (Stead, 1999, p.15). By the end of 1752, both the Brothers’ and Sisters’ choir houses were completed. They were situated either side of the church, with the congregation house (the church and vestry and minister’s accommodation) forming the centre piece of the new settlement (Stead, 1999, p.15). From April 1755 onwards, the ‘settling’ of the new congregation was celebrated with a special service (Stead, 1999, p.20). The year 1755 was particularly important for the development of the Moravian Church in England. Though still feeling the repercussions of the crisis of 1753, there was an expansion in 1755 of stand-alone Moravian
Churches that were not intended to become settlements. This included three churches in Yorkshire, all in close proximity to the settlement at Fulneck: Gomersal, Wellhouse and Wyke, one in Northern Ireland at Kilwarlin. The one exception being in Lancashire at Dukinfield which was formed as a small settlement (Podmore, 1998, p. 289 and Stead and Stead, 2003, p. 77).

4.3 The Layout and Location of Fulneck

Fulneck is situated in a semi-rural setting and built on a hill. Its orientation is linear, and it consists of a single one-way road. Running parallel to that at a lower level, is a cobbled walkway (see Figure 7). Entry is from the Pudsey side, and on entering, there is to the left a small track that leads down to ‘God’s Acre’, the burial ground.

![Figure 6: Fulneck Settlement Entrance (Betty Longbottom n.d.)](image)

Confusingly, not only is the settlement called Fulneck, but also the road that runs through it (see Figure 6). To the left, the land drops steeply to the cobbled walkway along which are the choir houses that are now apartments for the residents. In the centre is the church.
The church was the first building with others added either side to create a terrace that runs the length of Fulneck Road. Always referred to by the residents as ‘The Terrace’ it is reputedly the third longest terrace in Europe after Hampton Court and Versailles. Behind ‘The Terrace’ is a broad gravelled path with views over the Tong valley.
Here the land slopes gently downwards, providing space for the gardens for the residents below and the tennis courts that are part of the school (Historic England, 1986).

**Figure 8:** Rear view of The Terrace and residents’ gardens (Moravian Church.org n.d.)

**Figure 9:** Plan of Fulneck (Historic England, 1986).
Despite sitting between Bradford and Leeds, the setting for Fulneck is still quite rural. From the south facing terrace you look across the open countryside. The screen shot figure 10 (Google Maps, 2020) shows the open setting of the settlement, the map figure 11 (Ordnance Survey, 1983) below shows that the outlying area is still by and large open countryside, giving the feeling of a secluded community.
4.4 Settlers at Fulneck from continental Europe

From its early beginnings Fulneck had a much stronger attachment to Moravians from continental Europe than Fairfield. The foundation stone for the church was laid by Br Töltschig, an associate of Zinzendorf’s, in 1746.47 Furthermore, my research at the archives found evidence of migration of people from Europe to Fulneck in the mid eighteenth-century.48 The majority came from Germany, but also from Denmark, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Sweden, and Switzerland. While some did return home, others emigrated from England to

47 Letter, Neißer to Töltschig 14th July 1746, Fulneck Archives FUL/24/1/42
48 Church Book of Fulneck Congregation 1742 – 1783, /Fulneck Archives, FUL/5/40
America, went into the Missionary Service, moved to other English Moravian Settlements (often to return to Fulneck in retirement) although many stayed at Fulneck. Between 1745 and 1797 eighty-seven people from different European countries came to Fulneck to work: sixty-one from Germany; seven from Denmark; six from Sweden; four from the Netherlands; four from Switzerland; two from Norway; one from Moravia and one from Poland. The archives provide a wide range of information on each of these individuals, date and place of birth, details of marriage and children, arrival, and departure from Fulneck, onward destination and so on. For example, Moritz Dohna, who was born in Halle in 1737 and in 1767 married Marie Zinzendorf (Zinzendorf’s daughter born in Herrnhut in 1735) in Chelsea before moving to Fulneck in 1768. Moritz was director of schools and Marie was a congregational labourer. In 1772 their son Henry Dohna was born at Fulneck and was baptised by Benjamin La Trobe. Moritz and Marie stayed at Fulneck for eight years before moving to Bath in 1776 to take up posts as assistant labourers. Moritz died on 4th March 1777 in Bath and was interred in Bristol on 11th March by Benjamin La Trobe. It is important to note that in the early period of the Moravian Church in England, training for the ministry was undertaken in Europe. So initially, the senior positions were filled with those trained in and arriving from Europe (Stead and Stead, 2003, p. 176). This changed in 1860 when the Training Institution was established at Fulneck (Stead and Stead, 2003, p. 177). In 1875 training was then transferred to Fairfield where a new college was set up and continued until its closure in 1958 (Mellowes, 1977, pp. 86-87). Today applicants for ministry are examined by the Church Service Committee with the final decision taken by the Provincial Board. Training for successful applicants is undertaken at an approved college or university, under the direction of the Provincial Board and with the advice of the Church Service Committee (Moravian Church, n.d.)

49 Church Book of Fulneck Congregation 1742 – 1783, /Fulneck Archives, FUL/5/40
50 Papers Relating to Education, John Rylands Library, MS1070
51 Papers Relating to Education, John Rylands Library, MS1070
Of those early arrivals, seven were founder members of the Fulneck congregation. Some of the settlers lived, worked and died at Fulneck: the organist, Christian Frederick Waiblinger who came from Germany was a founder member of the Fulneck congregation and served forty-six years. Lorel Gutbier another founder member from the Netherlands served eighteen years as a warden, a role similar to a housekeeper responsible for the secular material needs of the single sisters. Other examples of settlers from continental Europe who progressed through the church hierarchy were a labourer (church worker) from Denmark who became a Deacon and served fifty-two years at Fulneck, and a warden from Germany who became a Deaconess and served twenty-nine years. Not all those who came to Fulneck took up posts in the church itself: the most popular non-church posting was schoolteachers. However, the majority of schoolteachers stayed only two or three years before returning home or moving on, though the schools director from Denmark served thirty-eight years. Of the tradesmen who came to work in the settlement, a master tailor from Switzerland served thirty-seven years and a shoemaker from Germany twenty-eight years. Of all the eighteenth-century arrivals eighteen lived, died, and are interred at Fulneck. These findings highlight the close links between the English Moravians and their continental cousins. These close links are due to Fulneck being the first Moravian settlement in England, so there was more contact with the church leadership in Germany. Also, it was a period when there was a great interest in the Moravian movement in Yorkshire (Podmore, 1998, p. 186), and for this reason Zinzendorf was often present in England. The nineteenth century saw a change in who came to Fulneck. There were still people settling at Fulneck from Continental Europe. Between 1801 and 1889, there were twenty-nine arrivals. This included ten teachers, four tradesmen, seven church workers, and eight trainees for the mission service. However, the majority of people coming from overseas were the children of

---

52 Europeans in Fulneck in the Eighteenth Century, Fulneck Archives, FUL/S/1/114
53 Church Book of Fulneck Congregation 1742 – 1783, Fulneck Archives, FUL/S/40
54 Church Book of Fulneck Congregation 1742 – 1783, Fulneck Archives, FUL/S/40
English missionaries working at the Caribbean missions being sent home for education. In the early nineteenth century, there was a peak in the size of the population at Fulneck. For example, in 1805 there were sixty married people, four widowers, thirty-two widows, fifty-nine single brethren, five great boys (teenage boys), one hundred and thirty-four single sisters, eleven great girls (teenage girls), eighteen little boys in families, twelve little girls in families, thirty boys in the school and fourteen girls in the school – making a total of three hundred and seventy-nine. This breaks down to one hundred and forty-six male and two hundred and thirty-three female residents. The gender imbalance is an interesting topic that is open to investigation at a future date. However, it does raise some questions, were Moravian settlements more attractive to single women than single men? For instance, did the segregated living arrangements offer a haven where single women felt safe? These are interesting questions that go beyond the scope of my thesis. However, it is a topic that I might explore in a later research project.

4.5 The foundation of Fairfield

The Moravian Church first came to the Manchester area in 1751. Benjamin Ingham, originally an Anglican minister and friend of John Wesley, became interested in the Moravian Church and set up his own society in Yorkshire which was absorbed into the Moravian Church in 1740. Local man, David Butler, was influenced by the preaching of Benjamin Ingham who, by this time, was associated with the Fulneck settlement in Yorkshire. It was through this influence that Butler and two other local men requested the help of preachers from Fulneck. This resulted in James Taylor and John Wood going to Dukinfield in 1751 to an enthusiastic reception. As a

55 Fulneck residents born overseas in the nineteenth century, Fulneck Archives, FUL/5/1/114
56 Email correspondence with Fulneck archivist 5th October 2021
57 History of Nonconformity: Inghamites, John Rylands Library, MS871
result of this reception, evangelising work began with a preaching plan concentrating on the Dukinfield area. Stead notes that for several years this outreach preaching was the responsibility of the leaders of the settlement at Fulneck (Stead, 1999, p. 9). However, it was due to the success of this outreach preaching that by 1755 Butler, together with local Moravians and fellow Moravians from Fulneck, founded a small Moravian settlement in Dukinfield (Mellowes, 1977, p. 9). The church at Dukinfield was to be the centre of the settlement. Construction for the Brothers’ and Sisters’ Choir Houses was completed in 1758 (McQuillan, 1950, p. 12). A girls’ school was added in 1761 and a boys’ school in 1769 (McQuillan, 1950, p. 14). There is still a thriving Moravian Church in Dukinfield, though the original building was replaced in 1860 and then again in 1967. I will return to the Dukinfield Moravian Church in Chapter 6 in the context of the discussion of my contemporary fieldwork findings. The early settlement in Dukinfield itself no longer exists; all that remains is the burial ground.58 When the Dukinfield settlement needed to expand in the late 18th century, there were two things that prevented the expansion. Firstly, there was little available space and secondly, the lease on the land they held was not secure (McQuillan, 1950, p. 17 and Mellowes, 1977, p. 9). In 1783 various new sites were looked at, the most promising was farmland that was available for purchase adjacent to land already owned by Br Saxon, a member of the Dukinfield Moravian congregation. The decision was taken to buy this farmland and combine it with the land owned by a Moravian Br Saxon to create the new site that would be Fairfield (Mellowes, 1977, p.10). Building commenced in June 1784, and the foundation stones for the church and the choir houses were laid on the ninth of the month (Mellowes, 1977, p.17). By May 1785, these buildings and a further fifteen dwelling houses were completed (Mellowes, 1977, p.18).

58 Conversation with the Fairfield museum curator 3rd April 2017
The church at Fairfield would originally have had the same orientation as Fulneck, along with the white walls and white free-standing benches. Like Fulneck, the benches were replaced by fixed pews. However, when a major remodelling and refurbishment took place in 1908, the orientation of the church was changed to the traditional layout of Protestant churches in Britain. The side galleries were removed and a new gallery was built facing the pulpit across what was now the back of the church.

Figure 12: Fairfield Moravian Church (David Dixon n.d.)
In addition, choir pews were installed either side of the communion table. The photograph figure12\textsuperscript{59} shows the church in its current form. Note that again, like Fulneck the lightness and simplicity is maintained.

4.6 The Layout and Location of Fairfield

The layout of the Fairfield settlement is far more structured than Fulneck, including a square, wide roads, and green areas (see figures 15 and 16). Its configuration has more of a village feel than Fulneck’s single road, thus giving a much greater sense of an independent community. However, the relatively isolated rural setting of Fulneck also provides a sense of an independent community. Figure 13 shows the entrance to the settlement onto Fairfield Square. The settlements were gated communities. At the end of the day, the night watchmen (figure 14) would close the community to outsiders, thus, on the one hand, strengthening the sense of belonging and security, while on the other, separating the community from those outside. The night watchman would stand watch at the settlement gate and periodically walk round the settlement to check all was in order. For example, a lighted candle in the downstairs window with the shutters open or the blinds not drawn meant the resident required assistance. It was the duty of the watchman to enquire what was needed and render assistance.\textsuperscript{60} Fairfield ceased being a gated community and having a watchman in the early twentieth century. The archivist explained that when new gate pillars were installed (the current ones), the gates no longer fitted, and the decision was made not to replace them (conversation with archivist 28\textsuperscript{th} January 2022).

\textsuperscript{59} Fairfield Church interior, David Dixon, \url{cc-by-sa/2.0 - © David Dixon - geograph.org.uk/p/5171642}
\textsuperscript{60} The duties of the watchman, Fairfield church committee meeting December 1851. Fairfield Congregation Committee Minute book March 1847 to May 1870 Fairfield Archives T/13/1
Figure 13: Fairfield Settlement Entrance, where the gates would have been and where the watchman would have stood.

(Weaverham History Society n.d.)
Figure 14: Br. Chantler, the last night watchman (courtesy of Fairfield Museum n.d.)

Figure 15: Fairfield Square from Brethren Street (David Dixon n.d.)
When the settlement was built, it would, like Fulneck, have been surrounded by countryside. However, due to the expansion of Manchester and its satellite towns, the settlement is now surrounded by other housing in a totally urban setting (Historic England, 1966). The black outline on the map (see Figure 17) shows the settlement today. The yellow outline shows the area occupied by the girls High School that was part of the settlement until 1922, and the red line outlines Fairfield Garden Village. This illustrates the development, expansion, and contraction of Moravian Fairfield. The three outlined areas were part of the Moravian community until 1922. This was followed by its reduction in size with the selling off of assets. Both the map and the screenshot (Figures 18 and 19) show that while the Fairfield settlement is now surrounded by housing, it is still physically a recognizably distinct community.

**Figure 16**: Fairfield church with burial ground to the left (arts and craft church n.d.)
Figure 17: Plan of Fairfield (Historic England, 1966)

Figure 18: Fairfield aerial photo (Google Maps)
As mentioned above, a number of migrants from continental Europe settled at Fulneck after the settlement was established. I undertook further research at the archives at Fairfield and John Rylands Library to see if there was a similar movement from continental Europe to Fairfield. The reason behind this was to establish if there was the same European influence at Fairfield or whether it was predominantly populated by English Moravians, due to its later foundation some twenty-four years after the death of Zinzendorf. The congregation diaries show that members of the Fairfield community regularly visited other Moravian communities in England, Wales, and Ireland. In fact, there seemed to be a regular movement of members of the different Moravian
communities within the UK visiting each other. In the period 1793 to 1798 the diaries record numerous visits between Fairfield, Fulneck, Ockbrook, and Fetter Lane. These visits were also used as a way of finding a spouse, for example Br Joseph Oats returned from a visit to Fulneck on 7th March 1811 where he had met and married Sr Elizabeth Child. While I found little evidence of Fairfield members travelling to the Moravian communities in continental Europe, it did not mean that the Fairfield community was cut off from European Moravians as the settlement did receive European visitors. For instance, on the 4th October 1793 Br and Sr Reader visited from Germany to stay for a few days before moving on to Fulneck, and on 20th August 1795 Br and Sr Leibish, again from Germany arrived and met with members of the different choirs before moving on to Fulneck on 17th September 1795. Fairfield was also often used as a staging post for those travelling from the Gracehill settlement in Ireland. An example of this is Br Lavender’s arrival at Fairfield from Gracehill on 1st July 1794 before travelling on to Fulneck and then returning to Fairfield on 30th July 1794 on his journey home.

The congregation diaries show that visiting the different settlements was a popular undertaking among members of Moravian communities. The visits acted as a means of strengthening the connection between the different Moravian communities within the UK but also with continental Europe. Furthermore, they helped to keep in touch with family members who had moved to other settlements to marry.

For a considerable period, the only immigrants from continental Europe who settled in Fairfield were ministers. Indeed, from the foundation of the settlement in 1785 to current date, five of the

---

61 Fairfield Congregation Diaries 1793 to 1809, Fairfield Archives, T/7/15
62 Fairfield Congregation Diaries 1793 to 1809, Fairfield Archives, T/7/15
63 Fairfield Congregation Diary 1811, Fairfield Archives, T/7/17
64 Fairfield Congregation Diaries 1793 to 1809, Fairfield Archives, T/7/15
65 Fairfield Congregation Diaries 1793 to 1809, Fairfield Archives, T/7/15
thirty-seven ministers were from continental Europe, of which four were from Germany and one from the Netherlands.\textsuperscript{66} By comparison, from its foundation in 1746 to current date, seventeen of Fulneck’s forty-two ministers came from continental Europe. It was not until 1843, that Fulneck had its first British minister, John Rogers, who was born in Fulneck.\textsuperscript{67} In fact, the diverse range of ministers at Fulneck provides another strong link with Moravians in continental Europe. This applies in particular to Fulneck’s first minister, John Töltschig. Benjamin Ingham, a Yorkshire man who had formed Moravian societies in West Yorkshire, was eager for Töltschig’s assistance in his work (Podmore, 1998, p. 50). Töltschig was an associate of Zinzendorf who had arrived at Herrnhut in 1724 from Kuhländel, the German speaking area of Moravia. He was one of the five early members of the Herrnhut community who understood the traditions of the Unity of Brethren (Podmore, 1998, pp. 5-6). The archives show that Ingham had requested that Zinzendorf would permit Töltschig to come to Yorkshire as early as September 1738.\textsuperscript{68} Finally, Töltschig was one of the first Moravians to be sent to England to work with English communities. He arrived in London in October 1739 and continued his journey to Yorkshire to work with Ingham (Podmore, 1998 p. 8). Not only did Töltschig work with the Yorkshire communities, but he was also involved with the setting up of communities in Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire in 1740, Bristol in 1741, and Bedford in 1742 before returning to Fulneck in 1743 where he was appointed Fulneck’s first minister in 1744 serving until 1748.\textsuperscript{69}

This section has examined the layout of the planned Moravian settlements of Fulneck and Fairfield and the role it plays in building an English Moravian identity. It has explored how the

\textsuperscript{66} Index of Moravian Ministers 1740 to 1900, John Rylands Library, MS1066 and email correspondence with the Fairfield archivist 19\textsuperscript{th} May 2019

\textsuperscript{67} Email correspondence with Fulneck archivist 21\textsuperscript{st} May 2019

\textsuperscript{68} Letter from Benjamin Ingham in Herrnhut to Br J Töltschig in Marienborn regarding his enjoyment of his stay in Herrnhut and his request to Count Zinzendorf that Br Töltschig may go back with him to England. FUL/24/1/1

\textsuperscript{69} Europeans in Fulneck 18\textsuperscript{th} Century, Fulneck Archives, FUL/5/1/114 and Fulneck Ministers List compiled by the archivist and Index of Moravian Ministers 1740 to 1900, John Rylands Library, MS1066
time gap between the founding of Fulneck the first, and Fairfield the last of the English settlements changed their relationship with Herrnhut. Fulneck was much closer to the central European Moravians having people from the region settling in Yorkshire while Fairfield makes a point of being founded by English Moravians. Despite these differences there is a history of journeying between the settlements of the British Province and the European Continental Province, helping to form an international level of identity. Both sites are recognisable as distinct communities today and use heritage boards to inform visitors of important aspects of their history and heritage. These boards are going to be discussed in more detail in the following chapter.

4.7 Trade

A further part of settlement life was the establishment of trade and commerce with the aim of being self-sufficient communities. Self-sufficiency was a topic covered at both Fulneck and Fairfield 2021 Heritage Open Days and is also mentioned on Fulneck’s heritage notice board stating that ‘these businesses were for the common good rather than private profit’, a point that underlines the collective nature of the community. The collective, structured nature of the communities became an important feature of Moravian identity as it greatly strengthened the independence of Moravians. Podmore states that community life ‘was the keynote of the Moravian Church’ (Podmore, 1998, p. 136), and Peucker argues that working for the common good or the communal household ‘was a high ideal of Moravian belief’ (Peucker, 2018, p. 128). At the time of formation, both communities were situated in rural areas. In Fairfield, there was a weaving industry with thirty handloom weavers at the settlement, producing cotton cloth and muslin. Fine needlework was carried out by the single sisters and was mainly sold in London.

70 Conversation with Fulneck museum curator on 10th September 2016 and at the Fulneck Heritage open day 18th September 2021
The outlying fields were under cultivation and provided grazing for the cattle, the settlement having its own dairy.\textsuperscript{71} The produce was sold via a shop on the settlement, not just to members of the settlement, but also to other people in the neighbourhood. The selling off-site also extended to the baking where the baker rode out with his products to the outlying area (Mellowes, 1977, p. 14). As in Fairfield, wool spinning, weaving, needlework, lace making, and farming were the main occupations at Fulneck. In addition, to further increase in trade with those outside the settlement and their self-sufficiency, they also had their own mill and three bakeries, a carpenter’s shop, a pottery, and a paper-making manufactory.\textsuperscript{72} I suggest that this form of self-sufficiency would have created stronger bonds within the community and played an important role in the way Moravians viewed their place in their local environment. While the settlements are now no longer economically self-sufficient, the notion of community is still an important factor in today’s settlement life.

\textbf{4.8 Church Governance}

The relationship between individual churches, different provinces and the global unity of the Moravian Church play an important role in Moravian identity. Reverend Robert Hopcroft (former minister of Hornsey Moravian Church) states that for a small province like the British province, ‘it actually serves to give us an identity to something much bigger than ourselves and which we have a big part to play in the work of our church’ (\textit{The Moravian Messenger}, August 2016, p. 90). Furthermore, he argues that he believes that it is essential that all Moravians should ‘learn more about not only the structure of our own province but also the structure and workings of the worldwide unity’ (\textit{The Moravian Messenger}, August 2016, p. 90).

\textsuperscript{71} Heritage Open Day guided tour of Fairfield settlement 12\textsuperscript{th} September 2021
\textsuperscript{72} Conversation with the minister of Fulneck Moravian Church on 10\textsuperscript{th} September 2016 at the Fulneck Heritage open day and Heritage Open Day guided tour of Fulneck Settlement 18\textsuperscript{th} September 2021
The day to day running of the two settlements is undertaken via committees and various subgroups (a complete breakdown of the committees can be found in Appendix 2). There are only slight differences between the organisational process of the two settlements. The following organisational structure applies to all Moravian churches in the British Province. The Congregation Council consists of all the communicant members on the roll who must have been received into one of the following:- a) Baptised and received into communicant membership by confirmation, b) Received by adult baptism, c) Received from other Christian churches by Letter of Transfer and by the Right Hand of Fellowship or d) Received by reaffirmation of faith. The quorum for the transaction of business at a Council meeting is seven, or such number larger than seven as may be fixed in the rules of the particular congregation. The officers of the Congregation Council are the minister who acts as Chair by nature of his office, the Congregation Secretary and the Minute Secretary. The Council has charge of all matters touching the congregation life and work except such as are expressly assigned to the Congregation Committee. The Council elects the constitutional representatives of the congregation to the Provincial Synod, the District Conference, and the Congregation Committee.

Acting as the Board of Elders in conjunction with the minister, the Congregation Committee is responsible for the spiritual oversight of the congregation and the members, including decisions in all cases of discipline and is responsible for the appointment to all offices / elders in the congregation (other than the ministry), e.g., treasurer, congregation secretary, chapel servants,
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73 Church Order of the Unitas Fratrum (Moravian Church) 2016, Section 1, Chapter 1, The Unitas Fratrum and its Congregations, #56 Communicant members
74 Book of Order of the British Province, Section 13 The Congregation Council, Updated 2008, section 13.1. b Quorum
75 Book of Order of the British Province, Section 13 The Congregation Council, Updated 2008, section 13.2. a - f Duties of the Congregation Council
organist, choir, Sunday school officers etc. In addition, it is responsible for decisions about the admission of members, and about the removal of any name from the list of members, subject to confirmation by the minister.\footnote{Book of Order of the British Province, Section 14 The Congregation Committee, Updated 2008 section 14.1. a – d Constitution of the Congregation Committee and section 14.2. a.1-10 Duties of the Congregation Committee as Board of Elders}

The Congregation Committee (Fulneck) and the Elders Committee (Fairfield) are responsible for most areas of church life. The Congregation Committee at Fulneck consists of seven members, i.e., the minister and six others, and the Elders Committee at Fairfield includes eight members, i.e. the minister and seven others, who are elected by the Congregation Council. While the communities at Fulneck and Fairfield have chosen slightly different names for their committees, both committees meet monthly and have the same function.\footnote{Email correspondence with Fairfield archivist 19th May 2019} In addition to the Elders Committee at Fairfield and the Congregation Committee at Fulneck, both settlements have Congregation Councils. These consist of all communicant members on the roll, it meets twice yearly where members can discuss and vote on aspects of church life.\footnote{Book of Order of the British Province, The Congregation Council, section 13.1.a, updated 2008} Fulneck also has two other committees, both elected by the Congregation Council, the Settlement Committee (see Property) and the Museum Committee responsible for the running of the museum. Both committees’ decisions are ratified by the Congregation Committee. At Fairfield, instead of additional committees, there are subgroups for the different aspects of settlement life for example, Museum, Heritage Day, Sunday School, Christmas fayre and so on. Each member of the Elders Committee has an area of responsibility and the heads of the subgroups report to

\footnote{Book of Order of the British Province, The Congregation Committee, section 14.1.a, updated 2008.}
them. The committee member responsible for the weekly offertories felt this system kept everything central and manageable.\textsuperscript{80}

The members of the Moravian communities are represented at all levels in the hierarchy of the governance of the Moravian Church, as an individual by their membership of the Congregation Council, at their church by the Congregation Committee whom they elect, locally at the District Conference, nationally by the Provincial Boards at the Provincial Synod and internationally by the Unity Board and the Unity Synod.

4.9 Ordination of Women

There is evidence that women were ordained deaconesses during the early years of the renewed Moravian Church, Sr Roberta Hoey states that between 1745 and 1760, two hundred women were ordained deaconesses under Zinzendorf’s leadership. They were mainly responsible for the ministry and work of the sisters’ choirs. However, they did not preach. Hoey claims that this is something that Zinzendorf regretted (Hoey, n.d.). Peter Vogt agrees that most of the pastoral care of women was carried out by women who were ordained in the Zinzendorf era (Vogt, 1998 in Atwood 2015, p. 6). The practice of ordaining women ceased after the death of Zinzendorf in 1760. So, what happened? Atwood argues that this was a result of the anti-Moravian crisis of 1753 and Spangenberg’s work on rebuilding the church and trying to regain public trust and prove that the Moravian Church was not some religious sect threatening social norms (Atwood, 2015, p. 13).

The proposal for the ordination of women in the contemporary Moravian Church was passed at the General Synod of 1957 (Atwood, 2020, p. 26). However, it was not until 1967 that that the

\textsuperscript{80} Email correspondence with committee member 15\textsuperscript{th} and 19\textsuperscript{th} May 2019
first woman, Christine Gill was ordained at Herrnhut. I discussed the ordination of women in the Moravian Church with the archivist at Fulneck, a retired minister herself, on 27th March 2019 and followed up with email correspondence on 28th and 29th March 2019. She explained that the ordination in Herrnhut spurred Br Gubi along with Sr Barker to bring forward a proposal in July 1970 that women be accepted for the ordained ministry. The proposal was accepted and Sr Emily Shaw of Fulneck an accredited lay preacher and warden of the choir house since 1961 offered herself as a candidate for ordination. She was accepted for service and ordained on 27th October 1970 at Fulneck to be the first woman to be ordained in the British Province of the Moravian Church. Speaking during his address at the ordination of Emily Shaw, Bishop John Foy stated that it was a unique day, a day where traditions and authority were both challenged and also re-established, as we added a ‘new dimension to the ministry of our Moravian church’ (Sr Roberta Hoey, n.d.). Over the period 1970 to 1999 there were twelve women including Sr Shaw ordained in the British Province. In 1999 there were twenty-four ministers covering thirty churches comprising eighteen men and six women (Moravian Text Book, 1999). Over the period of my research, 2013-2022, two new ministers were appointed, one male, one female and one male retired. In 2013 there were sixteen ministers, consisting of eleven men and five women covering the same thirty churches. At the point of writing (2022), there are seventeen ministers, eleven men and six women (Moravian Church, 2022).

4.10 Moravian Bishops

The Church Book of Order claims the renewed Moravian Church ‘received the episcopacy as an inheritance from the Unity of Brethren’ (Church Book of Order, 2018, section 205a, p. 13). This was achieved by Zinzendorf when The Moravian Act of 1749 declared the Moravian Church ‘an Ancient Protestant Episcopal Church’ (see section 3.6 The Crisis). Today’s Moravian Bishops represent the unity of the church, and their role is primarily providing pastoral care to ministers.
However, this does not prevent them from also serving as ministers as two of the three Bishops of the British Province do. The Rt Rev Joachim Kreusel is minister for Ockbrook and Leicester Moravian Churches and the Rt Rev Sarah Groves is minister at Gracehill and Ballinderry Moravian Churches (Moravian Church, 2022). Bishops are elected by the Provincial Synod and their consecration can take place at the synod where they were elected or in a congregational setting (Church Book of Order, 2018, section 206c pp.14-15).

4.11 Property ownership and control; Fairfield, Fairfield Garden Village and Fulneck

Dramatic changes took place throughout the period 1825-1848 that would totally change the structure of the Fairfield settlement. This change was a transition from an exclusively Moravian Society into a select residential area. Mellowes states there was a desire to live in the Settlement ‘without subscribing to the aims of the Church and the Brotherly Agreement’ (Mellowes, 1977, p.63). The Elders tried to resist this change, but due to the exodus of members from the settlement, drawn by the prospect of work in ever-industrialising Manchester, they had no choice but to admit non-Moravians.81 It was the start of a transition from an exclusively Christian society to a select residential area (Mellowes, 1977, p.61). Fifteen houses were vacant, and this was the opening for non-Moravians, though Elders hoped to admit ‘only people of religious character’ (Mellowes, 1977, p.66). By 1849 one third of the houses at Fairfield were occupied by people who were not members of the Church (Mellowes, 1977, p.71). A request that Fairfield hold the Conference for the members of the Church Synod had to be refused as all the large houses bar one at the settlement were occupied by non-Moravians who showed little or no interest in the Moravian Church (Mellowes, 1977, p. 84). Therefore, they were unable to provide ‘the needful accommodation for the members’ (Mellowes, 1977, p.84).

81 Elders Conference Minutes 1825-1839, Fairfield Archive, T/10/1/18
An article in the July 1901 edition of *Manchester City News* talked about the settlement’s picturesque setting and its tranquillity confirming that it continued to be a sought-after place to live.\textsuperscript{82} The Moravian Church set up the Unitas Estates Board to look after all the church’s property, to be run commercially so that any profit would go to support the church as a whole (Mellowes, 1977, p.87). The downside to this was that as vacant properties were let more often than not, they went to people not involved with the Moravian Church (Mellowes, 1977, p.87). Throughout these changes the Fairfield community managed to keep exclusive ownership of sixteen houses on the settlement (Mellowes, 1977, p.87). However, due to lack of funds, to be able to maintain and update them, a decision was taken to approach a housing association to look after, maintain and let the sixteen houses that belonged to the Fairfield community.\textsuperscript{83} In 1972 the Anchor Housing Association took over the running of these properties. This was a hotly contested decision, one that Br Ellwood still believes to be wrong as the community no longer has any control over who lives in the sixteen houses. Another set back to life in the settlement were the property clearances of the 1960s early 1970s, when local residents were moved from the surrounding area to new estates further afield. This migration of local people had a negative impact on many of the youth-based activities such as Scouts, Guides and the youth club (Mellowes, 1977, p.92). The rest of the settlement is still run by Unitas Estates Board and the situation as regards non-Moravians has improved as the sixteen houses were returned to the control of Fairfield settlement in 2019.\textsuperscript{84} Moravian Estates now owns all the houses in the settlement apart from one which is privately owned. However, if this house comes onto the market Moravian Estates would make attempts to buy it.\textsuperscript{85}

\textsuperscript{82} *Manchester City News* July 1901, Fairfield Archives, T/29/161/1
\textsuperscript{83} Interview with a church elder 13\textsuperscript{th} January 2011
\textsuperscript{84} Discussion with Fulneck archivist 21\textsuperscript{st} February 2019
\textsuperscript{85} Heritage Open Day Settlement tour 12\textsuperscript{th} September 2021
The ownership of the settlement buildings by Moravian Estates is important. All residents rent their houses from Moravian Estates, so the Moravian Church would receive no income from houses in private ownership. Being in ownership of the Moravian Church through Moravian Estates protects the settlement as a religious community as they control the allocation allowing today’s Moravians to live in a community of fellowship. This is an important factor as my contemporary research will show. Furthermore, it highlights the importance of the physical, material aspects of the settlements, in particular the houses and the cobbled streets that form a link to the past for today’s Moravians. The members of the Fairfield community have pride in their settlement and this forms an integral part of their contemporary English Moravian identity. This sense of pride in Moravian cultural heritage, which includes the settlements’ buildings, will be explored in greater detail in later chapters.

In 1909 some members of the Fairfield settlement influenced by the construction of Burnage Garden Village considered expanding onto land in front of the settlement that was owned by the Moravian Church. The idea of Fairfield Garden Village was born and in 1912 land was leased from the Unitas Estates Board and Fairfield Tenants Ltd was set up to coordinate the work. Much of the construction was undertaken by members of the settlement with just specialist tradesmen employed when needed. The architects were Edgar Wood and James Sellars, both influenced by John Ruskin and William Morris. The result was a small estate of Neo-Georgian houses on Broadway and Broadway North (Evans, 2007, pp. 1-4). The Neo-Georgian Fairfield Tenants Estate and the Settlement are a conservation area. The Fairfield settlement has had
the status of a place of outstanding architectural and historic interest since 1966 and all the buildings of the settlement are Grade II listed. 86, 87

The Moravian community in Fulneck has maintained a much greater control over the management of its estate than that in Fairfield. They have never had to sell any of their land. Fulneck Golf Club rents the land for their course from Moravian Estates thus providing an income. Only one house in the settlement has been sold and all other settlement property is owned by the Moravian Estates and is rented to the occupants. Since 1912 the allocation of accommodation has been controlled by the Settlement Committee who interview and choose acceptable residents and it is then ratified by the Congregation Committee. There is a hierarchy in the allocation of property: retired ministers and their widows / widowers, members of the settlement congregation, members of other Moravian congregations, and finally, others outside the Moravian community who must supply reasons why they should be considered. 88 However, while this form of allocation allows the members of the community to control / choose who lives at the settlement, it does have limitations. While it virtually ensures residents will be members of a Moravian Church, the way the allocation hierarchy focuses on retired ministers and their widows / widowers influences the age of the residents. The result of this is an ageing population for the settlement. For example, two of the retired ministers are in their eighties as is the museum curator. While there are some community members in their thirties or forties, my contemporary fieldwork observations found the majority of residents to be in older age groups.

86 Interview with a church elder 13th January 2011
87 For more information on the conservation area see Fairfield Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Proposals https://www.tameside.gov.uk/planning/ldf/evidence/caamp/fairfield.pdf
88 Discussions with the Fulneck archivist held on 20th March 2015 and 7th April 2016
4.12 Sites of tourist interest

External interest in both the Fulneck and Fairfield settlements predominantly focuses on historic or architectural features of the settlements. Given that the locations of the two settlements are different, with Fulneck semi-rural and Fairfield urban, local news or tourism websites describe these settlements as places to visit, including them on country walks and urban trails (West Leeds Dispatch, 2015) or depict them as quaint places where you seem to ‘step back in time’ (Manchester History n.d.). Furthermore, it should be noted that non-Moravian interest is not limited to the Fulneck and Fairfield settlements. The Moravian settlements at Ockbrook in Derbyshire and Gracehill in Ballymena, Northern Ireland both feature on websites promoting places of interest, village tours and heritage trails (Discover Derbyshire, n.d.; Discover Northern Ireland, n.d.). The Fairfield settlement is also much in demand as a TV film location for period dramas, which will be explored in more detail in the next chapter (see section 5.4).

4.13 Education

Education has played a prominent role in both the Unity of Brethren and the renewed church, reflected in the teachings of Comenius in the Unity of Brethren and Zinzendorf’s plans for the renewed church. Comenius as an educator is held in high esteem by English Moravians. Stead and Stead argue that it is important to ‘English Moravians to perceive its educational tradition as following the lead of Comenius’ (Stead and Stead, 2003, p. 340). The communal living in the choir houses of the early settlements formed part of Moravian identity, indeed, the ‘choir houses were a great attraction’ (Podmore, 1998, p. 142). It is through the settlement system of living that the Moravians were noted for their education. Podmore states that in part it existed to free parents for church work, however, more important was ‘having one’s children
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89 Discussion with Church House archivist 20th May 2016
living and being educated communally was a further expression of being in community’ (Podmore, 1998, p. 142). Stead and Stead agree arguing that the early educational institutions in the British Province were seen as a necessity to provide a safe environment for the children of those called to serve in the mission fields (Stead and Stead, 2003, p. 341). The parents worked for the community while their children are educated by the community which brings together the notion of a greater communal family. The schools formed a children’s community and were their introduction to the discipline of communal living (Stead and Stead, 2003, p. 342). Podmore states that they ‘should be understood not primarily as a school but as a children’s choir house’ (Podmore, 1998, p. 142).

The importance Moravians placed on education is reflected in the development of schools at the two settlements. Stead and Stead argue that Zinzendorf’s ideas on education were based on his own schooling at Francke’s (evangelical theologian and teacher) theologically based establishment in Halle and it was Zinzendorf’s intention to create something similar at Herrnhut (Stead and Stead, 2003, p. 340). The provision of education was a factor from the start of the renewed church. Fairfield followed this and had a history of providing both primary and secondary education; it ran a boys’ day and boarding school and a girls’ day and boarding school. The boys’ school was founded in 1790. Lists of pupils show an intake from a wide area, the majority from Lancashire but many from as far afield as Wales, Scotland and even Ireland. The girls’ school was founded in 1796. Again, the majority of pupils came from Lancashire with others from West Yorkshire and Wales (Mellowes, 1977, p.76-77). Changes in wider society also impacted on Fairfield. The growing reputation of Manchester schools and the facilities they were able to provide was something the church did not have the money to compete with, so the decision was taken in 1891 to close the boys school. Stead sees the
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90 The Moravian Contribution to Education – Fairfield, J. Libbey, John Rylands Library. MS1070
91 The Moravian Contribution to Education – Fairfield, J. Libbey, John Rylands Library. MS1070
growing legislation for state education brought about by the 1870 Education Act as putting pressure upon the denominational schools having to compete with those under the control of the local authorities (Stead and Stead, 2003, pp. 127-128). The girls school continued until 1920 when negotiations were begun with the local authority and in 1922, it became a Girls High School, administered by the Education Authority, who also bought the land and the buildings (Mellowes, 1977, p.85). The Moravian Theological College transferred to Fairfield from Fulneck in 1875, training students for home and foreign service and ran until 1958 (Mellowes, 1977, p.89). Today, only the Sunday school remains, housed in the newly renovated building that housed the Theological College. This now has classrooms, a hall and stage, rooms for hire, a modern kitchen and can cater for the social needs of the congregation and the community (Interview with College steward, 13 January 2011).

Fulneck had boarding schools for boys and girls. The boys’ school opened in 1753 after it was transferred from Broadoaks in Essex and the girls’ school in 1755 after it was transferred from Chelsea (Stead, 1999, p. 43). Both schools were for the education of the children of the settlement members, children of members of Moravian Churches without a school, and those who were serving in the mission fields. In 1782 the General Synod ‘decreed that public education was to become a recognized branch of church work’ (Stead, 1999, p. 44). The English Moravian settlements were instructed to found public boarding schools which would be ‘open to all regardless of religious background’. The first of these was located at Fulneck and opened in August 1785 (Stead, 1999, p. 44).

The schools at the Fairfield settlement ran smoothly, and by the early nineteenth century were able to announce that fees collected meant that the schools paid for themselves (Mellowes,
However, the situation was different at Fulneck where both the boys’ and girls’ schools were reported to be running at a loss by the mid to late eighteenth century.⁹²

The decline of the boarding schools was a significant financial loss for the English Moravian Church as the school fees no longer subsidised the church. In fact, keeping the schools going became a drain on church funds (Stead and Stead, 2003, pp. 128). Thus, the Fulneck synod of 1886 had to recognise that some of the schools that had been really important to the church were no longer attracting enough pupils and were no longer financially viable (Stead and Stead, 2003, pp. 128). Today, Fulneck School is an independent, international, fee-paying day and boarding school. Although independent, the school still refers to the history and ethos of the Moravian Church. Its website gives a brief history of the Moravian Church, highlights the Christingle service in which its pupils take part, and includes links to the websites of the Fulneck Settlement and the Moravian Church in the British Province.⁹³ Ockbrook School, like Fulneck, was an independent fee-paying school that stated that it retained links with its Moravian roots. Unfortunately, the school after a period of making a loss was declared insolvent and closed in July 2021.⁹⁴ In an interview with the BBC on 8th July 2021, Roberta Hoey, chair the Provincial Board (PEC) who act as trustees, revealed:

‘That a detailed strategic review was launched in March 2020 to find "the best way forward" and secure the future of the school. After following the consideration of a number of options it has become clear that the school is significantly loss-making, a situation exacerbated by the Covid Pandemic, and we have not been able to find any backers willing to take on the scale of those losses. As a result, the school has become insolvent, and we therefore have no choice but to close Ockbrook School at the end of the 2021 Summer Term’ (BBC News 2021).

---

⁹² Fulneck Committee Minutes 1875 to 1896, Fulneck Archives, FUL/13/4
⁹³ Fulneck School https://www.fulneckschool.co.uk/heritage
⁹⁴ Ockbrook School https://ockbrooksch.co.uk/our-school/
While I was surprised to hear about the closure of Ockbrook, I was even more surprised to learn of financial difficulties at Fulneck School. I found this out when I was able to meet with the Fulneck archivist 19th July 2022. She stated that as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, the school had lost its main income source of international boarders, especially those from Hong Kong, alongside this they have also lost a number of UK boarders. The British Province has appointed a new management team and is supporting the school financially and is also committed to pay Fulneck church the money owed to them by the school.

While Fulneck school is situated at Fulneck Moravian settlement, it is not a Moravian school. The same used to apply to Ockbrook school, which is now closed. Fulneck school has a Christian ethos, and is open to pupils of all ethnic, religious, and cultural backgrounds and thus do not pass on Moravian values as would the Moravian schools of the past.

4.14 Community Activities

Both churches offer a range of activities in addition to the Sunday morning family service. The differences in what is offered highlight the demographics of the two settlements. Fulneck has a much older population than Fairfield and this is reflected in the type of activities on offer. For example, there is a Bible study group and a history group which meet at members’ homes. A monthly organ recital usually by Simon Landley is held at Fulneck church. Simon Landley is a resident at Fulneck. He is Organist Emeritus at Leeds Parish Church, organist at Leeds Town Hall, and he is also director of the St. Peters Singers choir. In addition, Fulneck has its own choir. Events to raise funds for the charities supported by the settlement are held. Afternoon teas take place throughout the year and lunches during the period of Lent. A junior church is held twice a month and an occasional youth group is held at one of the Moravian Churches in the Yorkshire district. However, other than these, there are no specific youth organisations.
These activities are listed on the church notice board and on their website.\textsuperscript{95} As a tour guide at the Fulneck 2021 Heritage Open Day pointed out, there is so much happening in the settlement, it is very difficult for the residents to not become actively involved in community life.\textsuperscript{96}

Fairfield, on the other hand, reflecting its population from a much wider age group, runs a programme of youth and family-orientated events. For example, it runs all the age groups of Scouts and Guides plus a term-time youth club. In addition, there is a coffee morning and ‘tots time’. Alongside the Sunday service, which offers creche facilities, there is a Sunday club for younger children. The youth activities are open to all in the surrounding area. Reflecting the different demographics at Fairfield, their fundraising events are more family focused with Christmas and summer fairs and cake sales, details of which can be found on their website (Moravian Church British Province, n.d.). As at Fulneck, these activities not only support the settlement financially, but also enhance the community spirit bringing the residents together.

The importance of community and pride in the settlements themselves is something that members of both sites relate to. My contemporary fieldwork will show the value that the residents place on the variety of activities offered at the two settlements. Furthermore, how they play an important role in bringing the community together uniting them as members of the Moravian Church.

\textbf{4.15 The Long Sixties, church membership at Fulneck and Fairfield}

Marwick describes the Sixties as ‘a period of exceptional cultural and social change’ (Marwick, 2000, p. 23). In this section I will examine how the congregations of both Fulneck, and Fairfield

\textsuperscript{95} Fulneck Settlement website, activities, http://www.fulneck.org.uk/?page_id=8.
\textsuperscript{96} Fulneck Heritage Open Day 18th September 2021
Moravian Churches fared in this volatile period. As mentioned in *The Beacon* one of the stand-alone Moravian Churches, in Horton West Yorkshire was already experiencing a decline in attendance in the 1950s (Chapter 3, sub-section The Long Sixties), while Brown argues that the 1950s witnessed the greatest church growth since the mid-nineteenth century (Brown, 2001, pp. 170-171). Furthermore, he argues that the 1960s brought about a dramatic decline in support for Christian churches in Britain (Brown, 2001, p. 176). Did Fulneck and Fairfield churches experience their highest growth in the 1950s followed by dramatic decline in the 1960s mirroring Brown’s thesis, or did they buck the trend? Using the congregation lists for both Fulneck and Fairfield I was able to calculate the number of adult communicant members, noting that this figure represents church members rather than church attendance and also that not all communicant members would be residents of the settlements. In addition, I was also able to calculate the number of children registered for Sunday school, again this figure represents school enrolment rather than attendance.

The four graphs below cover the period 1917 to 1971. Not all years are covered as I have only recorded years where there is complete documentation for both Fulneck and Fairfield in order to enable like for like comparisons. The graphs show the peak years for both communities were from 1919 to 1922, with Fulneck’s peak year being 1921 and Fairfield’s 1919. The combined adults and children graph (Graph 1) shows a disproportionate drop between 1922 and 1939. This is due to the decrease in the numbers of children recorded. There are several reasons for the decline. The total includes children at Fulneck school not just the Sunday school. There had been a drop in the numbers attending the school, this was reported in *The Moravian Messenger* of October 1922. It states that the school was actually running half empty. Finally, there is a long
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97 Fulneck Congregation Lists, 1917 to 1952 FUL/5/38 and 1953 to 1973 FUL/5/42
Fairfield Congregation Lists, 1839 to 1939 T/5/2 and 1940 to 1971 T/5/3
gap in the period covered so it does not truly show the speed of decline. However, on comparing Fulneck All (Graph 1) with Fulneck Adults (Graph 2) it still shows a decline in membership which climbs up in 1949 with a gradual decline through to 1955 and remains stable until 1963 which is followed by a gradual decline through to 1970 and climbs again in 1971.

Both the graphs for Fairfield All (Graph 3) and Fairfield Adults (Graph 4) show a trough in 1951 followed by an increase through to 1955 where the peak is equal to that of 1920. There is a gradual decline from 1956 to 1960 followed by a gradual increase to 1964 where membership remains stable until 1967 dropping in 1968/9 before climbing in 1970/1.

What is interesting about these two communities, which are only forty-one miles apart, is how they compare to Brown’s expectations. Certainly, Fairfield experienced growth in the mid-1950s, while Fulneck, on the other hand, had a fairly stable 1950s with a slight decline at the start, though nothing like what was reported from another Yorkshire Moravian Church at Horton. Perhaps more telling is that neither Fulneck nor Fairfield suffered a dramatic drop in membership numbers in the 1960s. There was only a slight decline in membership numbers at Fulneck and almost stable numbers at Fairfield, though both churches rallied at the start of the 1970s. This suggests that both settlements weathered what McLeod called ‘the religious crisis of the 1960s’ (McLeod, 2005). It would have been beneficial to extend the range of years for my analysis to cover the whole 1970s decade in order to see if the two settlements maintained their membership or if - as in other churches - there was a further decline. Unfortunately, that section
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98 The Messenger October 1922 p. 87 in Stead and Stead, 2003, p. 149

169
of the archives remains closed under the fifty-year rule as many current members will be mentioned in them.99

Looking at the graphs, what really stands out is the greater number of women compared to men across all periods at both settlements. Taking the high and low points and the mean, an interesting pattern emerges. At Fulneck 1921 was the high point for congregation members, with 315 adults and a split of 33.0% male and 67.0% female. 1969 was the low point, with 171 adults, split between 32.2% male and 67.8% female members. Taking the total adult communicant members for the period 1917 - 1971, there was a split of 34.3% male and 65.7% female. It is important to note that the totals are for congregation members not the number who attended services. Furthermore, the numbers could include members who are resident in the local area as well alongside members of the settlements themselves.

Fairfield’s results followed a similar pattern, 1919 was the high point with 270 adults (split between 39.2% male and 60.8% female) and 1951 the low point with 176 adults (split between 30.1% male and 69.9% female). After the low point of 1951, Fairfield’s congregation rose, peaking in 1955 with 267 adults (37.83% male and 62.17% female), followed by a low point in 1969 of 195 adults with a split of 35.90% male and 64.10% female, rising to 203 adults in 1971 with a split of 33.01% male and 66.99% female. For the period 1917 - 1971 there was an adult split of 37.4% male and 62.6% female.

99 Email correspondence with Fairfield archivist 5th January 2022
It is really interesting that the proportion of men to women for both settlements remain within the 30% / 60% parameters. It is even more remarkable when looking at the figures for Fulneck in 1805 (subsection 4.3 Settlers at Fulneck from Continental Europe), when the number of adults 289 were split between 31.2% male and 67.8% female. This shows striking long-term consistency in gender proportions. Further research into the attendance at the congregation council meetings showed a similar result. The congregation council consists of all communicant members on the roll and meets twice-yearly. Using the Congregational Council minute book, I was able to plot how representative the council was of the congregation.\footnote{Fairfield Congregation Council Minutes 1936 to 1964 T/12/4} I analysed the attendance figures for one of the twice-yearly meetings for the period 1943 to 1964, and the male / female split was 34.9% male and 65.1% female, evidencing a fairly consistent ratio of male/ female members throughout these years. However, the ages of the members of the congregation were not disclosed.
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4.16 Conclusion

The differences between the two settlements only forty-one miles apart highlights the role which time and place played in their development. Fulneck, the first Moravian settlement in England, was founded thirty-seven years before Fairfield, which was the last. Fulneck benefited from a close relationship with Zinzendorf who spent some time at the settlement and the notion that Zinzendorf was involved in the selection of the site for the settlement is still important to members today and will be explored in the chapter on my contemporary research. Fairfield was established some twenty-three years after the death of Zinzendorf, so has no immediate connections to him. Fulneck had closer ties to members of Moravian communities from continental Europe, as can be seen by the number of European residents in the early years.

Another important factor influencing the development of the settlements was the control over property and who lives in it. The Moravian community at the Fulneck settlement retains ownership of all but one property, as does the Moravian community at Fairfield after it regained the properties that had been run by a housing association (see subsection 4.10). However, Fulneck has a much stricter system of allocating residents to property and has always retained control of its property. In addition to this, when Fairfield girls’ school passed into the hands of the local authority, the land and buildings were sold, too. Furthermore, the location of the settlements also played a role in this. As Manchester expanded, Fairfield became a desirable place for non-Moravians to live. This gave rise to the creation of Fairfield Garden village.

There are many similarities in the type of activities provided by the two communities but even these are influenced by the demographics of the settlements’ populations. Today the residents of Fairfield are younger and so activities are more family friendly than those at Fulneck whose membership is now composed of older age groups.
While I was searching for photographs of the Fulneck and Fairfield settlements, it was interesting to note that the majority of these photographs came either from history and architectural societies or organisations promoting tourism. This reflects the fact that these two settlements are often promoted to non-Moravian groups as places of architectural and historic interest. There might be a number of reasons for this, but it could be seen as a way of allaying fears of Moravians being seen as a strange 'sect'. This is a concern that became apparent among the members of Fulneck and Fairfield when I conducted my contemporary fieldwork, whose findings will be discussed in the following chapters.

Having discussed the foundation and development of the two settlements, their expansions, and contractions, it is evident from the structure and layout that both sites were planned communities. While their history and heritage form a part of their identity, it is important to remember that these are active living religious communities today. As my research findings will show, the settlements themselves form an important part of being Moravian as is the act of living and worshipping in these two close-knit communities.

Finally, I think that while this chapter shows is that there are differences between the two settlements they are outweighed by the similarities, especially those relating to the organisation and functioning of the communities and a deep interest in the history of their church. These all point to the importance that members of both communities assign to notions of unity, not just between members of the Moravian Church in England, but also to notions of a global unity between members of the Moravian Church worldwide. These notions of unity and the interest the community members have for the history of their church will be fully explored in Chapter 6 Perceptions of Moravian identity in Fulneck and Fairfield today: contemporary fieldwork findings. Having examined the history of the Moravian Church in England and the development of two
English Moravian settlements, I now turn to explore the public face that today's Moravians in England wish to present.
Chapter 5. Moravian Public History and Identity

5.1 Introduction

This chapter examines the way that the members and the leadership of the Moravian Church in England both nationally and regionally celebrate particular dates and events from its long history. It will investigate the various aspects of history that the members choose to highlight and those they choose to leave out. It will explore how different practices that were introduced over the years have become established as part of traditions that are still practiced today. In this chapter, I will compare the ways in which the settlements at Fulneck and Fairfield represent their history and identity through festivals, pageants and through the displays at the museums located at each of these two settlements.

Paul Peucker, former Archivist at Herrnhut, argues that following the death of Zinzendorf in 1760, Moravians began to re-establish themselves by developing an elaborate culture of remembrance where history played an important role in representations of Moravian identity. The use of history in this way also helped the establishment of the notion that the Moravian Church was not a new church, but a revived old church, in order to distance it from Zinzendorf (Peucker, 2010, p.11).

5.2 Celebrations

As a means of bringing Moravian communities together, the church leadership introduced special services to the congregations that developed into established traditions of the Moravian Church. This includes the tradition of holding early morning services on Easter Sunday in the graveyard of the settlement in Fulneck. This early morning service, introduced at Herrnhut in
1732, is one of the earlier examples of a special Moravian service, where one can reflect on and remember those who died that year (Peucker, 2010, p.11). Peucker argues that it forms part of a culture of remembrance and helps link the present to the past (Peucker, 2010, p.11). This tradition still takes place every Easter Sunday at 7:00 am at Fulneck and 6:00 am at Fairfield.

Zinzendorf introduced the idea of holding festivals to celebrate dates that are considered to be important in recent Moravian history (Peucker, 2010, p.9). In 1743, there were forty-two festivals that were celebrated by the Moravian communities throughout the world, some of which are still celebrated today. These festivals, which are celebrated by Moravian Churches in addition to other Christian festivals, are special historical memorial days stipulated by the Unity Synod. They include the 13th August Memorial Day celebrating the ‘spiritual birthday of the Moravian Church’, the 12th May commemorating the signing of the Brotherly Agreement, as well as the 16th September and the 13th November celebrating the election of Christ as Chief Elder of the Church. All of these relate to the Zinzendorf era. There are also two memorial days relating to the Unity of Brethren, i.e. the 6th July the martyrdom of Huss and the 1st March celebrating the founding of the United Brethren (Atwood, 2013, p.134).

The Fulneck archivist explained to me that all these festivals were held in Moravian Churches across the worldwide Moravian community and supported the development of a global Moravian identity (conversation with the archivist 20th March 2015). While both Fulneck and Fairfield observe these festivals, the Fulneck community also celebrates some festivals that are unique to Fulneck. One that is unique to Fulneck is the celebration of the laying of the foundation stone
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101 Church Book of Order 2016, Chapter 12 Church Festivals and Memorial Days #681 Special Historical Memorial Days p. 80
of the church in 1746 (conversation with the archivist 20th March 2015). In addition to the foundation celebration, a Sisters’ Festival and Breakfast, a Brothers’ Festival and Breakfast and a Celebration of Mission to the West Indies are also held at Fulneck. These events help to bring the Fulneck community together, promoting its distinct sense of identity, whilst also linking it to past traditions. For example, both the Brothers’ and Sisters’ festivals originate with Zinzendorf, so have a long tradition, while the festivals themselves are a simple service followed by a communal breakfast for all the brothers or sisters (depending on whose festival it is). From a more personal perspective, the Celebration of Mission to the West Indies means a lot to several of the community who served in the West Indies missions (conversation with archivist herself a former missionary to the West Indies 17th August 2016). There are no special liturgies or special set services except for important years like centenaries for the celebration of memorial days. Normally they would take place on the nearest Sunday to the memorial date and the minister would focus on the topic, and sometimes there may be a guest speaker as well.102

Another service that is now an acknowledged tradition of the Moravian Church is Christingle, a children’s Christmas Service, started in Marienborn, Germany, on 20th December 1747 (FUL 29/1197) usually held on the last Sunday before Christmas.103 At the climax of the service, each child is given a Christingle – an orange representing the world, decorated with a lit candle to represent Christ, and nuts, raisins, and sweets on cocktail sticks that surround the candle and represent God’s bounty, as well as red paper around the base of the candle representing the blood of Christ. This tradition has been adopted by Moravians across the world and was highlighted as extremely popular by respondents to the questionnaires from both settlements. The tradition developed much later in the British Province and was first introduced in England at

102 Email correspondence with Fulneck archivist 19th January 2022
103 http://www.moravian.org.uk/who-we-are/moravian-customs
https://search-credo-reference-com.libezproxy.open.ac.uk/content/entry/brewermod/christingle/0
Bristol Moravian Church in 1903, then at Fairfield in 1906 and at Fulneck in 1917 (FUL 29/1197). However, there is some dispute about the date when Christingle was introduced to English Moravian Churches, John Libbey principle of Fairfield Theological College claimed he remembered the service at Fairfield in the 1890s (FUL 29/1197). Furthermore, Fulneck’s website states Christingle was introduced to Fulneck around the 1930s (Fulneck Moravian Church and Museum, n.d.). While the Moravian Church claims the origins of this tradition as their own, it has since been adopted by many other Christian denominations across the world. Its wider popularity in England grew when it was adopted by The Children’s Society in 1968.

While responsible for the growth in popularity of the Christingle service, The Children’s Society freely acknowledges its Moravian history. This is highlighted by the fact that a special Christingle Service was held at Liverpool Cathedral in December 1997 to mark 250 years of Christingle (FUL 29/1198). Although this service was essentially a Children’s Society event, it clearly made efforts to link the present use of this tradition to its Moravian origins which underlines the influence, however small, that the Moravian Church has had on other Christian denominations. However, there are still issues about the use of the name and symbolism by The Children’s Society. In response to an article in *Church Times* on 7th December 2018 about the celebration of fifty years of Christingle, Sr Grove of Brockweir Moravian Church sent a letter to *The Moravian Messenger* published in the January 2019 edition titled ‘Christingle – It’s more than fifty years!’ This letter takes issue with the claim that Christingle is only fifty years old in the UK and that it was the Children’s Society that introduced the celebration to the UK. She states, ‘I know THEIR Christingle is only fifty years old (her capitals), but Moravians have been celebrating it in their churches throughout the UK many years before 1968’. She continues ‘no one doubts that The Children’s Society does a lot of good work and whilst using our precious Christingle as a fundraising tool goes against the grain with many of us, we acknowledge that it
does help them raise money for their work’ (Moravian Messenger, 2019 p.147). Another big issue for Sr Grove is the inaccuracies and misleading information that run throughout the Children’s Society’s website about Christingle (Moravian Messenger, 2019 p.147). The editorial response agrees that a lot of members of the Moravian community have been upset by the way the way Christingle has been used. Furthermore, she adds that what really hurts is ‘the perception that it is trampling over a beloved tradition of our church […] I am sure too that another feeling is that this has happened because we are a small church. […] It has unconsciously made people feel that we don’t matter, that we can be sidelined’ (Moravian Messenger, 2019 pp. 146-147).

It is clear that this issue of the perceived misuse by The Children’s Society of Christingle upset members of the Moravian Church in England as the letter and the editorial response shows. Christingle is a very popular tradition in the Moravian Church calendar as will be seen in my contemporary fieldwork chapter. Furthermore, it appears still to be an issue almost three years later when it was raised in the introductory talk before the start of the settlement tour at Fulneck Heritage Open Day on 18th September 2021.

104 January 2019 edition of The Moravian Messenger
While hymns and singing played an important role in the United Brethren, they sang in the vernacular and had their own hymnals in Czech and German. It was under Zinzendorf’s leadership that hymn writing developed on a massive scale. Zinzendorf laid down the tradition of hymn singing that was to be the core of Moravian worship into the nineteenth century (Stead and Stead, 2003, p.261). The first Moravian hymnal was published in 1735. It contained 972 hymns of which 225 were written by Zinzendorf and at the same time instrumental accompaniment developed with the use of trombones, trumpets, horns, and organs (Stead and Stead, 2003, p.262).
James Hutton had complained about the poor translation of the German hymns to English and undertook to translate and privately publish hymnals in English. He published them from 1742 to 1749 (Stead and Stead, 2003, p.266). Stead and Stead argue that the lack of English hymns (with some hymns translated to English from German, and some written in English but set to the original music written by German composers) ensured that the Moravians evolved differently from other British Protestant denominations (Stead and Stead, 2003, p.267). An official British hymnal was not published until the furore of the ‘blood and wounds’ controversy of 1750 had died down. This reflected changing trends by rejecting the ‘blood and wounds’ symbolism. The 1757 hymnal laid the foundation for the subsequent British Province hymnal which was published in 1769. It was a smaller version of the 1757 one and had been carefully edited to remove any hymn that could cause offence (Stead and Stead, 2003, pp. 266-267).

One service, which today is primarily a song service and is celebrated throughout the worldwide unity of the Moravian Church, is the Lovefeast, which originated in the first gatherings of Christians after Pentecost. The early believers broke bread together, thereby signifying their union and equality. These simple meals were called ‘agape’ from the Greek word for ‘spiritual love’.\(^{105}\) The original simplicity of this practice was ‘resuscitated’ by Zinzendorf in 1727 (Podmore, 1998, p. 32) after members of the Herrnhut community experienced a profound moment of spiritual renewal and reconciliation when celebrating the holy communion on August 13th, 1727. Seven groups of the participants continued to talk about the great spiritual blessing which they had experienced and were reluctant to separate and return to their own homes for the noonday meal. Zinzendorf, sensing the situation, sent them food from his manor house,

which they shared together, continuing in prayer, religious conversation, and the singing of hymns. This incident reminded Zinzendorf of the primitive agape, and the idea was fostered until Lovefeasts became a custom in Moravian life. Reed Knouse states that by 1756 the Lovefeast had become a highpoint of Moravian worship (Reed Knouse, 1996, pp.13-14). Often there is no address; the hymns in the order of service provide the subject matter for devotional thoughts. The presiding minister often says a few words, explaining the purpose of the service, just before the congregation gathers to share traditional buns and coffee. On special occasions an address may be added, giving opportunity to remind the congregation of the history of the anniversary or the deeper import of the day.

A tradition designed for personal use that is still in use throughout the worldwide Moravian Church is the Daily Watchword or Daily Text. This was introduced by Zinzendorf at Herrnhut in 1728. A daily biblical text was shared amongst the inhabitants of Herrnhut to act as a common guide to meditation and conduct. Initially it was passed by word of mouth. In 1731 a series of texts was printed for the full year with the texts supplemented by hymns (Wiedermann, 2011, p. 6). Zinzendorf used to choose the texts himself. After his death the task was undertaken by selected members of the Herrnhut community (Wiedermann, 2011, p. 6). Later, further amendments were made to the layout, increasing the use of Old Testament sources drawn by lot, and adding a further text from the New Testament not drawn by lot and a hymn line (Stead and Stead, 2003, p.370). The publication of the annual Watchword book has taken place every year since with the format little changed. Today there are fifty different translations of the Daily Text, the most recent translations have been for Korea in 2009 and for Zambia in 2010 (Wiedermann, 2011, p. 7).

Today the aim of the Daily Text or Watchword is still to promote personal devotion, but also remind the reader of the unity of the church as Moravians worldwide are all reading the same text as this quote from the Editing Panel explains.

'It is our prayer that users of this book will find that its contents speak to them in their situation, and that they may be guided to a fuller knowledge of the Bible that offers ever-increasing enrichment to their lives. May the sense of unity with so many others in the world, provided by the daily texts that are common to all editions, nourish our feeling of fellowship with the whole family of God, however the daily pattern of life varies around the world'.

The support for these celebratory services, festivals and long-held traditions highlights the pride that the members of the two communities place in their past. They bring together not only the local communities, but also link local communities to the global Moravian community with the international Moravian Church celebrating the same services on the same days strengthening the global unity of the Moravian Church. Perhaps the most significant of these in forming a notion of an international Moravian identity is the daily watchword in which all Moravians are reading the same biblical text on the same day throughout the year.

5.3 Pageants

Another method that the Moravian Church in England has used to showcase important periods of its history to members of the church and the general public is via pageants. Historical pageants began as an Edwardian craze and became one of the most significant aspects of popular engagement with the past in twentieth century Britain (Bartie et al, 2020a, p. 1). This is of particular relevance as Moravian historical pageants were held in England in the 1930s and the 1950s when the pageant format was still popular (Bartie et al, 2020a, p. 305). The pageant

‘craze’ in Britain began with the 1905 pageant in Sherborne in Dorset to celebrate the founding of the town in 705, generating pride in the town and drawing the community together. The whole town was decked out in bunting and flowers celebrating 1200 years of civic pride.109 The producer Louis Napoleon Parker set the style and content for historical pageants of the Edwardian era and beyond. The format was essentially a series of dramatic representations of episodes of the history of a community or organisation in chronological order (Bartie et al, 2020a, pp. 1-2). The Dorset pageant had eleven episodes starting in 705 and finishing in 1593 (Bartie et al, 2020a, p. 2). Throughout much of the twentieth century, pageants were a way to unite communities in Britain, by presenting ‘established understandings of their past’ (Bartie et al, 2020b, pp. 13-14). These pageants often blended fact and fiction but were always concerned with the past and its representation in the present (Bartie et al, 2020a, p. 2). Due to pageants rarely being performed today, it is easy to overlook their importance to communities across the country in the twentieth century (Bartie et al, 2020a, p. 3). Indeed, the aim of pageants, the stories they told and the way they were organised was to bring people together (Bartie et al, 2020a, p. 4). In addition, pageants fulfilled many other roles, for example, the promotion of tourism, making the public aware of the communities who were holding the pageant. Furthermore, these productions could revitalise and reaffirm both local traditions and identities (Bartie et al, 2020a, pp. 6-7). The popularity of pageants in the interwar period boosted the local economy as well as local identity, something that has been overlooked in previous research (Bartie et al, 2020a, p. 10). The popularity of pageants increased in the post war period extending to the late 1950s and early 1960s (Bartie et al, 2020a, p. 11). Finally, the notion that pageants bring people together is summed up in a report in the Yorkshire Post on the Gildersome pageant of 1934 (just under three miles from Fulneck).

‘Pageants are filling a need of the time in revealing past traditions and past achievements. We may read into them a hankering after unity of purpose, 

such as tradition gives; and a sense of fellowship, such as comes from the memory of deeds done together' (Yorkshire Post 14th August 1937 in Bartie et al, 2020a, p.22).

Following Parker’s style, Moravian communities used pageants as a way of celebrating important dates in Moravian history, of which there were five celebrated in the British Province. The first pageant was held at Fulneck in 1932 and celebrated 200 years of mission work. This was followed in 1957 by a pageant which celebrated 500 years of the Moravian Church, both as a national event in London and a local one at Fulneck. The final pageants celebrated 250 years of mission work in 1982 and were performed nationally in Coventry and locally at Fulneck. These pageants are well documented at both the Fulneck archives and the West Yorkshire archives at Bradford. What do these pageants say about the way the Moravian Church presents its history? What aspects of their history do they choose to promote? What is the image that they are trying to create? Close analysis of the archival evidence of these different pageants should yield some answers.

The 1932 pageant was Fulneck’s first event of this type, and it is well documented with a large number of photographs and other memorabilia held in the settlement’s archives (FUL 29/745). The photograph of the cast (figure 21) shows the large number of people involved in the 1932 pageant at Fulneck.

Figure 21: Cast of the 1932 Pageant at Fulneck (Ful/29/1188)
The event was covered by the Yorkshire Post (figure 22). They sent their photographer, Les Overend, whose father coincidentally had taught at Fulneck school. Bartie et al (2020a) state that historical pageants were popular with religious groups across the twentieth century, stating that the 1932 performance at Fulneck is an example of one such pageant. The pageant dramatised the missionary activity conducted by the Moravian Church. The focus was on the fairly distant past, since the action concluded in the mid-eighteenth century with an episode entitled 'Among Eskimos in Labrador 1755'.

![Figure 22: Photograph of 1932 from the Yorkshire Post (Ful/29/1529)](image)

The pageant covers the early missions of the Moravian Church. The first was to St Thomas in the Danish West Indies. On 21st August 1732 Leonhard Dober and David Nitschmann set out
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from Herrnhut marking the start of Moravian mission work.\textsuperscript{111} Five months later on 19\textsuperscript{th} January 1733 the second mission started as a group of three missionaries Christian David, Matthäus and Christian Stach set off from Herrnhut to Greenland.\textsuperscript{112} The third mission was to Labrador when a group of merchants, members of the London Moravian congregation set sail in 1752. A mission house was established. although the expedition ended badly as all six of the missionaries were killed by Inuit in 1755.\textsuperscript{113} It could be argued that the way in which pageants have highlighted missionary work reflects the importance that Moravian communities in England have assigned to the notion of global unity. This becomes more evident because the notion of the global unity started in the early years of missionary work when the missionaries would periodically send copies of their diaries back to Herrnhut. Here they were collated into weekly events, bundled, and sent out to the separate provinces for distribution. The packages for the British Province went from Herrnhut to London and were send on to the larger congregations like Fulneck and Fairfield to be circulated to the local congregations. (Stead and Stead, 2003, pp. 352-355). Furthermore, funds raised at the two performances were to be for the Pre-war Missionary Pension Fund of the Moravian Church. To this end, posters to promote the pageant were produced (Ful/29/895), alongside a handbook (Ful/29/745) and hymns for the interludes between acts (Ful/29/747). The hymns sung during the pageant included ones by Jan Hus (1372-1415) and Jan Augusta (1500-1572; a Bishop in the Unity of Brethren) and English Moravian James Montgomery (1771-1854) representing both the United Brethren and the

\textsuperscript{111} This Month in Moravian History No.5 March 2006 http://www.moravianchurcharchives.org/thismonth/06_march_dober.pdf

\textsuperscript{112} This Month in Moravian History No.27 January 2008 http://www.moravianchurcharchives.org/thismonth/08%20jan%20greenland.pdf

\textsuperscript{113} The Moravian Church 2001 https://www.heritage.nf.ca/articles/society/moravian-church.php
renewed church. There were sixteen hymns in total: five were sung in the intervals between the scenes and the audience joined with the players to sing four of them. The other eleven were embedded in the scenes and were sung by the players.

The size of these performances meant that the cast was drawn from the congregations of the Yorkshire Moravian Churches of Baildon, Fulneck, Gomersal, Heckmondwike, Horton, Wellfield, and Wellhouse (FUL/ 29/745). Depending on the numbers of players involved in a particular scene, members of one congregation could provide all the players and join with others on the larger scenes. This really united the local Moravian communities, not only those taking part in the performances but also their friends and family in the audience. While the pageants were advertised to all in the local community the audience would have been predominantly Moravian not only because of the involvement of the local Moravian Churches but also these were years the Synod of the British Province were held at Fulneck.

Five hundred years of the Moravian Church was a long anticipated major event for the Moravian world. For British Moravians, a national pageant celebrating five hundred years of the church: ‘Moravian Church Quincentenary - A Pageant of our Church’s Story 1457 - 1957’ (WYB 75/9/14 and FUL 29/743) was held at Central Hall, Westminster on 1st March 1957, and on 15th July 1957 at Fulneck (FUL/29/82). The London event was one that members of Moravian communities across the country could attend. The choice of 1457 as the starting date emphasises a perceived connection of the Moravian Church with the Unity of Brethren, and that the history of the church was a continuous one, formed in 1457 and renewed in 1722. The pageant also referred to the earlier date of 1415 and the execution of Huss, which is in line with the timeline at Fairfield museum (see Chapter 3, section 3.1). The pageant was divided into ten scenes each representing a selection of highlights in the Moravian Church’s history and both productions followed the same format. These scenes were grouped into three acts to show
three distinct periods of the history of the Moravian Church. The first act had three scenes related to the church of the United Brethren: 1415 Execution of Huss, 1457 Kunwald (The Formation of Unity of Brethren), 1628 Bohemia (Comenius, and the period of ‘The Hidden Seed’). The next act had four scenes: 1722 Zinzendorf (the foundation of Herrnhut), 1732 Herrnhut (early life at the settlement, its expansion, and the beginning of missionary work), 1735 Wesley and the Moravians (the voyage to America on the Simmonds during which the Moravians made an impression on John Wesley), 1745 Cennick (when Cennick left Whitefield’s association to join the Moravians). These scenes refer to Zinzendorf and the renewed church. The final act had three scenes: 1952 Mission Work (overseas mission), 1956 Mission Work (home mission), 1957 Fulneck and the future referring to the contemporary church.

These pageants represented the history of the Moravian Church as a history of a single unified church. Furthermore, the selection of events that were commemorated as part of this pageant reflects a particular view of English Moravian identity as they focus on representations of events dating back to the early church of the United Brethren and the renewed church of Zinzendorf. My contemporary research will show that both these aspects of Moravian Church history are important to the community members, as it reflects the notions of continuity and discontinuity of the Moravian Church (Vogt, 2012).

The most recent of the two pageants were performances of ‘Moravian Church 250th Anniversary of Missions 1732-1982 – A Pageant ‘Christ of the world’. These performances were held at Coventry Cathedral on 15th May 1982 (WYB 75/9/21 and FUL 29/1022) and at Fulneck on the 25th and 31st July 1982 (FUL 29/888). These two pageants followed exactly the same format with seven acts highlighting missions in the Caribbean, Labrador (figure 23 shows the Moravian missionaries meeting the Inuit), Africa, Northern India, and Ramallah (WYB 75/9/21).
Figure 23: The Labrador Mission Fulneck 1982 (Ful/29/888)
The importance assigned to missionary work as a significant part of the Moravian Church is reflected in the performance of these pageants. Not only are there two pageants dedicated to mission 1932 and 1982 but also the fact that two sections of the 1957 Quincentenary pageant at Westminster were also devoted to mission work. In an interview at Fulneck on 20th March 2015 the archivist emphasised how important the pageants had been to the congregation. However, she thought there would be no further local pageants held at Fulneck due to the ageing congregation and lack of interest from others.

Celebrations for the 500th anniversary of the Moravian Church took place across the different provinces. These included large scale events in the USA and pageants in the UK and USA and somewhat smaller ones in Herrnhut. As part of the 500th Anniversary celebrations the 1957
Unity Synod instituted the Unity Prayer Watch a twenty-four-hour prayer chain that continues to the present day. This was a revival of the prayer watch that Zinzendorf introduced at Herrnhut, and it was Herrnhut who began the new prayer watch, their contribution to the celebrations (Atwood, 2020, p. 49).

In contrast, for the USA, the approach to the Quincentenary celebrations were on a much larger scale. The year of the 500-year anniversary celebrations started with a public service at the Winston-Salem Memorial Coliseum in North Carolina on 3rd March 1957, with key speakers from the US, UK, and Germany. This event was broadcast on radio and television and was attended by 80,000 people (The Wachovia Moravian, April 1957, pp. 1-3). Alongside such mass gatherings, tableaux consisting of manikins dressed in period costumes were set up in shop windows depicting key events in Moravian Church history and these were supported by displays of ancient manuscripts and church memorabilia (The Wachovia Moravian, March 1957, p. 12). The Friedland congregation in Winston-Salem presented a Quincentenary Pageant on 16th June 1957 following the same historical events as the one in England (The Wachovia Moravian, June 1957, p. 12). While many varied formats may have been used on different sides of the Atlantic, the message that was presented to both members of Moravian communities and the general public was the same: the Moravian Church united in promoting its public history. The use of mass media to cover the events in the USA meant that they were seen by a wider though probably non-Moravian Church member audience, whereas the events in the UK were focused on members of the Moravian communities. This suggests a low key / local approach in the UK to the way events of historic relevance were celebrated. However, the number of Moravian communities and size of membership also needs to be taken into consideration. The size of membership stated in the 2016 edition of the Moravian Almanac are as follows: The North American Provinces include 166 communities with 37,250 members, while The British Province consists of 30 communities (four settlements and twenty-six churches) with 1,200 members.
Both the national and local pageants show the importance that the English Moravian Church places upon its history, and the aspects of history that it wishes to promote both inwardly to the church members and outwardly to non-members. The church promotes key events in its history from both the ancient and renewed churches starting in 1415 with the martyrdom of Huss and the founding of the Unity of Brethren in 1457. Of course, Zinzendorf plays an important role in this history, but it is noted that the representation of history from the Zinzendorf era is selective, missing out the less desirable parts. However, it can be argued that the celebration of the 300th anniversary of Zinzendorf’s birth saw a definite thawing of attitudes towards him. This was marked by special services throughout the Unity and at Herrnhut by a Zinzendorf sculpture trail.\textsuperscript{114} The regional pageants held at Fulneck again show the importance they place on the history of the church. I found no evidence of pageants having been staged at Fairfield. In a conversation on 29\textsuperscript{th} September 2018, the current archivist confirmed as far as she was aware, such pageants had not taken place at Fairfield, though they as a congregation had travelled to see the national ones. However, the decision may have a logistical dimension as Fairfield does not have large grounds in which to stage such events.

The number of pageants in Britain, especially those adopting Parker’s chronological style, still flourished in the 1950s, but the 1960s saw a steep decline (Bartie \textit{et al.}, 2020a, p. 305). According to Bartie \textit{et al.}'s study (2020a, pp. 307-8), the decline of pageants has mainly been due to difficulties in recruiting participants, cost, and increasingly fragmented and diverse identities. While my research at Fulneck found little evidence of a fragmented community or lack of community spirit, the cost of pageants and the age of the residents are likely to have played

\textsuperscript{114} Zinzendorf sculpture trail, https://www.moravian.org/bcm/2020/05/06/good-old-count-zinzendorf/
the biggest role in the decline of pageants. The last pageant to be held at Fulneck was for the celebration of 250 years anniversary in 1982 (Ful/29/888). However, a modern-day version of a ‘Parker style historical pageant’ that is performed today is the one that has been presented at Bishop Auckland since 2016. The pageant, ‘Kynren – an Epic tale of England’ described by the producers 11 Arches as a ‘spellbinding journey through time [...] watch legends come to life in the thrilling tale [...] as the last 2,000 years are brought to vivid life on an enormous scale.’ and has been seen by over 300,000 spectators since its introduction. This is a good example of history / heritage for entertainment. The show of twenty-nine scenes happily moves from history to myth and legend, encompassing Roman Britain to the second World War via Viking raids and King Arthur and Excalibur. 

5.4 Other Celebratory Events

While the number of pageants has been declining, the Moravian Church still continues to celebrate important dates in their history by staging celebratory events. Br. Peter Vogt, now minister at Herrnhut, wrote in the January 2022 edition of The Moravian Messenger of the plans for the 300th anniversary of the founding of Herrnhut on 17th June 2022. Despite COVID-19 causing serious delays in the planning, it was a great festival year for both the town, and the church community. While the main events took place between June 12th to 19th the events calendar continues throughout the year. Br. Vogt sees the inclusion of both those inside and outside the Moravian community as important. He explains that there will be a special exhibition at the Herrnhut museum, a collaboration between the Unity Archives, the town museum, and

115 The Kynren [https://www.11arches.com/kynren](https://www.11arches.com/kynren)
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the Herrnhut congregation. This will offer ‘a very professional presentation and interpretation of Herrnhut’s history and global impact’ (Vogt, in The Moravian Messenger, January 2022, p. 12). He concludes that Herrnhut is a place that has a fascinating history, a place full of connections branching out to Moravian communities in many parts of the world, and that the festival will ‘give us the opportunity to celebrate our history and our connection with brothers and sisters around the world’ (Vogt, in The Moravian Messenger, January, 2022, p. 12).

The number of ways used to reach out to the wider global community of the Moravian Church and beyond to ensure they are included in the 300-year anniversary speaks a lot about the importance placed in this celebration. As The Moravian Messenger reports, it presents a great opportunity for the Herrnhut community to showcase their history to a wider public. The opening service was televised to enable the worldwide Moravian congregations to share in the event and at the same time introduce contemporary Moravian worship to a new audience. A video is also available online (Moravian Church n. d.). However, what stands out is the inclusiveness of the event, involving the Herrnhut Moravian community and the residents of the town from the start, when three years ago the mayor sent out an invitation for a public meeting where citizens could express their ideas and volunteer to get involved.

5.5 Heritage Open Days

In 1991 the Council of Europe and the European Commission set up European Heritage Days to raise appreciation for Europe’s rich and diverse cultural assets and their need for care and protection. The idea was to open the doors to historic monuments and buildings, in particular those normally closed to the public. Heritage Open Days were established in 1994, as England’s contribution to the European Heritage Days and has since grown into the country’s
largest community heritage festival.\textsuperscript{117} Today, they are held annually in September with each country running it in their own way. Both Fulneck and Fairfield Moravian settlements are active participants in these annual events. The heritage days at these two communities are far more than opening their doors to the public. A lot of time and effort is put into these events. The church and museums are open, and there are special exhibitions or presentations about different aspects of the history of the Moravian Church as well as guided tours of the settlements with various members of the community dressed in traditional 18\textsuperscript{th} century Moravian period costume (Dickinson, Fulneck museum curator in \textit{The Moravian Messenger}, December 2021, p. 140). Figure 25 shows one of the Fulneck tour guides resplendent in costume and figure 26 two visitors joining in the fun at Fairfield. Fulneck also hosted an additional invitation Heritage Open Day in 2021 for members of the Moravian community and friends of the community.\textsuperscript{118} These events are informative and fun at the same time and allow the two communities to raise awareness of the Moravian Church in England, its history, and beliefs. From my visits to the open days (2016, 2017, 2019 and 2021) it was clear that they always followed a similar format in what they presented to the visitors. The presentations of the history of the Moravian Church at the two settlements covers both the church of 1457 and the renewed church of 1722. While Fulneck made a point about its close links to Zinzendorf they both promoted their Englishness, an important factor at both communities. A common theme that runs through the tours, exhibitions, and presentations is the value of being a community of English Moravians.

\textsuperscript{117} History of Heritage Open Days \url{https://www.heritageopendays.org.uk/about/history}

\textsuperscript{118} The Magazine for Fulneck and Gomersal Moravian Churches, September 2021, p. 3
Figure: 25 Tour Guide in traditional 18th century Moravian costume typical of the time the settlement was founded. Fulneck Heritage Open Day September 2021 (Jim Rollo 8/09/21)

Figure: 26 Two members of St Chrysostom's Church, Manchester, in 18th century style costume. Fairfield Heritage Open Day (St Chrysostom's 10/9/2012)
5.6 Heritage boards

As mentioned before, both settlements display heritage boards that provide visitors with an overview of the settlements’ history, within the broader context of the Moravian Church. Figure 29 is a close up of the plaque on Fairfield square that gives a short history of the United Brethren founded in 1457 and the renewed church in 1722. There is a larger information board in front of the church (figure 28). This is a practice common to Moravian Churches in the UK, Europe, and the USA.

Information and heritage boards are a common sight outside Moravian Churches in the UK and highlight the importance that Moravians place on their history. Three examples of these boards at different locations show subtle variations in the way Moravian Church history is presented. The oldest is for the University Road Belfast Moravian Church (see figure 27).

Figure 27: University Road Belfast (John Wolffe n.d.)
They state that the church was founded by followers of Huss in 1457 in Bohemia-Moravia and is the oldest Protestant Church in Northern Europe. Reference is made to the church being renewed in the eighteenth century and that the 1749 Moravian Act recognised the Moravian Church as an ‘Ancient, Protestant, Episcopal Church’, however does not mention Zinzendorf.

Fairfield’s board outside the church was replaced with a new one in 2020 (see figure 28). This, too, states that the Moravian Church is the oldest Protestant Church in Northern Europe and was founded by followers of Huss in 1457 in the Czech Republic. However, it makes no reference to the church being ‘renewed’ or any reference to Zinzendorf. Instead, it states that the eighteenth-century church was a pioneer in missions and that Fairfield was founded in 1785 by English Moravians.

![Figure 28: Fairfield Settlement heritage board (Tame Side Library)](image)

While the heritage board was replaced a much earlier plaque is still mounted on a house in The Square (see figure 29). This plaque was presented in 1967 by Droylsden U.D.C. in recognition
of the settlement being scheduled as a place of historic interest in 1966. It states that the settlement was founded in 1785 derived from the Unitas Fratrum (1457). That Moravians were part of the Evangelical revival in England. That the settlements were founded to pursue Christian, Educational and Missionary purposes. Again, there is no mention of the renewed church or Zinzendorf.

![Image of heritage plaque]

**Figure 29**: Fairfield Square heritage plaque (Tripadvisor n.d.)

The heritage board in Fulneck is the most recent (see figure 30), it was unveiled on 3rd July 2021. The text displayed on it focuses specifically on the Fulneck settlement and its history, though it also refers to the wider history of the Moravian Church. It makes a point of telling of Zinzendorf’s role in choosing the site for the settlement and mention two traditions of the Moravian Church.
These three simple heritage boards and the heritage plaque say a lot about how Moravians in the UK perceive and portray their history. I have included the University Road notice board as an example of an earlier style of heritage boards as both Fulneck and Fairfield have recently updated theirs. While Fairfield makes no specific reference to Zinzendorf, University Road follows the narrative of founded in 1457 and renewed in 1722 alluding to Zinzendorf, whereas Fulneck name Zinzendorf and his involvement in the founding and development of the settlement. Making the claim that they are the oldest Protestant denomination in Northern Europe underlines the support for the notion that there is a continuity from 1457 to today. This is a much-debated topic both inside and outside the Moravian Church about the different periods of Moravian Church history and will be discussed in Chapter 6, Perceptions of Moravian Identity in Fulneck and Fairfield today: contemporary fieldwork findings, in the section Perception of the contemporary church.

Looking at the two settlements Fulneck and Fairfield you can see from their heritage boards that they adopt different approaches to the representation of the history of the Moravian Church in general and the Zinzendorf heritage in particular. The heritage board indicates that residents at Fulneck embrace their early association with Zinzendorf, while those at Fairfield highlight its Englishness.
5.7 Museums

Another medium that both communities use to bring important aspects of their history, their traditions, and their way of life to both members of the Moravian Church and the general public are museums. According to McLean (2008, p. 283), the curation of Museum exhibitions involves the negotiation of three different layers of identity: the identity of those who select the collection exhibited, of those who view the collection and of those who are being represented by the collection. Both of the settlements have museums that are open to the general public. As with the pageants, museum displays are selective in that they promote the image / identity that they as members of the two Moravian communities, through the role of the curator, wish the visitors to see. What is interesting in the case of both of the settlement museums are that layers one and three are the same in that objects are selected by present day Moravians to represent Moravians of the past. What then do these onsite museums tell us about English Moravians?

The museum at Fulneck is the older of the two. It was opened in July 1969 with the idea to show the history of the Fulneck settlement and aspects of the Moravian Church worldwide. It is situated in two converted cottages and run by a committee with the committee chair taking on the role of curator (Discussion with museum committee members 17th August 2016).

There have been significant and recent changes to the displays and layout of the museum at Fulneck since my first visit the on 17th August 2016. At that time Fulneck Museum was a ‘museum concerning the history of the Fulneck Settlement and the Moravian Church worldwide’ (Fulneck Moravian Church and museum n.d.). It focused on the history of the settlement and those who lived in it, rather than the beliefs and traditions of the Moravian Church. The six rooms each had a separate display; the first displayed artefacts brought back from the mission
fields of Labrador and Tibet and some examples of lace work, which was one of the cottage industries undertaken at Fulneck. The next four displays set out in separate rooms focused on aspects of settlement life. A typical early 19th century parlour (see figure 31) with a table set for tea, a scullery with displays of flat irons and laundry equipment (see figure 32), the Fulneck hand pumped fire engine that was operated by volunteers from the community with a brief history of its use, and a working example of a ‘1733 Kay flying shuttle’ loom, typical of the type that would have been used in the settlement in the mid eighteenth century and samples of the cloth woven on it. Finally, the sixth room displayed a selection of period costumes.

Figure: 31: Fulneck Museum - The Parlour (Rotary Club n.d.)
As noted above, the museum presented little information about the Moravian faith. In fact, the only explicitly ‘religious’ artefacts on display were a set of Tibetan prayer wheels. When I spoke to the curator at the Heritage Day on 10th September 2016, he did not think that the Tibetan prayer wheels were ‘appropriate’ and could not tell me how long or why they had been on display. When pressed, he said he expected that the prayer wheels were the mementos of a returning missionary and that in his opinion, they did not fit into the museum’s exhibition. Indeed, apart from the references to the posting of missionaries to Tibet and Labrador, the Fulneck museum’s approach was predominantly adopting a secular point of view. It gave the visitor snap shots of everyday life and of how community members worked and relaxed during the formative years of the settlement in the mid-eighteenth century. However, it did not cover aspects of the community’s devotional life or give examples of the traditions and practices of the English or the worldwide Moravian Church. The museum at Fulneck introduced the visitor to the Moravian life in Yorkshire through different periods of the history of the settlement and further afield with information of their missionary work in Labrador and Tibet. It presented a public
image of the settlement whose members have a strong sense of community and a pride in their past.

After the archivist told me that they had made some changes to the museum displays (email correspondence with Fulneck archivist 30th May 2018) I visited the museum on 4th July 2018. I was fortunate to have a guided tour of the museum by one of the two museum committee members who has been responsible for the changes. We spoke about what had made the committee decide to make the changes. The main reason I was given was that the fiftieth anniversary of the museum was approaching in the following year (2019). Furthermore, some of the previous exhibits had become somewhat tired and jaded. In addition, the committee felt that many of displays had ‘no feeling’, ‘failed to tell a story’, and had little impact upon the visitor (conversation with museum committee member 4th July 2018). The changes undertaken range from cosmetic to radical. For example, ‘The Moravian Room’ has been renamed ‘Moravian World’. The displays in this room highlight three aspects of life in the ‘Moravian World’, the mission fields in Tibet and Labrador, lace work and the importance of music in late eighteenth-century Moravian life. This display not only aims to represent the global reach of the Moravian church but also focuses on Fulneck itself. The artefacts from the mission fields were brought back home to Fulneck after their service as missionaries, the lace exemplifies what was manufactured at Fulneck, and the instruments and music are examples of what was played at Fulneck. The displays give examples of how members of the Fulneck Moravian community lived and how they perceived themselves.

The Victorian Parlour’ has been totally reworked as ‘The Nelson Parlour’ and focuses on the life of the Nelson family who were residents at Fulneck from 1784 to 1959. The exhibits include
family trees, photographs and other details relating to this particular family. The table laid out for tea has been replaced by a writing desk with examples of the type of architectural work different members of the family had undertaken. The Nelsons moved to Fulneck in the late eighteenth century, their first son William was born in 1806. From 1831 to 1866 he was the organist at Fulneck church. His eldest son then took on the role for ten years to be followed by his second son from 1876 until 1923, meaning the Nelsons held the position of organist for ninety-two years. I had access to the family tree of four generations of the Nelson family, three of which lived in Fulneck. Of all the Nelson children born at Fulneck only one moved out and that was to the Moravian settlement at Ockbrook in Derbyshire where she married and settled. The others married and remained at Fulneck. There is a continued theme which focuses on actual Fulneck residents who were members of the Moravian Church. Hence the exhibits give insight to the type of person that lived at Fulneck over several generations of the same family. In this case, the Nelson family seemed to be either architects or musicians. Their children would have been educated at Fulneck school. Their house is still called Nelsons’ House (see Figure 33).
Finally, The Costume Room has been totally revamped and renamed ‘The Exhibition Room’. While it still retains a much smaller display of period costumes that can be rotated, so as not to show the same costumes all the time, the big change is the exhibition space which will change annually (like Fairfield). The committee decided the exhibit located in the church for Heritage Day which has a different theme each year and is only on display for one day would be better served if it had its own space for the rest of the year. The creation of The Exhibition Room allows a year-long display which will be changed each September (conversation with museum committee member 4th July 2018). So far there have been three different exhibitions, Moravians and the World Wars, Influential Moravian Women and The production of food at Fulneck.
Having not been able to visit the settlements due to COVID restrictions, I was at last able to revisit the Fulneck museum on 31st July 2021 when it reopened on Saturdays only until 18th September 2021. At my previous visit I had been told that there were plans to make big changes to the scullery for the fiftieth anniversary, the working title being 'Fulneck Street', though it was all dependent on available funds as the museum is meant to be self-supporting (conversation with museum committee member 4th July 2018). I was pleased to find that during the lockdown period, the planned changes and updates had been made to the displays and exhibitions. First and foremost was the new Heritage Board erected outside the museum making a clear statement about how much they value their history: Fulneck Moravian Settlement “Founded in the 18th century - a living community today” Continuing this theme of history and how contemporary English Moravians identify with it is represented by the updated masthead of the settlement’s website ‘Fulneck Moravian Church and Museum, Pride in our past, faith in our future’. Turning to the changes to the museum displays, the coverage of the missionary work has been extended to include the West Indies and the displays now cover the life and work of both the missionaries and the Indigenous people. I spoke to Myra Dickinson who was responsible for the changes, who said she felt that the original display did not give the viewer an idea of life as a missionary. Using her own experience as a former missionary in Labrador, Myra hoped that the new display conveys a story about life in the mission fields which the previous one did not. She also explained that there was resistance to making the changes from some members of the museum committee who thought there was no need for changes.119 The other major change is the completion of the Fulneck Street project. Fulneck Street resets rooms three and four to focus on life in the settlement and the various trades undertaken therein. It uses the theme of work undertaken at the settlement that helped make them self-sufficient. The visitor now progresses through rooms three and four with displays of trades such

119 Conversation with Myra Dickinson 31st July 2021
as carpentry, cobblerly, and baking which ties in with the production of food at Fulneck, the next
topic in the Exhibition Room. Furthermore, continuing the theme of work neatly links rooms
three and four to room five the Loom Room. Another change to the Loom Room is that the loom
once again is in full working order and there is now an operator who will be able to give weaving
displays.

The museum at Fairfield is a more recent addition and is housed in what was originally the
Sisters’ House which became Fairfield College, closed in 1958 and renovated in 2007. My first
visit to the museum was on 13th January 2011 as part of my research for my MA. I was then
given a guided tour by Anthony Torkington, Fairfield Steward, and original curator. I returned to
the museum on 3rd April 2017, which was my first visit as part of my research for my PhD thesis.
In a conversation with the current curator, she explained that it had been a wish by the
members of the Fairfield congregation to have a museum and that it was established in 2008.
Prior to entry, whoever is on duty at the museum checks with visitors to see if they are church
members. If not, a short introductory talk is given about the Moravian Church. The hallway
leading up to the museum entrance has a timeline of the history of the Moravian Church which
covers both the major events of the church’s history but also those of the Fairfield settlement.
From the start the visitor is made aware of key points of the history of the Moravian Church. The
church is presented as ‘founded’ in 1457 and ‘renewed’ in 1722. The museum is focused on
both religious and secular aspects of settlement life. Visitors are introduced to the way members
of the Moravian community lived, covering the founding, the running and the rules and
regulations of the settlement, all clearly explained on information panels. There are illustrated
panels explaining beliefs and traditions of the Moravian Church and highlights of three popular
practices, Christingle, the Easter Service and the Lovefeast. Rather than dwelling on just past
traditions, it juxtaposes 18th century Moravian practices of worship with 21st Century worship,
showing continuity and development. This is a theme that runs throughout all of the Fairfield museums’ exhibitions: i.e., the comparison between ‘then and now’.

There is one further room at Fairfield that is set aside to host a temporary topical exhibition. The topic of the exhibition during the time of my visit in 2018, was the First World War. The curator explained to me that this topic was chosen for two reasons: firstly, because of the various 100-year anniversaries associated with the war, and secondly, because people in the congregation knew little of Fairfield’s fallen on the 1914-1918 memorial in the church (see figure 34). So, the exhibition was personalised by reference to former congregation members. The exhibition focuses on sixteen names on the memorial to the fallen in the church that brings them out as real people rather than names on a list. Each person has a brief outline of their life before enlisting, detailing their connections to the church and community, followed by their war history, where they died and where they are buried. Where possible, there is a picture of them in uniform and a picture of their grave. However, there are two names that highlight the strong desire that many had to enlist and really brings home the global nature of the Moravian Church and the war. Two brothers Benjamin Westphal (1893-1917) and Richard Westphal (1896-1916) were sons of a German Moravian missionary in Jamaica. The brothers, when they reached the age of twelve were sent to Fulneck school where children of missionaries were educated. When aged seventeen they moved to Fairfield to continue their education and then to Victoria University Manchester. The minutes of the Provincial Elders Committee of 25th September 1914 show that their father Br. Augustus Westphal objected to his sons serving in the war.\footnote{Details of Provincial Elders Committee meeting provided by Church House archivist.} How then did the sons of a German missionary end up serving in the British armed forces? The 1911 census shows Benjamin living with his ‘uncle’ Reverend Samuel Libbey Conner who served as
the minister at Fairfield 1915-1922. While there is nothing written in the nationality column for Benjamin, Jamaica is entered as his place of birth and therefore it was assumed he was British. Both brothers enlisted when they were of age in order not to need parental consent. Richard died on 7th May 1916 aged twenty and Benjamin on 23rd April 1917 aged twenty-four (see figure 35). That both brothers enlisted in the British armed forces by choice shows their integration into the dominant British culture. They had lived and been educated since the age of twelve at both Fulneck and Fairfield and thus had been totally submerged in the community life of the two English settlements to the extent that they identified as British. While the exhibition commemorates all fourteen of the Fairfield men and the two from Wheler Street Moravian Church (now closed) who lost their lives in the 1914-18 war it was the determination of the two Westphal brothers to enlist that stands out along with the consequences of doing so. Benjamin the elder brother enlisted in 1914 and in October of the same year Richard undertook to train for the ministry and was awarded a grant in December 1914. Yet by June 1915 Richard wanted to enlist and did so on 6th October 1915 and was told that he would have to reapply for training for the ministry on the close of his military service. I can only speculate on what changed his mind, peer pressure? Whatever it was, seven months after enlisting he was killed in action.

121 Details of 1911 census provided by Church House archivist.  
122 Details of the Westphal brothers provided by Fairfield Museum curator.
Figure: 34 Fairfield Church War Memorial Font (Jim Rollo 17/02/2022)

Figure: 35 Fairfield Church War Memorial Font, the Westphal brothers, (Jim Rollo, 17/02/2022)
This exhibition was changed at the end of 2018. The exhibition for 2019 focused on the topic ‘Notable people who have lived, worked, and worshipped in Fairfield’ (email correspondence with museum curator 4th April 2019). Due to COVID-19 restrictions the museum which usually opens May to August remained closed throughout 2020. Thankfully, with the easing of COVID-19 restrictions throughout 2021 the September Heritage Open Day was able to take place.

I revisited Fairfield museum on 12th September 2021 as part of their Heritage Open Day. I found that the media display that was introduced to the museum in 2018 to promote its tranquillity and peacefulness and how that draws film and television production to the site had been extended. As well as the static visual and audio-visual displays about how the settlement is used in television productions it now includes displays that cover the latest productions of the TV series *Peaky Blinders* and the film *Mrs Lowry and her son*, which both used Fairfield as a filming location.\(^{123}\) This display clearly shows how proud members of the community are of their settlement and how they want to share that pride. In conversation with the Fairfield archivist, I asked how Fairfield became involved in TV and film. She said that it all started in the 1960s when the settlement became a conservation area, and the buildings became listed. At this time the Fairfield community were renovating the old college building and in need of funds so when asked about the availability for filming they said yes.\(^{124}\) The first time Fairfield appeared on TV was a short documentary broadcast on 26th May 1965 at 6:30pm. In the July 1965 edition of *The Fairfield Moravian* the minister states ‘we are all proud of our settlement and we take pleasure in the obvious interest and envy of others. It all increases our self-esteem and emphasises our privileged position’. He also noted that after the programme was aired there had been a lot more

\(^{123}\) *Manchester Evening News*, September 25th, 2017, and Fairfield Heritage Open Day 12th September 2021

\(^{124}\) Conversation with Fairfield Archivist 4th November 2021
people visiting the settlement and was ‘delighted in the fact that our church is admired by many’.\textsuperscript{125}

Of course, the desire to use Fairfield in period film is also due to the settlement being unspoilt and grade two listed. There are no satellite dishes or other modern-day clutter. However, it also says something about the community’s pride in the picturesque location of their settlement that they want to share. Furthermore, this represents an interesting contrast: on the one hand, the fact that the Fairfield community allows TV/film crews to use their settlement as a backdrop reflects a willingness to embrace modern technology, while on the other, it maintains the old-world image of the settlement itself. However, while their history and heritage form a part of their identity, it is important to remember that these are active living religious communities today.

\textbf{5.8 Conclusion}

This chapter has shown that the Moravian Church has a history of using types of celebrations to unite communities dating back to the early years of the Zinzendorf era at Herrnhut. It has explained how Moravian settlements present their history to promote a public facing image. The individual churches and settlements can oversee this at the local level via their Congregation Council and Congregation Committee and in the wider area via the district conferences (see Chapter 4 The Two Settlements, section 4.7 Church Organisation). These different celebrations, festivals and pageants are examples of how Moravian settlements in England create links to the past but selectively present historical events to promote a public image of their history. Some of these celebrations, such as the Easter graveyard service, were introduced by Zinzendorf and still take place today. More large-scale events have been undertaken, for example Fulneck’s

\textsuperscript{125} Reverend Norman Driver, Minister’s letter \textit{The Fairfield Moravian July 1965 Fairfield Archives T/29/504}
production of their own pageants. These open-air performances show them to be proud of their past and of the achievements of the Moravian Church and are also open to a wider audience, not just members of the Moravian Church. Though the following comments published by the Moravian Messenger in 1957 show that the performance had the desired effect:

One of the outstanding events at the Synod of the British Province, held at Fulneck in July, was the Pageant. What impressed me was the way the future generations of Moravian men and women, the children of today portrayed the Moravians of yester-year. It was a thrill and an experience that I am sure they will never forget. Then the climax, over a hundred youngsters all in white forming a cross, for the heroes of the past to move symbolically towards. (Br. S. Bord in Moravian Messenger August 1957)

Both settlements take part in the annual Heritage Open Day, another method of presenting representations of Moravian identity to those outside the Moravian community. These events give visitors an opportunity to see inside some of the historic buildings but also introduce them to not only the history of the settlements but also provide an insight into how life was for those who lived there. The museums at the two settlements have quite different approaches to their presentations of the history of their settlements. The museum at Fulneck looks mainly to the past, concentrating on what life would have been like living at the settlement, with little information about their religious practices and traditions. Furthermore, although the majority of the displays at the Fulneck museum are of a secular nature the importance that the present-day members of the community place upon their history is clear. Fairfield, on the other hand, looks to both the past and the present - what the beliefs and practices of the members of the Fairfield community were in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century and what they are today. The displays at the Fairfield museum embrace the practices and traditions of the settlement, showing continuity from past to present and making the museum more than just a site of memory. The methods that the two settlements use to promote their public image has moved to more modern media. Fairfield embraced the idea of using the settlement as a location for film and television productions in the 1960s with Fulneck recently joining them in 2021. This can
also be seen as a way of advertising the location itself as it is so easy for viewers to check what locations were used in a production. The settlements are something that members of both communities are proud of, and they want to bring them to the attention of viewers and visitors. This will be discussed in the next chapter, which presents the findings of my contemporary fieldwork, where it became apparent that the notion of not dwelling in the past but wanting continuity from the past to the present was reflected in the responses to the questionnaires at Fulneck and Fairfield.
Chapter 6. Perceptions of Moravian identity in Fulneck and Fairfield today: contemporary fieldwork findings

6.1 Introduction

This chapter is based on the findings of my analysis of the questionnaires that I distributed among members of the Fulneck community on 23rd April 2016 and collected on 31st May 2016 and the Fairfield community on 12th April 2017 and collected on 14th May 2017. This was further supplemented by information gathered through interviews, focus groups that I conducted, and participant observation undertaken at the two settlements (see Chapter 2 where I offer a more detailed outline of my methodological approach). I decided to combine my archival research with contemporary fieldwork after reading Colin Podmore’s judgement that English, like American Moravians identify with the United Brethren founded in 1457, rather than the renewed church created by Zinzendorf in 1722 (Podmore, 2007, p.33). With this in mind, I wanted to explore what aspects of the history of the Moravian Church contemporary Moravians refer to in order to build their identity, and how they understand their community’s history.

This chapter is structured according to themes that emerged in the analysis of the questionnaires, including perceptions of Moravian history (such as perceptions of places, events, historical figures, and traditions) and their contemporary relevance. It also relates the findings of my contemporary fieldwork to relevant literature in this field. Furthermore, I will examine how notions of the past have evolved ushering in new viewpoints from all levels of the Moravian community.
6.2 Initial Approach, Questionnaires

The questionnaire consisted of twelve questions (see Appendix 1), including two closed multiple-choice questions, four questions each asking the respondents to rank the importance of a different pre-selected aspect of the church’s history and six open-ended questions asking respondents to provide some narrative. In addition, the first six questions had open text boxes to enable respondents to comment and further expand on their answers to the multiple-choice questions. These comment boxes proved to be a popular option. The questionnaire also gave participants the opportunity to specify their age and gender, if they wished to do so, and invited them to indicate their willingness to talk to me in more depth. The questionnaire was designed to be simple to answer and not too time consuming in order to increase the chance of receiving fully completed questionnaires (Navarro-Rivera and Kosmin, 2011, p.408). All respondents answered all of the questions on the returned questionnaires, though not all took the opportunity to use the additional comment boxes.

The first set of questions were to establish the extent to which present-day members of the Moravian Church identify with the ancient church, the United Brethren or with the renewed church of 1722. To this end, they were first asked to reflect on how they viewed their church from both, a historical and contemporary perspective. The next set of questions were devised to bring out aspects of church history and church life that they assigned particular importance to. This included historical figures who stood out in the history of the church, places that were seen as important, events that held a particular significance and finally books, texts and practices that were important to them as Moravians. Again, the idea was to consider both historical and contemporary perspectives. The format of these questions asked for up to three examples with space to explain their choices. The next set of questions looked at how current adherents felt about how the Moravian Church is represented by outsiders, both media and members of the
public, and whether they felt it important for those on the outside to know that they were Moravians. For these questions, the respondents were asked to rank in importance their concerns about how others viewed them. Again, there was space to expand on their choice. The final question simply asked: what does being a Moravian mean to you? At the end of the questionnaire, there was space to put contact details for those who said I could contact them to discuss points raised in their completed questionnaires. However, the response rate to my questionnaires was relatively low: across the two settlements, a total of twenty-eight questionnaires was completed.

While the initial questionnaires provided me with limited insights for my investigation of members’ perceptions of what it means to be a Moravian today, they gave an entry point to the two communities and helped me make connections and identify people who were willing to be interviewed in more depth. Both Fulneck and Fairfield are long-established settlements that have evolved over time. I designed the questionnaires in a way that would assist me in gaining further insights into how members of both settlements thought about their settlement and its history in the wider context of the Moravian Church in England. I aimed to find out more about similarities and differences between the two settlements and whether time had widened any differences between them or brought them closer together. I also aimed to establish how contemporary members of these settlements conceptualise notions of community within the settlement and how they perceive or interact with non-Moravians living in these two settlements.

The breakdown of questionnaire respondents is heavily weighted to the older age brackets, though when all respondents from both communities are combined there was at least one respondent for each of the age brackets.
Table 6: Fulneck Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>18-29</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50-59</th>
<th>60-69</th>
<th>70-79</th>
<th>80+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Fairfield Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>18-29</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50-59</th>
<th>60-69</th>
<th>70-79</th>
<th>80+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: All Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>18-29</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50-59</th>
<th>60-69</th>
<th>70-79</th>
<th>80+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fulneck produced more male respondents, whereas at Fairfield that position was reversed, although between both communities the gender split was fifty / fifty. However, in light of the fact that both communities have a significantly higher proportion of female members, it meant that men were more willing to respond to my survey than women. I had hoped for a more balanced split between the age groups, especially from Fairfield, as the age of the respondents did not reflect the greater age range in the community membership. By contrast the community at Fulneck has a higher proportion of older residents. It is a popular destination for retired ministers. For example, the former ministers from Fairfield and Ockbrook settlements are now residents at Fulneck.
6.3 Perceptions of the church

I wanted to investigate how contemporary members of the two settlements identified with the Moravian Church, from both historical and contemporary perspectives, in order to draw out their relationship with different aspects of the history of the church. For example, when thinking about the church historically, did they identify with the church of 1457, the renewed church of 1722, or both? Of the twenty-eight asked, twenty-two said they identified with both. When thinking from a contemporary perspective, did they identify with their local settlement, the English Moravian Church, or the international Moravian Church? This time, eighteen respondents said they aligned with the international Moravian Church, the Global Unity; however, this was often qualified with them identifying with the English Moravian Church, and their own settlement as well. Seven members from Fulneck and one member from Fairfield showed the importance they placed upon the English Moravian Church and community life when they stated that they identified with the English Church. Furthermore, two Fairfield residents and one Fulneck resident said they identified equally with the English church and their respective settlements. I had fourteen follow up interviews in response to my questionnaires. In one such interview, two Fairfield residents explained that being members of both, the Fairfield community and of the English Moravian Church, was important to them (Elizabeth 60-69, and Richard 60-69) while at Fulneck, Paul felt equally attached to the English Moravian Church and the Fulneck settlement (Paul, 60-69). My findings indicate that the members of the Fulneck and Fairfield communities see a historical continuity of the church with no division between the pre-Zinzendorfian church and the renewed church, with the two periods being seen as different parts of a whole. Furthermore, my findings show that members of both communities value the Global Unity of the Moravian Church within which the English Moravian Church and the individual settlements play an important role.
The findings of my contemporary fieldwork indicate that for members of both communities, their church and their settlements formed an important part of their English Moravian identity. What then was the outward-facing identity that members of the Moravian communities wished to present? Here, there were different responses from the two settlements. The majority of the respondents at Fulneck felt it was important for people to know that they were members of the Moravian Church, one Fulneck resident told me that she felt it important that others saw them as ordinary Christians who are proud of their Moravian history, but not stuck in the past (Susan, 80+ Fulneck). Whereas at Fairfield, there were two different viewpoints: half of the respondents stated that, like Fulneck, recognition of them as Moravians by others was important, while the other half did not consider this to be important. Instead, they felt that it was more important for people to know that they were Christians, first and foremost. In a follow up conversation, a Fairfield member, who had commented on the questionnaire that she considered herself to be a Christian first, then told me about her experience of telling her work colleagues that she was a Moravian. She noted how surprised she had been by how interested her colleagues were. Talking to them about the Moravian Church and its history had made her realise how important being a Moravian was to her (Claire, 60-69, Fairfield). Another Fairfield resident said that it was important for people to know they were members of the Moravian Church and followed its traditions (Sandra, 60-69, Fairfield).

My fieldwork showed that members of both communities valued their community's history and regarded it as an integral part of their identity as Moravians. However, the name ‘Moravian’ itself sometimes raised issues. Members from both Fulneck and Fairfield made comments about not being seen as ‘one of those funny sects’ (Susan, Fulneck, 80+) or ‘having peculiar beliefs’ (Marianne, Fulneck, 70-79). One Fairfield member spoke of being thought of as a member of a ‘sect of a very strange church’, or even sometimes being mistaken for a Mormon (Edith,
Fairfield, 60-69). I would argue that this fear of being seen as some kind of sect is a throwback to the crisis of 1750 - 1753 when, arguably, the Moravians were justifiably perceived as rather ‘funny’ or ‘strange’ in light of Christian Renatus’s activities, which were particularly damaging to the reputation of the Moravian Church in England. The worry of being misconceived is not limited to members of Fulneck and Fairfield. As Peter Vogt points out, in the United States, some congregations went as far as to drop the name ‘Moravian’ from their signage because it sounded foreign and was often confused with the Mormon church (Vogt, 2013, p. 6). Peucker gives the example of a Moravian Church community in the United States that dropped the word ‘Moravian’ from its name in 2008 as it wanted people to know them as Christian first, before telling them about the history of the church. The minister explained that he did not want people to be put off by the name Moravian (Peucker, 2010, p. 6). The minister at Fairfield also emphasised that it was more important to him for people to know that he was a Christian, however, if people were interested and he felt it appropriate, he was happy to tell them about the history of the Moravian Church (Conversation with Fairfield Minister 3rd April 2017). In order to address misconceptions about their communities, Moravian Churches in the British and American Provinces display a notice either outside the church or at the entrance to the settlement giving a brief history of the Moravian Church (see chapter 5, Moravian Public History and Identity, subsection 5.5 Heritage Boards). Thinking back to Peucker’s comment about the consequence of the Sifting Time and how it ‘changed the Moravian Church from a radical, controversial religious group to a more mainstream, conventional denomination’ (Peucker, 2015, p.171). How do today’s Moravians see themselves, controversial or mainstream? While the results of my research suggest that there is a fear of being seen as a sect, however, when speaking to members of both communities, the consensus was that they saw themselves as ‘ordinary’ Christians - who belonged to a church with a long history, as the Fairfield minister told me, ‘ecumenical and welcoming to other Christians’ (conversation with minister 24th November 2017).
Whilst making a point about being worried about those outside the Moravian communities thinking of them as foreign, there is also a sense of affiliation among research participants from both communities with their central European heritage, both the Czech and the German. As one resident said, ‘I love the history of the church, both the ancient and renewed church, I would like to think that our ancestors would be proud of what we do today’ (Elizabeth, 60-69, Fairfield). Here Elizabeth is referring to the history of both the church of 1457 founded in Kunwald, in what is now the Czech Republic and the church of 1722 founded in Saxony, Germany.

As I explained earlier (see Chapter 2), the name the ‘Moravian’ Church was not officially adopted by the British Province until 1908. Until then, it was referred to as the Church of the United Brethren, the Brethren’s Church, or the Unity of Brethren (Stead and Stead, 2003, p. 127, Vogt, 2013, p. 5). Furthermore, the confusion arising from the name seems more problematic in the American and British provinces as many other provinces use vernacular versions of the original ‘Unitas Fratrum’ rather than ‘Moravian’ (Vogt, 2013, p. 5).

6.4 Perceptions of Moravian identity

What does it mean to be a Moravian today? This was a question initially put to members of both communities via the questionnaire and followed up with meetings and discussions which produced a wide range of answers. Herrnhut minister Peter Vogt’s thoughts on what it means are: ‘a tradition of community and faith, that continues to be meaningful; a sense of connectedness that stretches through time and space; a history that reminds us we don’t stand alone but are part of a larger community’ (Vogt, 2013, p. 18). These thoughts echo many of the members of both communities’ ideas, too. Both Fulneck and Fairfield ministers felt that integral to being a Moravian was the ‘rich’ and ‘noble’ history of the church and its liberal theology. The
history and heritage of the church was a common theme that ran through the questionnaire and interview responses of both communities. In an informal discussion over a coffee with a small group at Fairfield on 14th June 2018, it became apparent that the important aspects associated with being a Moravian were faith, fellowship and a way of life. Overall, what stood out in the group discussions was the prevalence of notions of ‘community’, ‘unity’, ‘equality’, ‘acceptance’ and ‘fellowship’. The ministers at Fulneck and Fairfield cited Bishop Shawe’s 1957 *The Spirit of the Moravian Church* as shaping their understanding of Moravian identity. In this study booklet which was written for the 500th anniversary of the Moravian Church, Shawe sets out what he considers to be the five key characteristics of the Moravian spirit: simplicity, happiness, unintrusiveness, fellowship and the ideal of service. In one of my interviews, a resident explicitly referred to Shawe’s understanding of the Moravian Spirit, though they referred to only three of these five characteristics: ‘Bishop Shawe says it all about being a Moravian, simplicity, happiness, and fellowship’ (Susan, 80+ Fulneck). Only three residents made an explicit reference to Shawe, however, others mentioned these characteristics in a broader sense, as two residents explained ‘Fairfield is a very close-knit community, for both young and old’ (Elizabeth, 60-69, Fairfield) and ‘I feel attached to the settlement here at Fulneck’ (Paul, 60-69, Fulneck).

While this is the kind of thing residents might say about any small village community, it is important to note that historically, the idea of community is central to the Moravian Church, as Zinzendorf’s dictum ‘that there could be no true Christianity without community’ shows (Stead, 1999, p. 44). Stead argues that the establishment and maintenance of a sense of community was fundamental to the organisation of Herrnhut and the other Moravian settlements (Stead, 1999, p. 44). Vogt sees this as important because the same organisational structures were used in each individual settlement. Whether the settlements were in Germany, England, or the United
States they were all organised in the same way (Vogt, 2006, p. 20). This common structure helped create the feeling of a worldwide Moravian community where Moravians in all parts of the world would ‘feel connected with their distant brothers and sisters’ (Vogt, 2006, p. 20). Alongside this it also meant that it was fairly easy for Moravians to move from one community to another and feel instantly at home (Vogt, 2006, p. 20). With the strict organisational structure no longer existing, what are the notions of community for today’s Moravians?

In my fieldwork, it became apparent that for many members of the settlements in Fulneck and Fairfield, the notion of community stretches further than living in the same ‘village’. There are many facets of ‘Moravian community’: the settlements themselves, the other Moravian churches in the local districts, the community of the British Province and the community of the Global Unity of the worldwide Moravian church. There are many things that bring the members together, as one resident said, ‘we are part of a living church, with social and religious connections and a strong sense of a united congregation and community’ (Richard 60-69 Fairfield). The notion of family and close community came up when talking to three Fairfield residents about living in the settlement (coffee morning, 1st July 2017). They felt it was ‘a church family supporting one another, a community’ (Lidia). Community members saw the settlements as places where they could ‘appreciate being part of a community, sharing close fellowship with other Moravians’ (Jane), and also be ‘part of a family of the church, sharing fellowship, love, and worship’ (Lynne). Indeed, the combination of religious worship and social activities as a means of uniting members was often mentioned by respondents to questionnaires and in discussions and meetings. Both Fulneck and Fairfield offer a wide range of social activities (see Chapter 4 ‘The Two Settlements’). In the focus groups and interviews I conducted as part of my fieldwork, it became apparent that notions of community life and of a united congregation relate not only to the contemporary church, but also to the value assigned to the history of the Moravian Church and to being ‘part of a continuum reaching back through history’ (Claire, 60-69, Fairfield).
During my fieldwork which I predominantly undertook at Fulneck during 2015 and 2016 and Fairfield in 2017 and 2018, I attended many different events, some planned and others that were more impromptu. Such events have often revealed much of what I am certain underpins notions of Moravian identity today, and it could be argued that these events highlight that Moravians feel bound together by a common story (Vogt, 2013, p. 18).

One such event was a Saturday reunion lunch organised by a group who used to live in the settlement or nearby and used to attend the Fairfield Moravian Church but had since moved away. Having spent a morning in the archives, I went to get a coffee from the kitchen only to find a large buffet lunch laid out. After a brief explanation of who I was and why I was there, I was invited to join their reunion lunch. They were interested in my research, and they were happy to clarify that some were still practising members of a Moravian Church and that all of them liked to meet at Fairfield as they still felt they had a link to it. They explained that despite no longer living there, they felt that their memories made them still feel part of the Fairfield Moravian community. These notions of a time or a place Vogt refers to as ‘Moravian moments’ when one steps back and reflects on that moment and state ‘this is why I am a Moravian’ (Vogt, 2013, p. 14). Vogt’s personal Moravian moment was at a burial in Herrnhut’s God’s Acre. The coffin was brought in a procession from the church to the grave side, led by Herrnhut’s brass band Vogt describes his feelings as they entered the gate to God’s Acre,

I felt a deep sense of consolation in the midst of grief, a deep sense of connection between the past and the present, a deep sense of community among those who had come together for this occasion from many different places. And I remember thinking in the midst of hymns and the gathered congregation, the peaceful rows of graves and the view of Herrnhut church in the background: This is why I am Moravian! (Vogt, 2013, pp. 14-15)

Vogt suggests other scenarios where ‘Moravian moments’ may occur such as the Easter graveyard early morning service, international meetings of the Moravian Unity and the singing of
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beloved hymns that ‘give us a sense of rootedness in our tradition (Vogt, 2013, p. 15). Indeed, singing and music have been integral to Moravian traditions and Moravian life since the renewal of the church. This encompasses both organ and brass band music (Reed Knouse, 2007, p.46) – a tradition that is still alive at Fulneck with monthly organ recitals. I have attended several of these recitals performed by City of Leeds organist Simon Lindley and my attendance at these events helped build a relationship with members of the Fulneck community.

The closest I have been to a ‘Moravian moment’ also involved singing. This was at an event held at Fulneck church on 20th May 2017 as one of the optional activities at the ‘My Heart Strangely Warmed’ conference to bring people together and also to promote awareness of the choir. Those taking part included choir members (The Moravian Singers), singers and non-singers (by non-singers I mean those who do not sing on a regular basis who would normally only sing when the need arose, this group included myself) – about thirty people in total. The object was to sing a verse from an old German Moravian hymn that had been translated into English. We were split into groups by voice type and slowly worked through the verse, sometimes by group and sometimes as a whole, culminating with us all singing together. This for me was a totally different experience where I was outside my comfort zone, singing an unknown hymn with a group of people I had only just met. However, despite my initial discomfort, the support and encouragement from all those involved made the joy of singing as one become a genuinely shared experience of achievement, a communal effort, that led to much applause, hand shaking and a feeling of inclusiveness. Furthermore, my active participation in this event gave me a snapshot of what type of event could be someone’s ‘Moravian moment’ and also helped in understanding some of the respondents’ comments about community and common values. As an outsider I felt included. Obviously I was not having a ‘Moravian moment’, but I certainly got the point.
The importance placed upon hymn singing is still evident at both settlements. When asked about practices, the most popular choice by far among questionnaire respondents identified at both, Fulneck and Fairfield, was the Lovefeast singing service. One member commented on the way this service links the present to the past and explained, ‘it means a lot to me, it feels like a real connection to our history’ (Mary, 60-69 Fulneck). Also highly placed by both communities were Christingle and the Easter early morning graveyard service, again both singing services. More respondents made comments about the Easter Service along the lines of remembrance and reflection, for example ‘it is a time to reflect on the past year’ (Edith, 60-69, Fairfield). Table 9 shows the combined choices from those at Fulneck and Fairfield who completed the questionnaire. In light of the small number of participants, the results may not be fully representative of the communities as a whole, but still give an indication.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lovefeast</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christingle</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eucharist</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easter Burial Ground Service</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calling of Brother &amp; Sister</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellowship</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ as Head of Church</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moravonian Star</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Events</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayer Watch</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat Headstones</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christening Service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missionary Work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Fulneck and Fairfield Practices and Traditions
In line with the popularity of singing services, it was not surprising that when asked, the most popular books participants mentioned were the Moravian Liturgy and the Moravian Hymnbook, or in the case of Fairfield, the 1960 Hymnbook. Further investigation revealed that the Congregation Council at Fairfield preferred the 1960 version and chose to continue with its use, rather than the 1995 edition. There were many objections, but the opinion of the council was that the new edition was just too big, its size and weight considered too much for the elderly members of the congregation. In addition, many members of the congregation were upset by the number of popular hymns omitted from the new edition. Finally, cost: it was considerably cheaper to keep the 1960 edition and have a supplementary copy of the mission praise book instead of investing in the new combined edition (discussion with the archivist and congregation committee member 1st July 2017). However, not all agreed with continuing to use the traditional hymns. At the 2017 Fairfield Christmas Fayre I spoke to Peter (member of the congregation) about music and hymns. He thought that music had always had a central role in Moravian worship. However, he felt that in recent years, the English Moravian Church had neglected new hymns. He stated that ‘there is a need to provide attractive modern hymns which have a direct relevance to contemporary life, but little thought has gone into finding examples which match carefully considered words to music of quality’ (conversation with Peter at Fairfield Christmas Fayre 25th November 2017).

6.5 Perceptions of Moravian history and its relevance today

As my examination of the historical development of the Moravian Church has already shown, history and historiography have played an important role in the Moravian Church. The way its history has been told has been controlled, rewritten, deleted, and adapted, most notably, after Zinzendorf’s death in 1760. I have covered the process of the reimagining of the church in the
period between 1760 and 1811 in detail in the ‘Rebuilding and New Identity’ section of Chapter 3 ‘The Moravian Church in England, a short history’.

Given the important role the history of the Moravian Church played in its development, how do the contemporary Moravians of Fulneck and Fairfield identify with their history? In what ways does the past form today’s Moravian, what is the relationship between the two? For instance, are there particular aspects of it that they value, that they identify with? Does linking the present with the past form a continuity for English Moravians? Or conversely, are there areas that they feel are unimportant or no longer relevant to the modern church? My initial survey by questionnaire found that members of both the Fairfield and Fulneck settlements felt strongly that their history was important to them. An issue that has long been debated by both those inside and outside the Moravian Church is the link between the early church of 1457 and the renewed church of 1722. The official view was to present the history of the Moravian Church as a continuous one. However, my research findings demonstrate that this viewpoint is changing at both congregational and ministerial levels.

I asked members of the two communities in Fairfield and Fulneck how they see the Moravian church historically. The majority of both Fulneck and Fairfield respondents stated that they associated the church’s history with both the ancient church of the United Brethren founded in 1457, and the renewed church of 1722. One respondent sums up the way she understands the notion of identifying with both ‘I see the history as two parts, Huss 1457 and Zinzendorf 1722, the church as we know it’ (Helen 50-59 Fairfield). Like Vogt, Helen sees the 1457 church of the United Brethren and the 1722 renewed church of Zinzendorf as two distinct periods in the history of the Moravian Church (Vogt, 2013, p. 17), and identifies with both of them. Like Helen,
Fulneck resident Marianne acknowledges both sections of the church’s history as it ‘also explains the close connection with the German church and our mid European origins’ (Marianne 70-79 Fulneck). These views are from members of the congregations at Fulneck and Fairfield, and it is a viewpoint shared by the ministers at both settlements. In a meeting with the Fulneck minister on 7th April 2016 he stated that he sees the history of the church as two separate periods, the early church, and the renewed church of Zinzendorf onwards. Interestingly, he agreed with Podmore’s outsider perspective view that the church today is the renewed church of Zinzendorf. A year later, in a meeting with the minister at Fairfield on 29th April 2017, he identified the founding of the Unity of Brethren on 1st March 1457 and the renewal of the church by Zinzendorf on 17th June 1722 as key historical dates marking these two distinct periods of Moravian history. Furthermore, he felt that the beginning of Moravian missionary work on 21st August 1732 was a further third key point in Moravian history. He viewed them as stages in the development of the Moravian Church. However, I encountered a range of different views on this issue: while discussing a change of the way church history was viewed as a single continuous one, as represented, for example, by the pageant ‘Moravian Church Quincentenary – A Pageant of our Church’s Story 1457 – 1957’ (WYB 75/9/14 and FUL 29/743), the assistant archivist at Church House Muswell Hill stated that as far as he was concerned, Zinzendorf’s renewed church of 1722 had nothing to do with the church of 1457.

As I already pointed out in Chapter 3 ‘The English Moravian Church in historical context’ (section 3.4 ‘Continuity of the renewed church’), where I discuss the history and background of the debate about the continuity between the United Brethren and the renewed church, this is not a new debate. As Peucker points out it is a fascinating topic (Peucker, 2010, p. 8). The way Moravians view these aspects of their history says a lot about their Moravian identity, and the continuity between them plays an important role.
To further explore the role history plays in today’s members of the Moravian Church I wanted to find out if there were particular aspects of the history that held significant importance. The results of the questionnaire revealed that there were indeed people, places, and events from the history of the church that held a special place with the members of the two communities.

### 6.6 Perceptions of Historical Figures

Given the fractured history of the Moravian Church with its problematic continuous or two-stage setting, I wanted to establish which historical personalities, if any, were perceived as important to members of the two settlements in Fairfield and Fulneck. Therefore, I asked them to nominate people who stood out to them in the history of the Moravian Church. I intended to test the hypothesis that there would be a high proportion of respondents selecting people related to the United Brethren, rather than the renewed church. This would be in line with Podmore’s claim that ‘If one asks German members of the Brüdergemeinde where their church was founded and when, they will respond that it was founded in Herrnhut in the 1720s. By contrast, the Moravian Church’s British members tend to regard their church as having been founded in fifteenth century Bohemia and play down Zinzendorf’s role in its history’ (Podmore, 2007, p.32).

However, this was not the case. As opposed to the assistant archivist at church house (see subsection 6.5) most members of both communities identified with Vogt’s ‘Two Stage Paradigm’ (Vogt, 2013, p. 7). They also selected historical figures from both periods of Moravian history. At Fulneck, the founder of the renewed church, Zinzendorf, along with Huss, a Bohemian reformer, who left a lasting legacy within the United Brethren (Livingstone, 2000, p. 280), and Comenius, the last United Brethren bishop and former minister of Fulnek in Bohemia (Livingstone, 2000, p. 131), from where the Yorkshire settlement Fulneck takes its name, were all named as significant
people in the history of the Moravian Church. There was a similar result at Fairfield with both Zinzendorf and Huss being highly regarded, but Comenius less so. The tables below show all the choices made by both communities. It is interesting to note that the three most popular figures are the same for both settlements. Again, a necessary note of caution needs to be raised regarding the percentages as the overall number of selections represents a small proportion of the members of the two communities, the adult population for Fulneck is 68 and for Fairfield 98.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zinzendorf</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Zinzendorf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hus</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Huss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comenius</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Comenius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Church officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortimer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>La Trobe C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birhill</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>La Trobe B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cennick</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nischmann A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nischmann A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bishop Foster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cennick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>F/Field founded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 10: Fulneck Important Historical Figures**

**Table 11: Fairfield Important Historical Figures**

What was the rationale that led to members of both settlements making these selections? As already mentioned, Fulneck has a close connection with Zinzendorf (see Fulneck, Chapter 4 The Two Settlements). As a resident stated in the context of one of the focus group discussions I facilitated as part of my research at this settlement, ‘without Zinzendorf Fulneck church would not exist, it was Zinzendorf who planned for the settlement to be built here’ (Keith 70-79 Fulneck). Here, Keith is referring to the legend on the Fulneck website (see ‘The foundation of
Fulneck’ included in Chapter 4 ‘The Two Settlements’). Another focus group participant saw Zinzendorf as ‘a visionary, a man who believed all were equal in Christ and all had equal rights to pray, worship and believe regardless of wealth, education or social standing’ (John 40-49 Fulneck).

Fairfield has no such links to Zinzendorf as it was founded in 1785, twenty-five years after his death. So, what makes its residents assign so much significance to Zinzendorf? The key reasons that those respondents, who had selected Zinzendorf, gave were that he had given support to the first Moravian refugees who arrived at Herrnhut as well as the importance they assigned to his promotion of missionary work. The respondents were equally forthcoming with comments on their support of Huss ‘for his strength of belief and unwavering faith’ (Claire 60-69 Fairfield). Fulneck resident David was more forthcoming with his thoughts about Huss:

A man who at a very early age knew he was capable of influencing his own destiny by the decisions he made. A man who had such strong belief in what was right and what was wrong that he was prepared to die rather than change his opinion. A man I admire for his belief that those who claim to act on Christ’s Behalf yet do so for their own advantage cannot be a true Christian (conversation with David, Fulneck 11th January 2017).

These comments support the relevance assigned to both Huss and Zinzendorf and to the place they hold in the history of the Moravian Church as they see it.

6.7 Perceptions of Places

As part of the questionnaire, I used in the initial phase of my research, I asked members of both the Fairfield and Fulneck settlements to name any places of importance in the history of the
Moravian Church. I asked this question in order to gain greater insights into how members of these settlements view various aspects of their history. Would their selections follow similar patterns of a preference for places related to the United Brethren or Zinzendorf, or would there be a preference for places in England, central Europe or elsewhere? In their survey responses, all the respondents from both settlements selected Herrnhut as a place that was important to them. Herrnhut is Zinzendorf’s estate in Saxony where he first allowed exiles from Moravia to settle and where the church was renewed in 1722. In fact, the places chosen by members of both settlements were all places associated with the renewed church, with the exception of Prague, where Huss used to preach, and Kunwald, where the United Brethren were founded in 1457. All other responses referred to Moravian settlements and churches in England, Northern Ireland, and the USA. All the settlements in the British province were considered as important by the members of both communities. This was a totally free choice: there were no listed options so the respondents could choose any place that was important to them. These settlements and churches are all related to the renewed church as part of the expansion of the Moravian Church.

I now see a pattern forming in the way members of both Moravian settlements place importance upon different aspects of their history. This reflects an open approach to their history, for example, participants of neither settlement were totally pro-Zinzendorf, nor were they totally anti-Zinzendorf. In fact, the results have shown that in relation to historical figures, respondents at the two communities equally favoured those linked with both the renewed church and the United Brethren. Again, with regard to important places there was a symmetry between the two settlements with both communities placing a greater importance on those connected with the renewed church, though places connected to the United Brethren were also included. It shows a sense of connection to and continuance of their history, how the members of two English
communities ‘continue to express the elements of its tradition which identify it as a scion of its parent’ (Stead and Stead, 2003, p. 382). Again, as noted earlier, these findings relate to the people who took part and therefore may not be representative of the communities as a whole.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Herrnhut</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prague</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kunwald</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulneck</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fetter Lane</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Churches</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gracehill</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salem</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dukinfield</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ockbrook</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Herrnhut</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: Fulneck and Fairfield Important Places

6.8 Perceptions of Events

Continuing the examination of the significance placed upon different parts of the history of the Moravian Church by current members, the focus now turns to historical events. In line with their selection of Herrnhut as a place of particularly great significance, members of Fulneck selected the foundation of the Herrnhut settlement as the most important event in Moravian history, with the martyrdom of Huss a close second. On the other hand, the Fairfield members placed the foundation of the United Brethren at Kunwald in 1457 and the founding of Fairfield settlement in 1785 in joint first, followed by the foundation of Herrnhut in a close second place. Additional comments from the respondents show that Kunwald was selected because ‘that’s where the Moravian community started’ (Clair 60-69 Fairfield) and the foundation of Fairfield as an event of significance to a place ‘I truly belong to’ (Hilda 70-79 Fairfield). Further analysis shows that the
top four selections for both settlements were in the ratio of three renewed church related events to one Unity of Brethren church event.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Herrnhut founded</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martyrdom of Huss</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manifestation of the Holy Spirit</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moravian Missions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550 years celebration at Coventry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unity of Brethren founded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ as head of the church</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fetter Lane founded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointment of first Bishop</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synod of Lhotka 1467</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voyage to America</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: Fulneck Significant Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kunwald 1457</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield Opens 1785</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herrnhut founded</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manifestation of the Holy Spirit</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moravian Missions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Mountain 1629</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Years War 1542-1557</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christingle Service</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fetter Lane Agreement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huss Journey to Rome</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ as Head of the Church</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Bishops</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: Fairfield Significant Events

I propose that the results show that the members of both communities who participated in my fieldwork place great importance on their history and heritage and the role it plays in contemporary English Moravian identity. They have a sense of pride in their past and faith in the community’s future evidenced by heritage boards at the settlements, on site museums, the celebration of important dates in their history, and the continuing popularity of traditions and practices.

Furthermore, my fieldwork findings show that both the renewed church and the ancient church of the United Brethren are valued - though with a higher emphasis on Zinzendorf. This supports Podmore’s argument that ‘what is known as the Moravian Church today was essentially the creation of Zinzendorf’ (Podmore, 2007, p.31). In addition, my fieldwork findings indicate that
English Moravians agree with Vogt’s Two Stage Paradigm ‘that Moravian history is made up of two parts, two distinct periods’ (Vogt, 2013, p. 17) and that contemporary members of the Moravian communities embrace both.

6.9 Conclusion

The results of my questionnaires, observations, and fieldwork at the two settlements show that the majority of members of both communities view the history of their church as an important factor. In addition, members of both communities felt that some knowledge of the church history by those outside the church could help it not being thought of as foreign. The issue with being seen as ‘foreign’ or as a ‘sect’ is a recurring theme mentioned by members of Fulneck and Fairfield. It is their perception that it is a common misconception for those on the outside of the church to think of the members as being either foreign or members of some kind of religious sect. This is an area that would benefit from further investigation as my data is gathered from church members and not those on the outside. This topic of misconception has also appeared in magazines of the American Moravian Church where they are thought to be part of the Mormon church or closed communities like the Amish, though again these are written by those inside the church.127

My analysis found that community members from both settlements particularly valued the traditions, practices and events that have been with the church since they were introduced by Zinzendorf in the period 1727 to 1743. This is also reflected in the Moravian pageants, the
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displays at the Heritage Open Days, and the exhibitions in the museums. In a similar vein, when looking at the perceptions of places, the respondents placed particular importance on the various settlements of Zinzendorf's reformed church. My analysis of survey, interview, focus group responses as well as informal conversations and participant observation indicate that to the members of Fulneck and Fairfield, their settlements are more than where they live: they are places of worship, fellowship, and community.

My findings about perceptions of the history of the Moravian Church show that the members of both communities identify with a wide range of different aspects of their history. Some of which are linked to the early period of the church of the United Brethren and others are linked to the later period of the church founded by Zinzendorf. The common viewpoint that emerges is on the whole in agreement with Vogt’s Two Stage Paradigm (Vogt, 2013, p. 17). As the Fulneck museum curator stated:

I feel the ancient church and the renewed church are equally important. Though without the ancient church the renewed one would not have come about. Zinzendorf then drew on the spirit of the ancient brethren to bring people together and cement their aims and aspirations at Herrnhut. This gave them spiritual strength to start the missionary outreach with worldwide impact. On balance, each in their own way are of equal importance (Fulneck museum curator email correspondence 31st January 2017)

Through my visits to and observations of the two communities I sensed there was a great pride in the settlements themselves. The fact that Fairfield is used in television and film, the most recent being the TV series Peaky Blinders and the film Mrs Lowry and her son, says something about the community’s pride in the picturesque location of their settlement that they want to share. Fulneck share this pride in their settlement as their heritage board announces, ‘Fulneck Moravian Settlement Founded in the eighteenth century – a living community today’ with its layout of the site and photographs of the buildings. A pride in the history and heritage of both the communities is something that forms part of their identity.
What clearly emerges from my analysis of questionnaire responses interviews and focus group discussions is the importance that contemporary members of Fulneck and Fairfield assign to the perception of the history of the Moravian Church by those inside the church and outside it: a community united not only by their shared beliefs, but also by a shared sense of history.
Chapter 7. Conclusion

While the history of the Moravian Church of the eighteenth century is well documented, the nineteenth century is under-researched, and there has been little written about the modern history of the church, especially after the Second World War. Moravian academic Craig Atwood finds this disappointing as the modern church is very different from what it was in the past (Atwood, 2020, p. 31). Through the use of archival research of primary sources, as well as drawing on a broad range of literature by historians - some affiliated to the Moravian Church, others not - and in conjunction with contemporary fieldwork at two Moravian settlements in England, this thesis has examined the role of history in Moravian lives today. Different perceptions and understandings of the history of the Moravian Church have been explored as has the way in which history has been shaped over the years by the leadership of the church to present Moravian identity. The combination of my archival research and contemporary fieldwork shows how the different layers of Moravian identity, local - church and settlement, national - the British Province, and international - the global unity of the Moravian Church has interacted and intersected with each other, past and present. This included my analysis of the visits of central European Moravians to both Fulneck and Fairfield in the early years of the English Moravian Church to see the impact they had upon the formation of the settlements’ identities. In addition, my thesis has examined the development of relationships between the two settlements and central European Moravians, especially those with Herrnhut. I found that Fulneck initially had close ties to Zinzendorf, who was involved in the foundation of this settlement which had many settlers from central Europe. Fairfield was founded after Zinzendorf’s death by English Moravians and did not have the same level of continental European connections. However, it is also important to bear in mind that while the settlements in England were among the first settlements outside of central Europe, today the Moravian Church is truly international with twenty-four provinces. Thanks to its missionary work the church has expanded greatly in Africa
and the Caribbean. Of the twenty-four provinces eleven are in Africa and seven in the Caribbean.

I established that members of the communities at Fairfield and Fulneck highly valued the history of their church, furthermore, they assigned importance to notions of unity, not just between members of the Moravian Church in England, but also to notions of a global unity between members of the Moravian Church worldwide. Concerns about being seen as ‘foreign’ or as a ‘sect’ were a recurring theme that was mentioned by members of both the Fulneck and Fairfield settlements. The notion of being seen as a sect or in some way peculiar, prompted community members to want to explain their history to those outside the Moravian communities. Some members of both Fulneck and Fairfield felt that if non-Moravians understood the history of the Moravian Church, it would prevent them seeing Moravians as foreign. However, it was their perception that it was a common misconception for those on the outside of the church to think of the members as being either foreign or members of some kind of religious sect. This is an area that would benefit from further investigation as my data is gathered from church members and not those on the outside. However, the research I conducted on the way non-Moravian groups promote the settlements as places of architectural and historic interest could allay fears of being seen as strange sects and offer opportunities to present and explain their history and identity to a wider audience.

I investigated how both settlements present their history to promote a public facing image. Through the use of pageants which were held both nationally in London and Coventry and locally at Fulneck in 1932, 1957 and 1982, members of Moravian communities in England created links to the past: a past that is carefully selected to include key historical events in order to promote a particular public facing image of Moravian history.
Today the Moravian settlements of Fulneck and Fairfield hold Heritage Open Days where both settlements open their doors to the public and present their history and heritage via guided tours, exhibitions, and presentations which continue to promote their public facing identity. I view the Heritage Open Days and the museums as the present-day successors to the pageants as a means of communicating with a wider public.

The two on-site museums have different approaches to their presentations of the history of their settlements. While the museum in Fulneck is a museum of the history of the settlement, concentrating on what life would have been like living at the settlement, Fairfield looks both to the past and to the present, contrasting the beliefs and practices of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century with those in use today, in order to highlight continuity in their forms of worship. The exhibitions presented at both museums are easily accessible to a contemporary audience, be they Moravian or not. The settlement in Fairfield has a history of being used for period television and cinema locations and the residents take pride in sharing their picturesque setting, whereas Fulneck is a relative newcomer to the world of TV and film first used in December 2020. Again, I view both the open to all nature of the museums and embracing of TV and media as further ways to communicate their public image with a wider audience.

My analysis of survey, interview, and focus group responses and of my contemporary fieldwork brings new insights to the perceptions of Moravian history held by today’s Moravians and the role that plays in their public facing identity. Naturally, there have been changes to the two communities but there is also a continuity with the past. They are both still lived-in religious communities though now there is no segregated living. The choir houses at Fulneck have been converted to apartments and the larger houses at Fairfield have been sub divided. Both of the settlements are seen as desirable places to live. However, through the traditions of the church
there is a continuity with the past. Indeed, the museum at Fairfield draws the visitors’ attention with displays showing ‘how we were’ and ‘how we are’ linking the present to the past. My research indicates that to the members of Fulneck and Fairfield, their settlements are more than where they live: they are places of worship, fellowship, and community. The very words worship, fellowship, and community ran throughout my discussions with the community members.

This thesis argues that the Moravians I surveyed and interviewed see the history of their church as two separate periods which are equally important and agree with Vogt’s Two Stage Paradigm (Vogt, 2013, p. 17). I established that community members from both settlements particularly valued the traditions, practices and events that have been with the church since they were introduced by Zinzendorf in the period 1727 to 1743. This is interesting given the differing demographics of the two settlements. Fairfield has a wider range of age groups while at Fulneck the residents tend to be older.

My research investigated how the congregations of the two settlements fared in the 1960s. The results showed that neither of the congregations suffered dramatic losses. However, the post-pandemic situation at Fulneck is not so good. I recently met with the archivist at Fulneck and found that the church itself was suffering in the aftermath of the pandemic. She explained that the congregation numbers had dropped dramatically and are nowhere near the pre-pandemic numbers. Some members have passed away probably due to the high COVID infection rate after the New Year’s Eve Watchnight service, while others have simply not returned to church. The archivist linked those not returning to the change of the minister and that the church has not had an organist since the start of the pandemic. This also means the monthly organ recitals, which were a popular event and fund raiser, no longer take place (meeting with Fulneck archivist 19th July 2022).
What clearly emerges from my analysis of survey responses, interviews and focus group discussions is the importance that contemporary members of Fulneck and Fairfield assign to the perception of the history of the Moravian Church by those inside the church and outside it: a community united not only by their shared beliefs, but also by their shared history.

While my analysis has focused on the two largest Moravian settlements in England, there are limitations to the scope of the data collected in my research by choosing to limit my fieldwork to two settlements. However, this focus on Fulneck and Fairfield allowed me to use these settlements as case studies that I could explore in some depth. Potential future research could extend the research to cover the third English settlement at Ockbrook and the only settlement in Northern Ireland, Gracehill in order to further increase the number of respondents and explore a Northern Irish dimension of Moravian identity in Britain.

Looking back at my research, could I have done things differently? I think I probably introduced my questionnaires to the communities too soon and with an over reliance on key figures such as the ministers and the archivists. If I had left it later until I was more established in the community, I may have had a greater response. It is also worth noting that COVID 19 and the associated restrictions impacted on the access I had to archives, museums and other aspects of community life during the later stages of my research.

Having reflected on my research at Fulneck and Fairfield, I turn to think about moving forward, looking at different areas of research into the Moravian Church that would benefit from further exploration. One of these areas is the role of gender. While researching the population of early nineteenth century Fulneck, I found that there was a considerable gender imbalance in 1805, which was: 61.5% female 38.5% male. This raised questions, such as whether Moravian
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settlements were more attractive to single women than single men. Did the segregated living arrangements offer a haven where single women felt safe? Or were there other reasons that brought about this imbalance? However, this gender imbalance becomes even more interesting when looking at the same data for the long sixties. When I examined the data for the congregations of Fulneck and Fairfield to test Brown’s argument that the 1950s were the best years for the Christian church (Brown, 2001) and that there was a rapid decline in the 1960s (Brown, 2001), I established that the gender split for 1966 at Fulneck was 37.7% male and 62.3% female, while at Fairfield it was 36.9% male and 63.1% female.¹²⁹

My thesis brings new insights to the way today’s Moravians view their history and examines the role it plays in constructing their public facing identity. While little has been written about the contemporary Moravian church, my research maps the fortunes of the English Moravian church across the 20th century. My examination of the relationship between the British Province and the Continental Province through the two World Wars and the post war Cold War period fills an important gap in academic research of Moravian history. I investigate the changing focus of Moravian communities in England from Continental Europe to the United States. My research also considers how processes of secularisation in the 1960s and 70s affected Moravian communities. Here my findings show that the settlement churches of Fulneck and Fairfield had a higher retention of church attendance than other denominations in this period, countering Brown’s argument (Brown, 2006). Finally, my research has shown that Fulneck and Fairfield have historically been a significant part of the wider diverse global Moravian Church.

Looking forward, what is the next chapter in Moravian history? There are several topics that would benefit from further research. One is the position of the Moravian church as a minority

¹²⁹ Fulneck Congregation Lists, 1966 FUL/5/42
Fairfield Congregation Lists, 1966 T/5/3
religious group in Britain today, bringing the study of the Moravian church into the 21st century. The consistency in the percentage of the gender split over the years is another interesting topic that could be explored in a future research project. This is something that could be brought up to date, reflecting on what has attracted women to Moravian communities, whether this still applies and if so, how this compares to other religious communities. There is also scope for further research into the role that historical pageantry has played in promoting historical narratives. The role of pageants in the Moravian church could be juxtaposed with other Christian denominations’ use of the similar methods.

Finally, another interesting future research topic would be the exploration of notions of Moravian identity among members of the African-Caribbean Moravian communities in London and Birmingham, which were briefly mentioned in Chapter three. These communities offer a very different perspective on the Moravian Church in England. They are testament to the diversity of Moravian communities and have brought a different style of Moravianism to England. It is an area that would certainly benefit from further research. However, whichever theme is followed, it is going to be a fascinating story to tell.
Appendix 1. Copy of questionnaire

This questionnaire forms part of my research project for a PhD in Religious Studies with The Open University on ‘Contemporary English Moravian identity in historical perspective’. It is a questionnaire asking about your views of the relevance of the history of the Moravian Church. Completing this questionnaire should take you about ten minutes.

1. Historically, how do you see the Moravian Church?
   A) The church of the Ancient Brethren founded in 1457
   B) The church renewed in Herrnhut in 1722
   C) Both
   D) Other

   Would you like to add a comment? If so, please write below:

2. Do you think of yourself as
   A) Belonging to the Ancient Brethren
   B) Belonging to the renewed church
   C) Belonging to the global unity
   D) Belonging to the English Moravian Church
   E) Other

   Would you like to add a comment? If so, please write below:

3. On a scale of 1 – 4 (with 1 being not important and 4 being very important), how important is the history of the Moravian Church to you?

   1  2  3  4

   Would you like to add a comment? If so, please write below:
4. Are there any particular people who stand out to you in the history of the Moravian Church?  
   If yes, please list up to three:

   If you would like to add any further comment, please write below:

5. Are there any particular places that stand out to you in the history of the Moravian Church?  
   If yes, please list up to three:

   If you would like to add any further comment, please write below:

6. Are there any particular events that stand out to you in the history of the Moravian Church?  
   If yes, please list up to three:

   If you would like to add any further comment, please write below:

7. Are there any particular books or texts that are important to you as a Moravian?  
   If yes, please list up to three:
If you would like to add any further comment, please write below:

8. Are there any practices that are particularly important to you as a Moravian?
If yes, please list up to three:

If you would like to add any further comment, please write below:

9. On a scale of 1 – 4 (with 1 being not important and 4 being very important), how important is it to you how the history of the Moravian Church is portrayed in the British media (press, TV, radio)

1 2 3 4

Would you like to add a comment? If so, please write below:

10. On a scale of 1 – 4 (with 1 being not important and 4 being very important), how important is it to you that those outside the Moravian Church know about its history?

1 2 3 4
Would you like to add a comment? If so, please write below:

11. On a scale of 1 – 4 (with 1 being not important and 4 being very important), how important is it to you that those outside the Moravian community know you are a Moravian?

1  2  3  4

Would you like to add a comment? If so, please write below:

12. What does being a Moravian mean to you? (brief comment)
About you:
What is your age group?  18-29  30-39  40-49  50-59  60-69  70-79  80+

Are you Male  Female  Don’t wish to say.

If you would be willing to talk to me in more depth, please let me have your contact details below. Please be assured that I will not use your names in my research and any data will be treated with the strictest confidentiality:

Name:

Phone:

Email:

Finally, I would like to thank you for taking the time and trouble to fill in this questionnaire.

If you have any other questions, you can contact me on 07963 553583 or james.rollo@open.ac.uk

Or my supervisors
Professor John Wolffe:  john.wolffe@open.ac.uk
Dr. Stefanie Sinclair:  stefanie.sinclair@open.ac.uk

Or:

Faculty of Arts
The Open University
Walton Hall
Milton Keynes
MK7 6AA
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The General Directory (Unity Elders Conference) -

The General Directory is a legal corporation registered in Herrnhut, Germany. It consists of the members of the Provincial Boards of all the Unity Provinces. The President of the Directory is elected by the Unity Synod and must be a member of the Provincial Board of the Continental European Province.

The Unity Board -

Consists of one member from each of the Provincial Boards of the twenty-four Provincial Provinces and are appointed by the Provincial Board. From this a President is elected and serves a maximum of two years. The Unity Board meets three times in the inter-synodal period, the first immediately following the Unity Synod.

The Unity Synod -

Consists of three delegates from the Unity Provinces, two elected by the Provincial Synod and one appointed by the Provincial board. The Unity Synod sits every seven years.

The Provincial Boards -

Are elected by the Provincial Synods and act in their name and by commission of their synods and are responsible to them.

The Provincial Synods -

Consist of ex-officio members and members elected to represent the Congregations of the Provinces. Details of numbers elected rules of order etc. are decided by each Provincial Synod for its own Province.
Congregation Committee -
Consists of the Minister and at least two others, elected by the Congregation Council.

Congregation Council -
Consists of all communicant members on the roll and meets twice yearly.

Representation
The members of the Moravian communities are represented at all levels in the hierarchy of the governance of the Moravian Church, as an individual by their Congregation committee, locally at the District conference, nationally by the Provincial Boards at the Provincial Synod and internationally by the Unity Board and the Unity Synod.

Provinces of the Moravian Church

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Churches</th>
<th>No. of Provinces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Continental</td>
<td>14,530</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>37,250</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>187,510</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>867,830</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Breakdown of the Provinces of the Moravian Church

**Africa**

Democratic Republic of Congo
Malawi
South Africa
Tanzania, East
Tanzania, Lake Tanganyika
Tanzania, North
Tanzania, Rukwa
Tanzania, South
Tanzania, Southwest
Tanzania, West
Zambia

**Caribbean**

Costa Rica
Eastern West Indies (Includes as one province: - Antigua, Barbados, Grenada, St. Croix, St. John, St. Kitts, St. Thomas, Tobago, Tortola, Trinidad)
Guyana
Honduras
Jamaica
Nicaragua
Surinam

**North America**

Alaska
America North (includes as one province: - Canada, Greenland, and Northern U.S. states)
America South (includes as one province: - Southern U.S. states)
**European Continental**
Includes as one province: -
Albania
Denmark
Estonia
Germany
Latvia
Netherlands
Sweden
Switzerland

**Czech Republic**
As one province

**British**
Includes as one province: -
Great Britain
Northern Ireland

**British Province Districts**

**Eastern District**
Queens Park, Bedford
Fetter Lane, London SW10
Harlesden, London NW10
Irish District
Ballinderry, Co. Antrim
Cliftonville, Belfast
Gracehill, Co. Antrim
Kilwarlin, Co. Down
University Road, Belfast

Lancashire District
Dukinfield, Manchester
Fairfield, Manchester
Royton, Oldham
Salem, Oldham

Midlands District
Hall Green, Birmingham
Leicester, Leicestershire
Leominster, Herefordshire
Ockbrook, Derbyshire

Western District
Brockweir, Gwent
Coronation Avenue, Bath
Kingswood, Bristol
Swindon, Wiltshire
Tytherton, Wiltshire
Weston, Bath

Yorkshire District
Baildon, West Yorkshire
Fulneck, West Yorkshire
Gomersal, West Yorkshire
Horton, West Yorkshire
Lower Wyke, West Yorkshire
Wellhouse, West Yorkshire
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlements</th>
<th>Stand-alone Churches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1722 Herrnhut DE</td>
<td>1730 Marienborn DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1734 Heerendijk NL</td>
<td>1735 Zurich CH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1738 Herrnhag DE</td>
<td>1739 Bern CH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741 Bethlehem USA</td>
<td>1740 Basil CH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1742 Niesky DE, Montmirail CH</td>
<td>1742 Fetter Lane UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1743 Nazareth USA</td>
<td>1743 Tytherton UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1744 Haarlem NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1745 Gnadenthal NL</td>
<td>1745 Kingswood UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1746 Ebersdorf DE, Fulneck UK, Zeist NL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750 Ockbrook UK</td>
<td>1750 Neuwied am Rhein DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1753 Salem USA, Bethabara USA</td>
<td>1751 Kleinwelka DE, Ballinderry UK, Gothenburg SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1755 Dukinfield UK</td>
<td>1755 Kilwarlin UK, Gomersal UK, Wellhouse UK, Wyke UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1759 Bethania USA</td>
<td>1756 Berlin DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1765 Gracehill UK, Serepta RUS</td>
<td>1759 Leominster UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1767 Gnadau DE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1769 Hope USA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1771 Friedland USA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1772 Friedberg USA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1773 Christiansfeld DK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1785 Fairfield UK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1415 – John Huss burned at the stake by the Council of Constance.
1419 – First crusade against the Hussites.
1457 – Unity of Brethren formed by Gregory the Patriarch in Kunwald
1467 – Brethren establish separate priesthood and episcopacy from the Roman Catholic Church.
1505 – First Brethren’s hymnal.
1580 – Publication of the Kralitz Bible, the first complete Bible in Czech.
1592 – Jan Amos Comenius born.
1609 – Letter of toleration makes the Unity of Brethren legal in Bohemia for a brief time.
1623 – Comenius minister at Fulnek in Bohemia (from where the settlement in Yorkshire takes its name).
1627 – Unity of Brethren is exiled from Bohemia and Moravia, find refuge in Poland, Comenius becomes minister at Lissa.
1656 – Destruction of Lissa, Comenius finds refuge in the Netherlands.
1670 – Comenius dies in exile in the Netherlands.
1700 – Zinzendorf born.
1722 – The establishment of the Herrnhut settlement.
1723 – The first visit to England. This visit was to seek fellowship, inter-confessional contact, and solidarity.
1727 – The manifestation of the Holy Spirit, the spiritual birthday of the Moravian Church,
1734 – The second visit to England. Zinzendorf sought permission to start a settlement in the colony of Georgia.
1735 – John Wesley met the Moravians en route to Georgia. David Nitschmann consecrated as the first bishop of the Renewed Moravian Church.
1738 – Formation of the Fetter Lane Society in London.
1749 – English Parliament passed The Moravian Act and declares the Moravian Church “an Ancient Protestant Episcopal Church”. This act linked the reformed church or 1722 with the Bohemian Brethren.
1753 – Climax of the anti-Moravian campaign led by Archbishop Herring via his mouth piece Henry Rimius.
1760 – Death of Zinzendorf, succeeded by Spangenberg as leader.
1764 – Under Spangenberg’s leadership a period of distancing from Zinzendorf with the removal and destruction of documents considered sensitive to the church’s image.

1764 – Start of a period of development and expansion of missionary work.

1770 – Start of a period of recovery after the crisis of 1753. During the period 1770 to 1790 The Moravian Church works hard at regaining its reputation.

1780 – English Moravians discuss greater independence from continental Europe.

1790 – Start of a period of expansion in education with the establishment of schools in England.

1792 – The Moravian Church in England recognised as the authority in the field of foreign mission work.

1795 – The conference at Fulnek in Yorkshire thought about moving away from the use of the Lot. A process where decisions were made by the drawing of a lot, it consisted of a Yes, a No and a Blank. If a Blank were drawn it meant either the wrong question had been asked or asked at the wrong time. The answer was taken as the voice of Christ.

1824 – The establishment of Provincial Helpers a committee authorised by Herrnhut to give greater administrative independence.

1859 – Independence from continental Europe, Herrnhut has only a supervisory role for central organisation.

1860 – The Fulneck Training Institution established in Yorkshire.

1864 – *The Messenger*, the official magazine of the church established.

1874 – Fairfield College established in Manchester.

1908 – The church in England officially changes its name to The Moravian Church as opposed to The Church of the United Brethren.

1914/18 – Decline in congregations due to military service. The new name also causes embarrassment throughout the war period; Moravia was then part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire and an ally of Germany.

1922 – The desire for reconciliation sees the Unity relationships well on the way to normality.

1939/45 – Closer ties with the Church in USA, daily texts come from USA rather than Europe.

1946 – Period of reconciliation, American and Western European churches unite in reaching out to the Moravians in Eastern Germany.

1957 – The first Unity Synod after the war approves the ordination of women in the Moravian Church.

1958 – Fairfield College closes.

1960s – Decline in membership, the need to attract and retain young people leads to a change in the style of worship.

1967 – First ordination of a woman.
1998 – Consecration of first woman bishop.

2007 – Moravian Church celebrates its 550th anniversary.
Appendix 5. Examples of Moravian Hymns

Two hymns from the 1969 hymnbook currently in use at Fairfield Moravian Church, one by Charles Wesley and one by Zinzendorf.

Hymn by Zinzendorf with music, 1912 hymnbook
The overall number of hymns in the 1969 hymn book were reduced, however, 599 were retained from the 1912 edition. The two lists below show the changes in the number of hymns written by key members of the Moravian Church and those that were close to it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zinzendorf, N.</td>
<td>Zinzendorf, N.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zinzendorf, D. (wife)</td>
<td>Zinzendorf, D. (wife)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zinzendorf, C. (son)</td>
<td>Zinzendorf, C. (son)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cennick, J.</td>
<td>Cennick, J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutton, J.</td>
<td>Hutton, J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Trobe, B</td>
<td>La Trobe, B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Trobe, C.</td>
<td>La Trobe, C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesley, C.</td>
<td>Wesley, C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesley, J.</td>
<td>Wesley, J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spangenberg, A.</td>
<td>Spangenberg, A.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The selection of hymns by Zinzendorf and his family as was as those by Spangenberg included in the 1969 edition show there is still a strong connection to the original German hymns, in fact the number by Zinzendorf himself increased.

The following hymn is an example of the style of Moravian hymnody from the period the Moravians called the time of the sifting, the example is from Paul Peucker’s 2007 article ‘The Songs of the Sifting. Understanding the Role of Bridal Mysticism in Moravian Piety during the late 1740s’. This example shows the fixation with the side wound of Christ mentioned in Chapter 3 section 3.7 The Crisis.
4. Göttliches Seitelein

1. Göttliches Seitelein,
   mein ewiges Schatzzelein
   must mir daß? Nachste seyn,
   hast du das geacht hast
   hab ich zum leben keine Lust

1. Divine sidehole,
   my only darling
   must be the closest thing to me,
   if you don't do that thing,
   I do not desire to live

2. Thust du dasjenige so,
   sing ich in Allegro
   Göttliches Seitelein,
   Ganz dem Hohlgen mein,
   ewiges Seitelein,
   vor dein Herzzelein

2. If you do that thing,
   I will sing in allegro
   Divine sidehole,
   long live my dear sidehole,
   eternal sidehole,
   for your sweetheart

   25 Liederbuchlein "auff"
   24 Liederbuchlein "dauerem"

3. Ey so, mein lieber Mann,
   weil ich doch sonst nichts kann,
   als an daß Hohlgen dein,
   stirb ich verbleibst zu seyn
   Daß west du selber wohl,
   mein Hertz ist von dir ganz voll

3. O my dear husband,
   since I cannot do anything else
   except be in love to death
   with the dear hole
   You know that indeed yourself
   that my heart is full of you

4. Lammlein den Seitelein,
   hat mich, den Sunderlein,
   genaglich zu deiner Braut,
   weil ich daraus erbaut,
   bin ich daß Brautel dein,
   und du der Brautgaml meyn

4. Dear Lamb, your side
   has made me, your dear sinner,
   your bride,
   because I am bewn from there i e the side]
   I am your dear bride
   and you are my bridegroom

   25 The German en can also be a term of endearment as machen = to stroke (compare Dutch
aan = to stroke)
   26 Liederbuchlein "zur Sandelehre"
   27 Liederbuchlein "so bin ich drau"
   28 Is 5:1
   29 Liederbuchlein "und nun das"
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